

of the law by this agency. There are some constructive steps that can be taken:

First. Item justification: With the exception of REA, Federal agencies primarily involved in power programs present their annual request to the Appropriations Committee on a line item basis. This gives Congress an opportunity to consider and specifically approve their construction programs. To the contrary, REA makes a lump-sum request which is justified by a vague type of survey among its borrowers. In other words, the financier decides how much he will provide for loans on the basis of how much the bank mortgagees decide they can spend. By requiring REA to present a line item budget to the Appropriations Committee each year for all loans over, for example, \$2,500,000, would give Congress the same control over this agency's lending activities that it exercises over Federal power construction agencies and would tend to reduce REA's presently increasing encroachment on congressional prerogatives. It would also give the Nation's farmers and their elected representatives a chance to check diversion of the Department of Agriculture's efforts to purposes unrelated to agriculture and rural areas.

CRITERION ELIMINATION

Second. Elimination of the third criterion: The Appropriations Committee could correct this matter and at the same

time strengthen generation and transmission standards by prohibiting funds from being used for generation and transmission loans unless they result in lower cost power to consumers. This administrative edict, the third criterion, offers no advantage to the farm user of electricity and negates the longstanding congressionally accepted standards that generation and transmission loans be limited to instances where power is inadequate or where rates can be reduced.

The third criterion was set forth by its proponents as being necessary to eliminate unfair provisions in borrowers' contracts and to insure territorial protection. Territory, however, is a State—not a Federal matter—and many States, without REA interference, have made substantial progress in working out equitable territorial arrangements. As for wholesale contract provisions, every effort should be made to insure their reasonableness, particularly in view of Congress support—and the Budget Bureau's endorsement—of the negotiated contract in preference to construction of generation and transmission facilities.

REA over the years has always taken into consideration the reasonableness of proposed contracts in considering generation and transmission loan applications. This was done without a third criterion. Unfortunately, this criterion has become a club in the Administrator's hands which he has used to become in-

involved in matters beyond his authority and a means by which he subtly operates his program contrary to the direction of Congress.

Third. Judicial review of REA loans: Legislation could be enacted to provide for judicial review of the Administrator's decision either by amendment to the REA Act or by amendment to the Administrative Procedures Act. This would provide an aggrieved party, either a co-operative or a power supplier, with an avenue in the courts for review of any generation and transmission loan decision made by the REA.

Regardless of what Congress may choose to do, one thing is certain—REA's abuse of the law and its encroachment upon congressional prerogatives must be stopped. The longer such activity is permitted to continue, the more difficult it will become to correct.

Professional Boxing Stinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, professional boxing stinks.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

Rev. Dean W. Miller, minister, Palm Desert Community Church, Palm Desert, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting Thou art God. A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past and as a watch in the night. Against the background of Thine everlastingness, grant us insight and vision, that we may behold things seen as temporal and things unseen as eternal.

Bless these, Thy servants, assembled in this hallowed Senate Chamber. Help them to weigh the clamoring demands of the times in the light of eternal truth. Give Thy servants the sturdy faith that amidst the perplexing and confounding evils of our day, Thou canst wrest good out of evil, and that all things work together for good to them that love Thee and serve Thine eternal purpose. Spirit of God, descend upon their hearts and guide them as they lead this Nation in the ways of righteousness and peace.

"God of justice, save the people from the clash of race and creed,
From the strife of class and faction,
Make our Nation free, indeed.

Keep her faith in simple manhood strong as when her life began,
Till it finds its full fruition in the brotherhood of man."

We ask it in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ, who affirmed, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God." Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 26, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

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

secretaries, and he announced that on May 22, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreements, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 3, 4, AND 5 OF 1965—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NOS. 193, 194, AND 195)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, embodying three reorganization plans. Without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

The messages were referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of the locomotive inspection activities of certain personnel employed by or attached to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I have stressed that we must reorganize and modernize the Government's organization structure in order to focus responsibilities, increase efficiency, and meet present day needs more effectively. The reorganization plan, which accords

with recommendations made to me by the Interstate Commerce Commission, supports these objectives. It will make possible necessary changes in the organization and administration of the Commission's railroad safety operations.

The Commission's ability to organize and carry out most effectively its responsibilities for railroad safety is now severely limited by certain anachronistic provisions of the locomotive inspection statutes. These provisions go back to an earlier period before steam locomotives were replaced almost completely by diesel engines. At that time locomotive boilers were temperamental and dangerous and special measures were required to enforce adequate safety standards. Present law specifies in detail the method of appointing locomotive inspectors, the functions to be performed by them, and the organization structure for administering inspection activities. While these provisions may have been suited to conditions 50 years ago, they are clearly inappropriate today.

Progress in railroad technology has not eliminated the need for locomotive inspection. Locomotive inspection is still essential for the safety of employees, passengers, and cargo. The Interstate Commerce Commission, however, properly should not be held to account for the performance of this important function as long as it lacks authority to make those changes in organization and operations which it deems necessary to meet current safety needs and to promote maximum economy and efficiency. The primary purpose of the accompanying reorganization plan is to terminate outdated arrangements which now stand in the way of the most effective management of the Commission's railroad safety program.

Organizational flexibility is at present restricted by the statutory requirement that there be 50 locomotive inspection districts and at least 1 inspector for each such district. The number of inspectors and districts cannot be adjusted to accommodate to changes in workload or other relevant factors.

Locomotive inspection is rigidly separated from related railroad safety activities performed under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The locomotive inspection statutes restrict inspectors of locomotives to the inspection of locomotives only and prevent the inspection of locomotives—except brakes and safety appliances—by other Commission railroad safety personnel. Thus, the Commission is prevented from making the most effective utilization of its total staff of locomotive and train inspectors. In order to eliminate the present uneconomical duplicate visits to railroad yards and otherwise to promote the most economical and effective administration of its railroad safety responsibilities, the Commission should have the authority to assign staff to duties for which they may be qualified by training and experience. The reorganization plan will make this possible.

Organizational flexibility is hampered further by the provision for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of a Director and two As-

sistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection. Originally, these officials were to be selected with reference to their practical knowledge of the construction and repair of boilers. Later amendments broadened their responsibilities to embrace all parts of the locomotive and tender. These clearly are not policy-making positions, warranting Presidential appointment. As is now the case with other comparable positions where appointments should be based primarily on professional and technical qualifications, personnel supervising locomotive inspection functions should be appointed under the classified civil service.

By eliminating the present cumbersome restrictions on inspection districts, the duties of locomotive inspectors, and the appointment of the Director and Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, the plan will make it possible for the Commission to utilize its personnel more efficiently, integrate the work performed by locomotive inspectors with that performed by other Commission railroad safety inspectors, and take full advantage of recent improvements in the organization of the Commission's central office and field activities.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan:

First. All functions of the Director of Locomotive Inspection, the Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, and district locomotive inspectors will be transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Suitable powers of delegation with respect to the functions so transferred will be conferred upon the Commission.

Second. The position of Director of Locomotive Inspection, the two positions of Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, and all positions of district locomotive inspector will be abolished. The Commission will be required to appoint to a position under the classified civil service, as provided in the reorganization plan, each person who immediately prior to the taking effect of the plan held the office of district inspector of locomotives; such appointments will be deemed to be made without any break in service.

Third. The function of dividing the territory comprising the several States and the District of Columbia into 50 locomotive boiler-inspection districts will be abolished.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that, by reason of the reorganizations made by the reorganization plan, it is necessary to include in the plan the provisions contained in section 5 thereof. The rates of compensation thereunder are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable positions in the executive branch of the Government.

The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 2(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 4 of the act of

February 17, 1911, chapter 103, 36 Stat. 914, as amended.

The reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will produce some immediate savings and significant long-range economies. The latter will result from future improvements in the organization and administration of the affected functions made possible by the plan. Since the plan will open the way for the more effective utilization of safety inspection staffs of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will yield a significantly increased measure of safety inspection activity for each dollar spent for this purpose. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

Under the accompanying reorganization plan, all essential Government railroad safety services to the traveling public and employees will continue to be performed. The plan provides urgently needed modernization of the organization and procedures in the Interstate Commerce Commission's railroad safety program. I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1965.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations of various committees and other similar bodies.

The strength and vitality of our democracy depends in major part upon the Federal Government's adaptability, on its capacity for fast flexible response to changing needs imposed by changing circumstances. If we are to maintain this capacity, we must have a government that is streamlined and capable of quickly adjusting and readjusting its organization and operating procedures to take up and surmount new challenges.

As government grows more complex and programs increasingly cut across traditional agency lines, we must exercise special care to prevent the continuance of obsolete interagency committees and other coordinating devices which waste time and delay action and the undue proliferation of new committees. Interagency committees are a valuable and often indispensable means for facilitating coordination, but we should be sure that a committee is the most efficient way to accomplish a given task and that it is structured to meet current needs effectively.

At my direction, guidelines for the management of interagency committees have been established. I have recently asked the heads of departments and agencies to give their personal attention to a complete review of all the interagency committees in which their agencies participate to determine which ones might be eliminated, consolidated or otherwise reorganized. We will take appropriate action to obtain essential

improvements in the organization and use of those committees which have been established by the executive branch.

The reorganizations accomplished by the reorganization plan transmitted herewith will enable us to take similar action with respect to a number of committees which have been established by statute. In many instances the statutory provisions creating these committees are very specific as to membership and describe in detail the functions to be performed. These provisions are rarely sufficiently flexible to permit the membership or role of the committees to be accommodated to changing circumstances or to permit their termination when they have outlived their usefulness.

The accompanying reorganization plan will abolish nine statutory committees. In each case the responsibility for providing suitable arrangements to assure effective consultation and coordination is placed in a specific official. Wherever the continuing need for and usefulness of a committee has been demonstrated, I would anticipate the establishment of a successor committee along the general lines of the body now provided by law. Certainly prompt action will be taken to create successor committees to such bodies as the Board of Foreign Service and the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. But we will have the flexibility promptly to make such changes in functions and membership as might be required to eliminate overlapping and duplication and to adjust to the development of new programs and shifts in executive branch responsibilities.

A number of the committees affected by the reorganization plan are advisory to the President or have functions which are closely related to responsibilities already vested in the President. The functions of those committees will be transferred to the President by the reorganization plan. The functions of the others will be transferred to the appropriate individual agency heads.

The management and control of interagency committees have been a matter of growing concern to both the executive branch and the Congress. The taking effect of the reorganization plan will contribute significantly to better management of interagency committees and will assist efforts to simplify and modernize coordinating arrangements within the executive branch.

Executive Order No. 10940 of May 11, 1961, provides for the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to consult with that Committee on matters of general policy and procedure arising in the administration of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 and to consider certain recommendations of that Committee, 42 U.S.C. 2546(b). To require the Secretary by law to consult with a committee established by Executive order is clearly anomalous. The plan abolishes the relevant functions of the Secretary with re-

spect to consulting and considering the recommendations of the President's Committee. The reorganization plan does not otherwise affect the Committee; it has no effect upon Executive Order No. 10940. The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 13(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 7(b) of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 574.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 4 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.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs and in a more timely manner than at present. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan. I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1965.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1965

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, May 27, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 203, as amended.)

ABOLITION OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES, COUNCILS, AND BOARDS

Part I

SECTION 1. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS. All functions of each of the following-named bodies, together with all functions of the Chairman and of other officers of each thereof, are hereby transferred to the President of the United States:

(a) The National Housing Council, provided for in section 6 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 (61 Stat. 955) as affected by (i) section 502(a) of the Housing Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1283; 12 U.S.C. 1701c); (ii) section 603 of the Housing Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 440; 12 U.S.C. 1701i); and by (iii) section 615 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 317; 12 U.S.C. 1701i-1).

(b) The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, provided for in section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, 59 Stat. 512, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286b).

(c) The Board of the Foreign Service, provided for in section 211 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, 60 Stat. 1001 (22 U.S.C. 826).

(d) The Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, provided for in section 212 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 827).

(e) The Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, provided for in section 204 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, 72 Stat. 431, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2474).

SEC. 2. PERFORMANCE OF TRANSFERRED FUNCTIONS. The President may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance of the

functions transferred by the provisions of section 1 of this reorganization plan by any other officers of the executive branch of the Government or by any agencies or employees of that branch.

SEC. 3. ABOLITION OF BODIES. (a) Each of the bodies referred to in paragraphs (a) to (e), inclusive, of section 1 of this reorganization plan is hereby abolished.

(b) The President shall make or cause to be made such provisions as may be necessary with respect to the winding up of any outstanding affairs of the bodies abolished by the provisions of section 3 of this reorganization plan.

Part II

SEC. 11. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission all functions of the Advisory Council on Group Insurance, provided for in section 12(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, 68 Stat. 742 (5 U.S.C. 2101(a)).

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration all functions of the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration, provided for in section 4(d) of the Small Business Act, 72 Stat. 385 (15 U.S.C. 633(d)).

(c) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior all functions of the advisory board provided for in section 2(a) of the Act of August 20, 1937, 50 Stat. 732, as amended (16 U.S.C. 832a(a)), commonly referred to as the Bonneville Power Advisory Board.

(d) There are hereby transferred to the Attorney General all functions of the Awards Board provided for in section 3 of the Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955, 69 Stat. 365 (50 U.S.C. 47b).

(e) The transfers made by subsections (a) to (d), inclusive, of this section shall be deemed to include all functions of the Chairman and of other officers of the respective transferor bodies referred to in those subsections.

SEC. 12. PERFORMANCE OF TRANSFERRED FUNCTIONS. Each officer to whom functions are transferred by the provisions of section 11 of this reorganization plan may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance of the functions so transferred to him by his subordinate officers, employees, or agencies.

SEC. 13. ABOLITIONS. (a) Each of the bodies the functions of which are transferred by the provisions of section 11 of this reorganization plan is hereby abolished. Each officer to whom functions are transferred by those provisions shall make such provisions as may be necessary with respect to the winding up of any outstanding affairs of the body or bodies the functions of which are so transferred to him.

(b) The functions vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the provisions of section 7(b) of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 574 (42 U.S.C. 2546(b)), are hereby abolished.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for certain reorganizations relating to the National Science Foundation.

The plan contains two reorganization measures. First, all committees provided for in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 would be abol-

ished. That section provides that there shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation, having not less than five members who are appointed by the National Science Board for 2-year terms. Section 8, as affected by section 23(b) (3) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, 76 Stat. 1255, directs each such committee to make recommendations to and advise and consult with the Director of the National Science Foundation with respect to matters relating to the program of its division. Originally the Foundation had three such committees, corresponding to its three divisions. With the growth of the Foundation, five additional divisions have been established; consequently the Foundation, in accordance with the requirements of section 8, now has eight divisional committees. This multiplication in the number of committees has proved cumbersome. For example, three committees are now concerned with scientific personnel and education matters instead of the original one committee, even though one committee is all that is required to meet the Foundation's needs in this area. The elimination of the various statutory divisional committees will simplify the structure of the Foundation and improve its administration.

The second reorganization measure contained in the accompanying reorganization plan would empower the Director of the National Science Foundation to delegate functions vested in him by law or delegated to him by the National Science Board. The expanding responsibilities of the Foundation and the Director indicate that it is necessary that the Director clearly have such authority.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan, the National Science Foundation will institute such new arrangements, in lieu of the divisional committees now required by law, as it deems appropriate. Such new arrangements may include the establishment of committees under section 6 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and such other devices for obtaining advice as may be available to the Foundation.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The reorganization plan will permit more effective management of the affairs of the National Science Foundation. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

The statutory authority for the exercise of certain functions which would be abolished by section 1 of the reorganization plan is contained in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 152.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1965.

REORGANIZATION PLAN No. 5 OF 1965

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled May 27, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 203, as amended.)

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. ABOLITION OF COMMITTEES. There are hereby abolished all functions of the (divisional) committees provided for in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 152; 42 U.S.C. 1867), all functions with respect to the appointment of committees under that section, and all committees now existing under that section. The Director of the National Science Foundation shall make such provisions as he shall deem necessary respecting the winding up of any outstanding affairs of the committees abolished by this section.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE. The Director of the National Science Foundation may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the National Science Foundation of any of his functions (including functions delegated to him by the National Science Board).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTES TO VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a most happy and auspicious occasion. It is the birthday anniversary of the Vice President of the United States, who

now sits in the hallowed chair before us. We are delighted that his health is as good as ever, that his vitality is unbounded, and that his mental quickness is undiminished. He has performed arduous duties which have been his lot since leaving the ranks of the Senate. I take this occasion to extend to him my best wishes, not only for a happy birthday, but for many happy birthdays to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the majority leader.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Speaking on the minority side of the aisle, I join with most sincere affection and respect in wishing for our Vice President many happy returns of the day. The difficult decision which you encountered on an earlier occasion in your life, Mr. Vice President, and, regrettably, perhaps somewhat erroneously, made, in joining your party rather than ours is, I am glad to say, quite irrelevant on a happy and auspicious occasion such as this, where festivity preempts the field, and where politics is irrelevant. I have heard many of my wife's friends, the wives of Senators, speaking with her in glowing terms about your good and gracious and lovely wife, Mrs. Humphrey, and the gracious and helpful manner in which she has always conducted herself in the wives' organization. Surely every Senator has the same happy thought as to the manner in which you have conducted yourself in the second highest responsibility which the people of the United States can repose in a man. From all of us, a fond and affectionate respect and best wishes on your birthday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from California.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I saw in this morning's newspaper two statements which were attributed to the Vice President, with one of which I wish to associate myself; about the other, I wish to express some doubts. One statement in the press quoted you, Mr. Vice President, as saying that you had reached the age of 37. I do not wish to associate myself with that part of the statement. I did, however, see the quotation of your statement that you intended to call your mother and congratulate her; and I would like to be a cosponsor of that call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join other Senators in extending congratulations to my Vice President on this milestone in his life, and to join all of his friends in the Senate in wishing him many happy birthdays in years to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I associate myself with the majority leader, the minority leader, and other Senators who have spoken in extending congratulations on our Vice President's birthday anniversary. It has been a pleasure to have been associated with him for many years as a Senator, and now it is a privilege to serve under his leadership and guidance in his capacity as Presiding Officer of this body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I am delighted to join other Senators in expressing my best wishes to the Vice President on his birthday. It is difficult for me to realize that this Vice President has birthdays. Vice President HUMPHREY does not seem to grow older; he is the personification of youth. He has been to me as ageless as laughter, good humor, and wisdom. I think he is to most of the country.

The word associated with birthdays—"happy"—is a word that we associate also with the distinguished Vice President of the United States. If anyone has brought happiness to public life, and hope and optimism for the future, it is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, now Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

He has brought to public life something else that is too rare a commodity—a delightful sense of humor. It is always in good taste; it never offends. It is something that has helped America as well as this great body to enjoy life.

We are all well aware that few Vice Presidents in the history of this Republic—perhaps none—have discharged the duties of their office with greater distinction than has Vice President HUMPHREY in the brief time that he has served in that office.

I am delighted to join my colleagues in wishing him a very happy birthday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, like my colleagues, I take great joy in the fact that the Vice President is a happy Vice President. To a happy Vice President and a very dear friend, I wish a very happy birthday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues and to join in wishing the Vice President many happy returns of the day, not only for his own sake and that of his family, but for the United States. We are proud of your conduct in your new capacity and wish you many happy years of success.

Someone referred to you recently as "the happy warrior." That is an old slogan that was associated with another great American. We are very happy that you are referred to in the same manner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

IN THE ARMY

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, in the Army, and in the Navy and Marine Corps, which were on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1966, FOR DISASTER RELIEF (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of \$35 million, for disaster relief (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO BEAUTIFICATION OF THE NATION'S HIGHWAYS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to provide for the control of junkyards along certain Federal-aid highways;

A bill to broaden the purposes for which Federal-aid secondary highway funds may be used;

A bill to provide for landscaping and scenic enhancement of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; and

A bill to provide for the control of outdoor advertising along certain Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27

"Concurrent resolution to place the Louisiana Legislature on record as opposing passage of S. 1592, proposing amendments to the Federal Firearms Act by placing unreasonable and unwarranted restrictions on the sale, possession, and use of firearms by sportsmen and other reputable citizens

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut (S. 1592), which would prohibit all mail-order sales of firearms to individuals, and would permit such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers, and dealers, and place severe and unreasonable restrictions upon reputable citizens who wish to order recreational firearms by mail; and

"Whereas the Dodd bill (S. 1592), if passed and written into law, would give the Secretary of the Treasury, or his agent, virtually unlimited authority to regulate the sale of firearms by dealers, which could result in the institution of stringent controls and prohibitions over such sales; and

"Whereas the founders of the United States of America, in the very first amendment to the Constitution, provided assurances of freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of peaceable assembly, and in the second amendment they made it possible to defend these freedoms by providing that the rights of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; and

"Whereas any firearms legislation at the Federal level restricting the purchase of firearms by responsible citizens would be a dangerous infringement of these articles of the Bill of Rights and could lead to administrative decisions imposing such a burden on the sale, possession, and use of firearms for legitimate purposes as to completely discourage and eventually exclude the private ownership of all guns and firearms of any kind whatsoever; and

"Whereas such restrictive regulations as are contained in the Dodd bill (S. 1592) against firearms sales could have a crippling effect on the economy of the multi-million-dollar-a-year sales and services business associated with recreational use of firearms in the State of Louisiana, and would only result in the further loss of American liberty, add to the workload and responsibility of our law enforcement and police forces, and inconvenience and penalize law-abiding citizens; and

"Whereas easy accessibility of firearms does not contribute significantly to the crime problem of the United States, and the target for preventative legislation should be the crime, not the tool used by perpetrators of crime; and

"Whereas Federal excise taxes on sales of firearms and other forms of revenue from special licenses and stamps for recreational hunting provide many millions of dollars annually for the conservation and preservation of wildlife of all kinds; and

"Whereas if honest citizens should be required to register every gun, regardless of the purpose for which it is to be used, it would provide the Federal Government with a national inventory of privately owned firearms which inventory would be under the control of and in the possession of a very small group of officials; and

"Whereas the passage of S. 1592 would greatly curtail the use of firearms by the youth of our Nation for recreational and sporting purposes and thus prevent many of the young people of the Nation from learning the use of firearms under supervision and control thereby creating a dangerous situation in later years whereby there would be a great number of inexperienced adults using firearms; and

"Whereas it is in the great interest of the national defense against enemy invasion that the people of the United States be familiar with and accustomed to the use of firearms; and

"Whereas history has shown that in some areas it was partially through such registration of weapons and the control of all such weapons by a very small percentage of the populace that the democratic form of government was lost; and

"Whereas public hearings on S. 1592 will be held May 19-21, 1965, by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which the author of the bill, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, is the chairman, and

"Whereas there is an increasing agitation in Washington, D.C., to pass bills to control the ownership, possession, and use of firearms, which are cardinal rights of citizens of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Louisiana Legislature does hereby go on record as opposing the passage of S. 1592 (the Dodd bill), and urges and requests that each and every member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States actively oppose and vote against the passage of the said S. 1592; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of senate shall transmit, without delay, copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the two Houses in the Congress of the United States, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

*"C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.*

*"VAIL M. DELONEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

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

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

"Concurrent resolution to request the Congress of the United States to give priority to the planning for improvements necessary to make the Red River navigable to Shreveport and to provide funds therefor

"Whereas the Red River is one of the largest rivers in the State; and

"Whereas the Red River flows into the Atchafalaya River which then flows into the Mississippi River, thus constituting a complete waterway for navigation from the Gulf of Mexico to the city of Shreveport, but many improvements are needed on the Red River in order to make it navigable; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to the economy and development of the Red River Valley and the people thereof that navigation be opened up on the Red River from Shreveport to its juncture with the Atchafalaya and the Mississippi Rivers: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana (the House of Representatives thereof concurring), That the Legislature of

Louisiana does hereby urge and request the Congress of the United States, and particularly the Public Works Committee and the subcommittees thereof, to take such immediate steps as are necessary to give serious consideration and high priority to the planning for such improvements on the Red River and funds therefor as are necessary and essential to make this river navigable from the city of Shreveport to the point at which it flows into the Atchafalaya River and on to the Mississippi River, thus providing a navigable waterway for shipping by water from the city of Shreveport to the mouth of the Mississippi River at the Gulf of Mexico; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted without delay by the secretary of the senate to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairmen of the Public Works Committee of the two Houses of Congress and to each Member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress.

"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

*"VAIL M. DELONEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

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

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to take action necessary to transfer ownership of land purchased by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 to the various States in which located, to be used for educational purposes

"Whereas the lands purchased by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 constitute a great portion of the surface of the many States in which these lands are located, and in Colorado cover in area approximately 625,000 acres in the counties of Weld, Baca, Prowers, and Otero alone; and

"Whereas the limited use and present administration of these lands by the Federal Government constitute an economic waste in the fact that only a small part of the potential revenues from these lands are being collected, and the failure of these lands to return proper revenues results in an irreparable loss to the people of the various States in which these lands are located; and

"Whereas these lands have been a burden to the Federal Government from the standpoint of administrative costs; and

"Whereas the granting of title to these lands to the various States in which located for the benefit of their public school systems would serve as a permanent source of income for such States and their public schools, thus making a concrete contribution by the Federal Government to the cause of education: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to transfer ownership of lands purchased by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1937 to the various States in which located, to be used, or the income therefrom to be used, for educational purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and

the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

*"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
President pro tempore of the Senate.*

*"ALLEN DINES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

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

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 47

"Whereas inasmuch as the present box car shortage has been with us for several years and that it appears to be getting worse instead of better, and inasmuch as it is having a depressing effect on grain markets and thereby on farm income in that export markets are being threatened, if not lost, because we are unable to move grain into export positions fast enough to satisfy shipping movements and thus grain may be more readily bought from other nations; and

"Whereas the available box car supply is totally inadequate; and

"Whereas often months lapse before grain can be moved for which orders for export have been received; and

"Whereas the shortage of cars has a serious depressing effect on the grain trade, and consequently on our agricultural economy; and

"Whereas middle western railroads are building cars but that these cars find their way to eastern and southern U.S. area railroads and are retained there because it is cheaper, under existing levels of per diem rates, to rent a car than it is to own one: Now, therefore, be it

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

"1. That Congress be requested to enact legislation which will authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to set the per diem rates at a point that there will be an incentive to all railroads to construct or to purchase rolling stock rather than to rent them from other railroads;

"2. That printed copies of this resolution be sent by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from Nebraska, to the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

*"PHILIP C. SORENSON,
President of the Legislature."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

"Joint resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to authorize the sale or transfer of the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital to the State of Ohio for use as a State hospital for mentally retarded children

"Whereas the members of the 106th General Assembly of Ohio are fully cognizant that the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital is situated on a 66-acre tract, 3 miles west of Brecksville, Ohio, in the heart of the populous Cleveland-Akron metropolitan area; and

"Whereas the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital is superbly equipped with all the modern facilities for the care and treatment of patients, including an excellent medical library, a clinical and research laboratory, a surgical unit, a complete radiology service, and approximately 300 full-time employees comprising a complete team of professional, technical, administrative, and other personnel supplemented by a visiting staff of consultants who are outstanding in their specialties; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has decided to curtail the operation of a number of such hospitals and Broadview is destined by this action to be shut down and its excellent facilities to lie fallow, unproductive, and unused; and

"Whereas the State of Ohio's need for such patient care and research facilities for mentally retarded children as exist at Broadview is immediate and immense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the 106th General Assembly of the State of Ohio respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the General Services Administration to negotiate with the Governor of the State of Ohio and the department of public works for the sale or transfer of the Broadview Heights Veterans' Hospital to the State of Ohio for the purpose and use as a hospital for mentally retarded children; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the pages of the journal and that the clerk of the senate transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to each Senator and Representative from Ohio in the Congress of the United States.

"ROGER CLOUD,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"JOHN BROWN,

President of the Senate.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 460

"Concurrent resolution directed to the West German Government to dispense with the limitations on the prosecution of capital crimes

"Whereas the limitations provision observed by the West German Government places a limitation on the prosecution of capital crimes which will prevent the ultimate apprehension and trial of Nazi war criminals responsible for horrible atrocities during the preceding World War II; and

"Whereas these crimes are offenses against humanity and not limited to any country or people; and,

"Whereas many residents of Florida were affected by these atrocities, either personally or through relatives and friends; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida desires to have all persons responsible for the extreme atrocities and genocide punished; and

"Whereas there is no limitations period for the punishment of capital crimes in the State of Florida, United States of America; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that West Germany should remove their limitations provisions; and

Whereas it appears to the Legislature of the State of Florida that those charged with the above crimes are tried by juries composed of the German people which gives the accused his fairest forum; and

"Whereas this limitations provision becomes effective May 8, 1965: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Legislature of the State of Florida hereby urges the West Germany Government to extend its limitations provision applying to Nazi war atrocities for an indefinite period and make appropriate provision for the complete and ultimate prosecution of all persons responsible therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Chancellor of the West German Government, the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and to members of the Florida delegation in Congress.

"Approved by the Governor, May 14, 1965.
"Filed in office of the secretary of state, May 14, 1965."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 454

"Resolution to compensating the Philippine Scouts for their services rendered in World War II

"Whereas the Philippine Scouts units serving with the U.S. Army rendered heroic and invaluable services in behalf of the United States of America and the free world during World War II, and suffered particular hardship and cruelties in the early days of that conflict when their homeland was overrun by the hostile forces of the common enemy; and

"Whereas the Philippine Scouts served side by side with American troops and conducted themselves with great valor and distinction in the campaigns in the Philippine Islands, and particularly in the battles on the Bataan Peninsula and at the Island of Corregidor; and

"Whereas during these campaigns and prior thereto the Philippine Scouts were compensated pursuant to pay scales fixed by the Government of the United States with levels of remuneration substantially lower than those prescribed for other soldiers serving with the U.S. Army, with the result that the compensation received by these brave men was not commensurate with the extraordinary service they rendered; and

"Whereas action taken by the Congress of the United States, through enactment of Public Law 607 of the 77th Congress on June 16, 1942, to raise pay scales applicable to the Philippine Scouts to levels of equality with those of other soldiers serving with the U.S. Army were never fully effectuated in respect to services rendered by those men in the early campaigns in the Philippine Islands; and

"Whereas many important and prominent personages, including the former commander in the Philippine area, the late General Douglas MacArthur, have commented upon and urged that appropriate actions be undertaken to effect the long overdue adjustments in compensations earned by the men who served in the Philippine Scouts during those critical days; and

"Whereas there is presently a bill in Congress to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their survivors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact the pending bill into law to compensate those Philippine Scouts who served in World War II for the lesser wage and salary amounts paid them at that time; and be it further

Resolved, That the Armed Forces Committee is strongly urged to schedule an early hearing on the pending bill so that action may be taken on the bill as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly 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.

"JAMES D. DRISCOLL,

Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 21

"Resolution Relating to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

"Whereas it is necessary that training and retraining opportunities be opened as fully as possible to older workers, including the provision for on-the-job training in advance

of layoffs in order that unemployment be reduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to increase the present funds allocated to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2571 et seq.) in order to expand the present opportunities for training of older adults and to increase the present level of training allowances for persons enrolled in such programs and to continue financing this program entirely with Federal funds; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared 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 concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"RESOLUTION 197

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress to appropriate an additional \$600,000 for the Economic Engineering Survey of the so-called All-American Canal

"Whereas the United States has assumed an obligation with its good neighbor, the Government of Canada, to contribute its full share toward the successful operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

"Whereas the only existing navigable facility connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is the Canadian-owned Welland Canal which is being sorely pressed to meet present and projected shipping needs; and

"Whereas the construction of an alternate ship canal in western New York State would make a major contribution to the welfare of the United States as well as Canada; because

"1. In the event of breakdown or destruction of the existing Welland Canal, the commerce of the entire Great Lakes area of the United States and Canada west of Lake Ontario would be denied access by water transportation to the St. Lawrence Seaway and international shipping lanes;

"2. It would provide a more secure inland route for the movement of iron ore in the event of war;

"3. It would ease the strain on congested rail facilities and east coast ports in the time of emergency; and

"4. It would allow the construction and repair of oceangoing vessels in the more secure areas of the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the construction of a new and modern canal built to the lock specifications of the Poe lock now being built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Sault Ste. Marie, would contribute greatly to the prosperity of commerce, industry and agriculture, not only in those States bordering the Great Lakes, but throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the commerce of the State of New York would be enhanced by the benefits accruing from the building of a new canal; and

"Whereas the construction of the canal would stabilize employment, provide job security and expand job opportunities; and

"Whereas the President and Congress of the United States in their wisdom and foresight approved, in 1962, a \$1,825,000 economic-engineering survey of a new Lake Erie-Lake Ontario Canal; and

"Whereas the Congress has appropriated to date \$650,000 in survey funds; and

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has publicly stated that the saturation point on the Welland Canal, including its twinned-

lock improvements, will be reached by 1980-85; and

"Whereas the period of construction of a new canal would take from 5 to 7 years and thus require that the building phase commence in the early 1970's; and

"Whereas there exists a definite need to move the economic-engineering survey along to a speedy completion so that actual construction might begin at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to provide an additional \$600,000 in study funds for use by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to advance the necessary survey and plans for the canal, as aforesaid; and, be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted as follows: 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; and to each Member thereof from the State of New York; to the Governor of the State of New York; to the Commissioner of Commerce of the State of New York; to the chairmen of the port authorities of Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego and Ogdensburg; to the Governor and State legislative leaders of the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota.

"By order of the senate.

"GEORGE H. VAN LINGEN,

"Secretary.

"In assembly May 12, 1965. Concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly.

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,

"Clerk."

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Texas Councils of the League of United Latin American Citizens, at Lubbock, Tex., on May 7-9, 1965, commending the fruitful efforts of the equal employment opportunity program for the Navy Department for Latin American citizens in this country; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Don Snider, of New Windsor, Md., remonstrating against the appropriation of additional money for the war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Blair County Game, Fish and Forestry Association, Inc., of Riggles Gap, Pa., protesting against the enactment of any laws that provide for the licensing of firearms by legitimate firearm owners; to the Committee on Commerce.

Three resolutions adopted at a convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, D.C., relating to a minimum wage proposal for the District of Columbia; home rule for the District of Columbia; and health and welfare proposals for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The petition of Sidney O. Sampson, Robot Education Systems, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to exempt tips from taxation under the Federal income tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Sparks, Nev., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a Great Basin National Park in eastern Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Albuquerque Typographical Union No. 304, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, relating to the employment of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Veterans' Organizations of Greater Dallas, relating to the closing of McKinney Veterans' Administration Hospital, and the Veterans'

Administration regional offices at Lubbock and San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Shawnee District Council of the AFL-CIO, endorsing the principles of Senate bill 1781, relative to the hiring of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Port Angeles, Wash., Local 956, International Typographical Union, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the employment of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Danville Typographical Union No. 230, of Danville, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, relating to the employment of strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Thief River Falls, protesting against the removal of mail from certain Soo Line trains; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, of Lapwai, Idaho, relating to the appropriation of funds for anthropological research and studies of ancient burial grounds and lands along the Snake River; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the South Carolina voter education project, of Columbia, S.C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 6755. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes (Rept. No. 266).

ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 265)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Antitrust and Monopoly Activities, 1964," pursuant to Senate Resolution 262, 88th Congress, 2d session, together with the individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT OF PEACE CORPS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 267)

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 2054) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon, which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 2049. A bill to amend subsections (b) and (c) of section 116 of title 28, United States Code, so as to realign the counties comprising the territory of the U.S. district courts for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2050. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 2051. A bill to clarify the tax status of American Indians; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonardo M. Cabanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Canton Federal reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2054. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 267).

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he reported the above bill, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REALIGNMENT OF COUNTIES COMPRISING THE TERRITORY OF CERTAIN U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in Oklahoma we have three judicial districts for U.S. district courts. These are the northern, eastern, and western districts. Court for the eastern district is held principally at Muskogee, Okla., court for the western district is held principally at Oklahoma City, Okla., and court for the northern district is held principally at Tulsa, Okla.

Judges in the eastern and western districts are unanimous in their opinion that these two districts should be realigned so that five counties in south central and southwestern Oklahoma would be transferred from the eastern district to the western district. The counties involved are Jefferson, Stephens, Grady, Garvin, and McClain. All are situated much closer to Oklahoma City than to Tulsa.

Because of this proximity to Oklahoma City and the advantages to attorneys and litigants through accessibility and monetary savings, county bar associations in the five counties involved have passed resolutions endorsing this realignment of the two districts. There is a unanimity of opinion on this proposal.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I introduce a bill to realine the eastern and western judicial districts of Oklahoma, moving the five counties to the western district, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2049) to amend subsections (b) and (c) of section 116 of title 28, United States Code, so as to realine the counties comprising the territory of the U.S. district courts for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), 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 subsections (b) and (c) of section 116 of title 28, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"EASTERN DISTRICT

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

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

"WESTERN DISTRICT

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

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

SEC. 2. This Act shall become effective sixty days after the date of its enactment.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF MIAMI INDIANS OF INDIANA AND OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], I introduce, by request and for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma.

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana, jointly, as representatives of the Miami Tribe as it existed in 1818, were awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets No. 67 and No. 124 for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Ohio

and Indiana by the treaty of October 6, 1818, 97 Stat. 189. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 251 for inadequate payment for lands in Kansas ceded by the treaty of June 5, 1854, 10 Stat. 1093. The awards in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 and docket No. 251 are on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" and draw interest at 4 percent per annum. The Miami Tribe of Indiana was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 124-A for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Kansas by the treaty of June 5, 1854, 10 Stat. 1093. The money is credited to the account of this group and draws interest at 4 percent per annum. The amount is also shown in the enclosed tabulation, which I shall submit at the close of my remarks for the RECORD, dated April 6, 1965, from John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior, to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, President of the Senate.

In contrast to the Miami Indians of Indiana, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma is organized as a single political entity under a constitution and bylaws adopted pursuant to the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936, 49 Stat. 1967. The constitution and bylaws provide for a tribal governing body authorized to speak and act in behalf of the tribe on all matters of interest to the tribe and to prescribe eligibility requirements for membership in the tribe.

The bill I am introducing today will permit the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to decide how they will program their judgment funds derived from docket No. 251. The proposed bill will also authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in docket No. 124-A to all persons, except the members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, who can trace their ancestry to either of the 1895 rolls or the 1889 Eel River roll. The proposed bill will also authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 to all persons who are on or can trace their ancestry to the 1889, or either of the 1895 rolls, or the "Western Miami" roll of June 12, 1891, which roll identifies Miamis living in Oklahoma as of that date. Persons of Miami Indian ancestry who are members of the organized Miami Tribe are not excluded from participation in the dockets Nos. 67 and 124 award. Finally, the proposed bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reserve a portion of the funds to meet litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, in future cases which are pending before the Indian Claims Commission for these groups.

Mr. President, in conclusion, may I add that the chief of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Forest D. Olds, has indicated unqualified support of this bill on behalf of the tribe. An identical measure, H.R. 7466, was introduced in the House on April 14, 1965, by the Honorable Ed EDMONDSON, of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as a cosponsor of this important proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 1 week so that other Senators who desire to do so may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill and Mr. Carver's letter, mentioned earlier, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be retained at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma, and the text of the bill and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2050) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2050

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall take the necessary steps to provide for the distribution and use of the money appropriated to the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma in satisfaction of judgments awarded by the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 67 and 124, 124-A, and 251 as herein-after provided.

SEC. 2. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 251, together with the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be advanced or expended in accordance with plans adopted by the governing body of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The persons entitled to share in any per capita payment authorized by the governing body and approved by the Secretary shall be all individuals who are enrolled members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, as organized under the Oklahoma Welfare Act (49 Stat. 1967).

SEC. 3. For the purpose of determining entitlement to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 124-A to the Miami Indians of Indiana and appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), the Secretary shall prepare a roll of all persons of Miami Indian ancestry who meet the following requirements for eligibility:

- (a) They were born on or prior to, and living, on the date of this Act; and
- (b) Their name or the name of an ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on the roll of Miami Indians of Indiana of June 12, 1895, or the roll of "Miami Indians of Indiana, now living in Kansas, Quapaw Agency, I. T., and Oklahoma Territory," prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 903), or the roll of the Eel River Miami Tribe of Indians of May 27, 1889, prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of June 29, 1888 (25 Stat. 223). No person whose name appears on the current tribal roll of the Miami Tribe of

Oklahoma shall be eligible to be enrolled under this section.

Sec. 4. For the purpose of determining entitlement to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 67 and 124 and appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons of Miami Indian ancestry who meet the following requirements for eligibility:

(a) They were born on or prior to, and living on, the date of this Act; and

(b) Their name or the name of an ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on any of the rolls cited in section 3(b) of this Act, or on the roll of the Western Miami Tribe of Indians of June 12, 1891, prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1000).

Sec. 5. Applications for enrollment must be filed with the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the eligibility of an applicant shall be final.

Sec. 6. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Indians of Indiana that were appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 124-A, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be distributed to the individuals whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 3, and in accordance with the instructions contained in sections 8 and 9, of this Act.

Sec. 7. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" that were appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 67 and 124, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be distributed to the persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 4, and in accordance with the instructions contained in sections 8 and 9, of this Act.

Sec. 8. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee, and the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share payable to a deceased enrollee directly to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary, whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive.

(b) A share payable to a person under twenty-one years of age or to a person under legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary determines will adequately protect the best interests of such persons.

Sec. 9. (a) Prior to making any distribution of the funds credited to the Miami Tribe or Nation and the Miami Tribe of Indiana or approving any expenditures of the funds credited to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, pursuant to this Act, the Secretary is authorized to reserve in the Treasury of the United States a part of such funds sufficient, in his judgment, to meet the litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, of the remaining cases which each has pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

(b) The funds reserved shall be available for appropriate withdrawal by the Secretary.

Sec. 10. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes, and any costs incurred by the Secretary in the preparation of the rolls and in the distribution of per capita shares in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment funds.

Sec. 11. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The letter presented by Mr. HARRIS is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1965.
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Miami Indians of Indiana, jointly, as representatives of the Miami Tribe as it existed in 1818, were awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets Nos. 67 and 124 for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Ohio and Indiana by the treaty of October 6, 1818 (7 Stat. 189).

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 251 for inadequate payment for lands in Kansas ceded by the treaty of June 5, 1854 (10 Stat. 1093).

The awards in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 and docket No. 251 are on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" and draw interest at 4 percent per annum. The amounts are shown in the enclosed tabulation.

The Miami Tribe of Indiana was awarded a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 124-A for inadequate compensation for lands ceded in Kansas by the treaty of June 5, 1854 (10 Stat. 1093). The money is credited to the account of this group and draws interest at 4 percent per annum. The amount is also shown in the enclosed tabulation.

The Miami Tribe or Nation was paid an annuity under the treaty of October 6, 1818, as well as under subsequent treaties. Following the treaty of November 28, 1840, a segment of the tribe moved to Kansas. However, a large number of tribal members, in addition to those who had special permission under treaties and acts of Congress to remain in Indiana, did not migrate to Kansas but remained in Indiana and adjacent States. Consequently, during the period of 1846 to 1854, the tribal annuities were made to those Miami Indians in Indiana and those in Kansas on separate payrolls. Most of the Kansas Miami Indians now constitute the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma.

In 1859, the Secretary of the Interior, without consulting or obtaining the consent of the Miami Tribe, recognized 73 individuals in Indiana as being of partial Miami Indian blood. Thereafter, the individuals were allotted lands of the reserve in Kansas and received a portion of the annuities belonging to the Miami under articles 2 and 4 of the 1854 treaty. The individuals were subsequently stricken from the roll, and Congress by the acts of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1000) and March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 903), appropriated money to pay to the Miami Indians the sums taken from the funds of the respective bands. It also compensated the western Miami for lands allotted to the 73 persons. Inasmuch as the judgment awarded in docket No. 124-A includes additional compensation to the Miami Indians of Indiana for their share of the annuities which were commuted in 1854, the Indiana Miami roll of June 12, 1891, and the "Indiana Miami living in Kansas" roll, both of which were prepared to distribute money to the Indiana Miami pursuant to the act of March 2, 1895, have been designated in the proposed bill for

establishing eligibility to share in the docket No. 124-A award.

The roll of the Eel River Miami Tribe of 1889 has also been designated as a basis for establishing eligibility for enrollment for the purpose of sharing in the judgment awards in dockets Nos. 67, 124, and 124-A. The records indicate that the Eel River Miami were a part of the Miami Tribe at all times. Separate rolls listing the individuals affiliated with the Eel River Band were prepared for the purpose of making annuity payments in accordance with the treaties of August 3, 1795, August 21, 1805, and September 30, 1809. The last separate roll found for them was prepared in 1889 for the purpose of distributing the funds paid in commutation of those treaties. Not all of the names on that roll were listed on the 1895 roll of Miami Indians of Indiana. Therefore, so as not to preclude the Eel River Miami and their descendants from sharing in the judgments, the Eel River roll also has been specified in the proposed bill as a basis for establishing eligibility to share in the funds appropriated to cover the awards.

In contrast to the Miami Indians of Indiana, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma is organized as a single political entity under a constitution and bylaws adopted pursuant to the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967). The constitution and bylaws provide for a tribal governing body authorized to speak and act in behalf of the tribe on all matters of interest to the tribe and to prescribe eligibility requirements for membership in the tribe.

The proposed bill will permit the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to decide how they will program their judgment funds derived from docket No. 251. The proposed bill will authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in docket No. 124-A to all persons, except the members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, who can trace their ancestry to either of the 1895 rolls or the 1889 Eel River roll. Finally, the proposed bill will authorize a per capita distribution of the judgment payable in dockets Nos. 67 and 124 to all persons who are on or can trace their ancestry to the 1889, or either of the 1895 rolls, or the "Western Miami" roll of June 12, 1891, which roll identifies Miami Indians living in Oklahoma as of that date. Persons of Miami Indian ancestry who are members of the organized Miami Tribe of Oklahoma are not excluded from participation in the docket Nos. 67 and 124 award.

The history of the Indian claims cases has shown that the lack of availability of funds for litigation expenses slows down the work necessary in establishing Indian title and determining the extent of financial liability. The proposed bill, therefore, authorizes the Secretary to reserve a portion of the funds to meet litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, in future cases which are pending before the Indian Claims Commission for these groups.

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

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

(Enclosure.)

Miami Tribe (Dockets Nos. 67 and 124-A, and 251) judgment funds

[Balance as of Dec. 10, 1964]

14X7417: Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma (includes awards from dockets Nos. 67 and 124, and 251):
Net award, dockets Nos. 67 and 124----- \$4,647,467.67

Miami Tribe (Dockets Nos. 67 and 124-A, and 251) judgment funds—Continued

[Balance as of Dec. 10, 1964]

Net award, docket No. 251	\$349,193.59
Total of awards, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	4,996,661.26
Deductions from award principal:	
Attorney fees, dockets Nos. 67 and 124	467,746.76
Attorney expenses, dockets Nos. 67 and 124 pending	
Attorney fees, docket No. 251	34,919.36
Total	499,666.12
Balance of award on deposit in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964	4,496,995.14
14X7917: Interest and accruals on interest, awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma:	
Interest accrued through June 30, 1964	219,679.51
Deductions: Attorney expenses, docket No. 251	5,701.27
Total	213,978.24
Total cash on hand in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964, dockets Nos. 67 and 124, and 251	4,710,973.38
14X7418: Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Indiana:	
Net award, Docket No. 124-A	64,738.80
Deductions:	
Attorney fees	6,473.86
Attorney expenses	1,908.10
Total	8,381.96
Balance of award on deposit in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964	56,356.84
14X7918: Interest and accruals on interest, awards of Indian Claims Commission, Miami Tribe of Indiana: Interest accrued through June 30, 1964	6,285.97
Total cash on hand in U.S. Treasury as of Dec. 10, 1964, docket No. 124-A	62,642.81

CANTON IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Canton Dam project on the North Canadian River was authorized by Public Law 761, 75th Congress, in 1938. Its construction was begun in 1940, suspended during World War II, and completed in May 1948, at a cost of \$10,552,000.

It is located in Blaine County, 3 miles north of Canton and about 75 miles west of Oklahoma City.

The reservoir, behind the rolled earth-fill embankment, controls a drainage area of 12,500 square miles and has a storage capacity of 386,000 acre-feet.

The Flood Control Act of 1946 authorized 69,000 acre-feet of storage in the

reservoir for irrigation of downstream lands, but the necessary improvements by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to permit utilization of the storage have not yet been developed. The 1948 Flood Control Act provides for 38,000 acre-feet of storage for municipal water supply. Pending development of irrigation features, the reservoir is operated to provide 276,700 acre-feet of flood control storage, 88,700 acre-feet for water supply and 20,600 acre-feet for conservation and sedimentation reserve.

Operation of the reservoir has proven beneficial from the standpoint of both flood and drought conditions. About 144,000 acres of land along the North Canadian River downstream from the dam are benefited from the storage of floodwaters in the reservoir. During the eight floods that have occurred since the project was completed, reservoir releases were held to bankfull flows or below in the channel immediately downstream from the dam. Flood damages prevented to date are estimated at \$4,774,180. In addition, revenues amounting to \$126,800 have accrued to the project from the leasing of lands in the reservoir area. Annual payments of \$148,550 are received from the city of Oklahoma City under terms of two contracts for temporary rental of storage space to augment the municipal water supply. Full benefits from low-flow and emergency water supply releases have not as yet been evaluated.

The extent of public interest in Canton and a measure of its value from the standpoint of recreation are demonstrated by attendance records. Over the past 12 years, attendance has averaged 638,000 visitors annually.

Overall, the benefits accruing from the project have, in the 17 years of operation, exceeded the construction and operation costs invested by the Federal Government.

The bill which I introduce today, joined by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], will authorize the construction and operation of the irrigation of 16,000 acres of land in Blaine and Canadian Counties with water from the North Canadian River impounded in the Canton Reservoir.

Representative JED JOHNSON, JR., will introduce an identical bill in the House.

A project feasibility report was completed by the Bureau of Reclamation in August 1951 and was formally reviewed in the first part of 1952 by Federal and State agencies in accordance with requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The feasibility report, entitled "Canton Project, North Canadian River Basin, Okla." was transmitted to the Congress on June 10, 1954, and was subsequently printed in 1954 as House Document No. 445, 83d Congress, 2d session.

More than 11 years have elapsed since the project feasibility report was prepared, and even more time has passed since the engineering, water supply, and economic studies were made; hence a "reappraisal" has been prepared for the primary purpose of determining current project feasibility and bringing studies

up to date so as to reflect changes in basic data, construction costs, and economic and other factors that have had a bearing on the project during the past decade or more.

The people of the project area in 1945 evidenced their desire for the project by formation under the laws of Oklahoma of the Canton Irrigation district, a responsible organization that has continuously supported efforts to obtain project authorization. This district, which is empowered to execute an irrigation repayment contract, is still existent.

A water right for the project has been established. The Secretary of the Interior on July 13, 1939, made application for withdrawal of unappropriated waters of the North Canadian River. This application was accepted by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board. It was recognized by the Oklahoma district court in decree No. 99028, December 1939, adjudicating water rights of the North Canadian River. This withdrawal has been modified by subsequent partial releases made by the Secretary of the Interior at the request of the State of Oklahoma. The project right is subordinate to the prior right of the city of Oklahoma City, which is significant in determination of the North Canadian River flows which can be stored for project use.

Hydrologic studies still show that a reasonably dependable water supply of quality suitable for irrigation could be provided for the project by regulation of the North Canadian River flows in the Canton Reservoir, provided the necessary irrigation storage capacity is maintained for the project.

The Bureau of Reclamation, with recognition of the authorization of the Canton Reservoir construction, and at the request of local interests and the State, developed plans for irrigation of the potential Canton project lands.

On the basis of decisions reached in conferences between the corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, the corps, as part of construction of the Canton Dam and at a cost of about \$100,000, constructed the outlet works determined by the Bureau to be desirable for delivery of Canton Reservoir to a gravity canal which would extend to the potential project lands.

Early planning by the Bureau was on the basis that construction of the reservoir with about 400,000 acre-feet of storage capacity insured that the approximate 69,000 acre-feet then deemed required to provide an adequate water supply for the contemplated irrigation, would be available to the Canton project without cost to the irrigators. This conformed to the viewpoint of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board and the project interests.

The plan provides for construction of works to convey and distribute water from Canton Reservoir for irrigation of 16,000 acres of land along the North Canadian River in Blaine and Canadian Counties, and for necessary drainage. The principal works include the irrigation outlet works at Canton Dam, a main earth canal about 46 miles long with a maximum capacity of 300 second feet at

the point of diversion at Canton Dam, laterals for distribution of water from the canal to the project lands, and drainage facilities.

The irrigation plan for the 16,000-acre project is identical to the one presented in House Document No. 445. However, construction costs have increased in the intervening years; and the current estimated cost of the irrigation system is \$6,355,000.

Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs under current prices are now estimated at \$85,000 annually for a 16,000-acre project on the basis of a full water supply for irrigation. This is \$5.30 annually per acre and is comprised of \$5.20 for the irrigation distribution system and \$0.10 for the irrigation outlet works at Canton Dam.

Payment capacity on the basis of a full supply of irrigation water is summarized from farm budgets tabulated below on a per-acre basis.

Farm budget summary based on full irrigation water supply

Item:	Per acre
Increase in—	
Gross farm income.....	\$44.93
Farm expense.....	22.41
Net farm income.....	22.52
Family living allowance.....	
Equity allowance.....	.83
Family labor and wages of management.....	5.17
Payment capacity.....	16.52
Contingency (15 percent).....	2.52
Payment capacity after allowance for contingency.....	14.00
Project O.M. & R. cost.....	5.30
Amortization capacity.....	8.70

It was estimated that the benefits of irrigation over a 100-year period will average about \$34 per acre per year. Total irrigation benefits for a 16,000-acre project are \$544,000 annually.

The investment cost for the project is estimated to be \$9,696,900, which includes interest during construction as well as the construction cost of the irrigation works. In addition, it includes a share of the cost of the dam and reservoir allocable to irrigation based on irrigation storage that would be provided.

Annual project costs consist of amortizing the net Federal investment cost over a 100-year period at 2½ percent interest, plus the annual operation and maintenance cost.

The benefit-cost comparison is as follows:

Total annual irrigation benefits.....	\$544,000
Total annual project costs (irrigation).....	\$377,800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.44

The delay in developing the project has already resulted in loss of considerable economic benefits to a fine agricultural area. Further delay will constitute a further waste of valuable water resource that is capable of providing over a half million dollars benefits annually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2053) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Canton Federal reclamation project, Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), was received, read

twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 217)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to S. 1446 the Wild Rivers Act. The effect of this amendment would be to add to the national wild rivers system State designated and administered wild river areas.

Inclusion of such nationally significant waterways, administered under State authority, would effectively bring the States into compatible partnership with the Federal Government. The preservation of selected rivers recommended by the Governors of the several States and the President and approved by the Congress would be enhanced and the national conservation purposes of the Wild Rivers Act thus furthered.

In submitting recommendations for State-administered wild river areas the Governor of the State would present to the President his recommendations for such inclusion in the national wild rivers system. His recommendations would be supported by a general plan which would assure the President and the Congress that the purposes of the act would be effected in perpetuity. The President would review State proposals and make known his recommendations to the Congress for legislative designation of the wild river area within the national wild rivers system.

Funds appropriated to the States from the land and water conservation fund would be made available to the State for the acquisition of property, rights, or easements necessary for the purposes of the act. Such authorization will provide the financial means of State action and is in full accord with the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which we passed in the last Congress. This is a logical extension of the Federal-State-local partnership required in the "new conservation" advocated so eloquently by President Johnson for the preservation and restoration of natural beauty throughout our land.

In my State of Maine this approach will, I feel sure, ameliorate the deadlock between Federal and State interests for the preservation of that most beautiful and wondrous wilderness area, the Allagash River, the greatest such remaining area in the Eastern United States. I feel equally sure that many of my colleagues here will be cognizant of similar application within their own States where the preservation of scenic wilderness waterways is impeded by alternate positions in the States and the Federal bureaucracy, albeit that their end intentions are the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 217) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 85, which I introduced on Monday, be held at the desk for an additional 3 days, until the close of the session on June 3.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. MURPHY be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1566) to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and Mr. PELL be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1807) to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation, at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] may be added as cosponsor to S. 1858, to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets, at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1858, to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets, at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] be added as cosponsors of the bill, S. 1596, to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1229) to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. SKUBITZ were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 821) for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product.

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

RESOLUTION RELATED TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. The State Corporation Commission of Kansas unanimously adopted a resolution in regard to Senate bill No. 218, which is now pending in Congress.

This bill, as approved, would authorize the Federal Power Commission to take jurisdiction over matters that many, including the State corporation commission, believe should be left in the hands of the States.

I share this view and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

(In the matter of the amendment of section 201(f) of part II of the Federal Power Act)

Whereas there has been introduced in the 89th Congress Senate bill 218 which would amend the Federal Power Act with reference to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and would provide that Federal regulation of matters relating to the transmission and sale of electric energy should not extend to those matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by a State regulatory body; and

Whereas the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas is of the opinion that the public interest is best served by legislation amending the Federal Power Act to remove jurisdiction from the Federal Power Commission those aspects of the transmission and sale of electric energy which are primarily of local concern and subject to effective State regulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact Senate bill No. 218 which would amend section 201(f) of part II of the Federal Power Act, or any other bill which would accomplish the same objectives: *Provided*, However, there is effective State regulation of the transmission and sale of electric energy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized by forwarding copies of this resolution to the Kansas congressional delegation; to the Senate Commerce Committee; to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and that copies be sent to the Federal Power Commission and the several State regulatory commissions; to the Secretary of the National Association of Railroads and Utilities Commissions, and to the electric companies operating in the State of Kansas.

The commission hereby adopts the foregoing resolution.

Commissioners:

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL, *Chairman*.

JAMES O. GREENLEAF.

HARRY G. WILES.

Dated at Topeka, Kans., this 17th day of May 1965.

RAYMOND B. HARVEY,

Secretary.

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRANCE AND DE GAULLE IN PROPER FOCUS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic has now been called into question by President de Gaulle, who declared yesterday:

The French Government is convinced that the foreign political and military intervention currently in progress in Santo Domingo, in continuing, can lead only to the extension both on the spot and in the whole of that region of the world of disturbances disquieting for international peace.

This statement is part of a consistent pattern followed by President de Gaulle, who has also criticized our proposals to help defend freedom and self-determination in South Vietnam and made dire predictions about the fate of NATO, from which beginning in 1969 any one of the 15 member nations may withdraw on 1 year's notice.

I have recently been in Paris on a mission as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and was there faced with questions about President de Gaulle's charge that the United States and the Soviet Union were trying to establish separate hegemonies with the implication that these threatened the national integrity of individual states. The whole pattern of the French President's pronouncements recently has been to nuzzle the American people and to undercut U.S. diplomatic and military efforts around the globe. It is therefore vital, considering France's importance to the security and freedom of Europe, President de Gaulle's historic services to the freedom and stability of France, and

the historic and close Franco-American friendship and alliance, that the matter be put in proper focus.

I believe that our country must stand behind the following propositions:

First. Now that our actions in the Dominican Republic have been assimilated into the authority of the OAS and are being taken in common with other OAS members with the objective of helping to maintain security, self-determination, and free institutions for the Dominican people, these actions are proper and vital to the peace and freedom of the Western hemisphere and fully in accord with the American regional system, which is consonant with and recognized by the United Nations Charter. We must and should, therefore, remain constant in this policy as it has developed.

Second. We are in South Vietnam struggling side by side with a people that shows every evidence of wishing us to do so, at the invitation of their government, to defend their country against aggression carried out through the fomenting of internal guerrilla war by North Vietnam, aided and abetted and supported by both Communist China and the Soviet Union. It is our traditional policy to counteract Communist subversion disguised as so-called wars of national liberation. Laying aside for the moment proper debates over means, tactics, and scale of our effort in Vietnam, this policy is absolutely essential to the peace, security, and freedom of the United States and the free world.

Third. Notwithstanding President de Gaulle's own feelings about Europe for the Europeans, the people of the United States have the right to believe that it is the preponderant sentiment of the peoples of Europe that their own economic, social, and political integration, in association with the United States and Canada through NATO and the growing instruments of the Atlantic community, represents their surest guarantee of peace and well-being and constitutes the basic foundation of the security of both Europe and North America and of international peace and freedom throughout the world.

Fourth. France is an essential, vital element in Europe, because of its capacity, its strength, its position, and its traditions. France has too much at stake to withdraw from or reject the instruments of security, including NATO, which have been fashioned since the end of World War II at such tremendous cost and through such great effort and struggle. The American people have the right to believe, therefore, taking into account France's historic and traditional concern for world peace, self-determination and freedom, and even considerations of strict self-interest, that France will not disrupt its own security or the Security of the Atlantic community by withdrawing from NATO or undertaking any other truly decisive disruptive act.

Fifth. We must continue to give the greatest consideration to the views of President de Gaulle and of France, fully understanding and respecting the historic role of the French President and that of the nation he heads, evaluating

French ideas and suggestions—no matter how provocatively put forth—not only in their form, but in their substance.

On the basis of these propositions I see the possibility of an entirely viable relationship between the United States and France, and as one Senator, I shall do everything I can to forward and secure that relationship and that historic friendship and alliance.

BURKE MARSHALL OPPOSES DIRKSEN APPORTIONMENT AMENDMENT AS DESTRUCTIVE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, pending at the present time before the Committee on the Judiciary is a constitutional amendment to provide that the States may elect one house of their legislatures on some basis other than population. This is the well-known Dirksen amendment. There has been much testimony pro and con about that amendment.

One of the most persuasive appearances, in my judgment, was by Burke Marshall. Burke Marshall was President Kennedy's expert on civil rights. He is recognized throughout the Nation as a man who understood the implications and problems of civil rights very well. He particularly understood the difficulty of enforcing effective civil rights legislation in view of our federal system.

In fact, he wrote a great book entitled "Federalism and Civil Rights." It is a very short book, but a most informative one. Burke Marshall has been vigorously against the so-called Dirksen-Mansfield apportionment amendment on the ground that it would interfere and interfere seriously with civil rights.

I should like to quote briefly from his testimony. He said:

Those who are concerned about increased Federal activity in seeking solutions for the immense difficulties the cities face in education, health, welfare, housing, and poverty should recognize that it has been the apparent inability of the States effectively to act that breeds the Federal programs now in process. We have seen this happen most clearly in the field of voting, where the abuse of State police power and the refusal in some States to correct discrimination against Negroes in registration and voting has inexorably led to Federal legislation, and the exercise of Federal power, in 1957, 1960, 1964, and now in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In the case of urban problems, the absence of effective State action has been at least in part—I believe in large part—an inevitable result of 60 years of history in which a small minority of the population of the States could elect and control their legislative houses.

Mr. Burke Marshall points out the concentration of Negro Americans who live in the cities. It is these people who would have their franchise diluted and reduced if the Dirksen amendment were to go into effect. That is why this is a central civil rights issue.

Burke Marshall also points out:

In the first place, none of the proposed amendments explicitly bars racial considerations as a factor in determining the apportionment of representation in a State legislature. I assume that it is not the intention of the proponents of the amend-

ments thus to dilute or eliminate the effect of the 15th amendment. Nevertheless, even if this is made clear, the choice as to method of apportioning under the amendment would necessarily be given in the first instance in some States to legislators who have been put in office by an electorate that has excluded large numbers of Negroes. This is certainly true now at least in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Further, the effect of past discrimination in other States, whether or not Negroes can now get registered, has been the cause of disproportionate underrepresentation of Negro population.

In my judgment, it would ignore reality to believe that race would not be a major factor, if not the controlling factor, in any referendum on the apportionment question in several of our States for a considerable time to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent statement by Burke Marshall, given before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY OF BURKE MARSHALL BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, MAY 14, 1965

I appreciate the opportunity to testify in opposition to the proposals to amend the Constitution to permit the States to abandon the principle of equality in selecting the Members of one House of their legislatures. I shall try to be as brief as possible in stating my reasons.

I am an attorney presently engaged in the private practice of law. From February 1961, until January of this year, however, I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. The briefs filed expressing the views of the United States in the reapportionment cases originated in that Division and accordingly the position taken by the United States, supporting the constitutional views later adopted by the Supreme Court, was initially my responsibility. In addition, the major efforts of the Division during the past 4 years have been directed at insuring the Negro citizens of some of the States that they would be given the right freely to register and to vote and accordingly to have a proportional voice in their State and local governments. I believe that the proposed amendments to the Constitution which are before this committee would seriously undercut those efforts, and it is to that aspect of the matter that I would like principally to direct the committee's attention.

It seems to me that the proposed amendments carry a very heavy burden from the outset because they are the first serious proposals that I know of to amend the Constitution to eliminate, rather than to enhance, rights that are protected against State action by the Constitution, particularly the 14th and 15th amendments, and are in that sense guaranteed by the Constitution to the people.

Only the most compelling reasons could justify this kind of dilution of the right to equal protection of the laws which is now a right of all our citizens. What has happened since the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Baker v. Carr*, *Reynolds v. Sims*, and the other reapportionment cases, certainly does not furnish any such reasons. Those decisions have not created any constitutional crisis. Rather they have provided a stimulus for long-overdue corrective action by the States that at least moves in the direction of making their legislative bodies working institutions of government, capable of dealing

with the problems of this century and the urbanization of our society.

All of the available history rather argues against any tampering with the Constitution in this respect. For the fact is that, until the Federal courts finally intervened, following *Baker v. Carr*, to protect the right to equality in voting which is guaranteed by the 14th amendment, a crisis in our Federal system was brewed by a failure on the part of the States to meet their responsibility in dealing with our society as it exists in fact, not in fancy. Those who are concerned about increased Federal activity in seeking solutions for the immense difficulties the cities face in education, health, welfare, housing, and poverty should recognize that it has been the apparent inability of the States effectively to act that breeds the Federal programs now in process. We have seen this happen most clearly in the field of voting, where the abuse of State police power and the refusal in some States to correct discrimination against Negroes in registration and voting has inexorably led to Federal legislation, and the exercise of Federal power, in 1957, 1960, 1964, and now in the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In the case of urban problems, the absence of effective State action has been at least in part—I believe in large part—an inevitable result of 60 years of history in which a small minority of the population of the States could elect and control their legislative houses.

Amending the Constitution so as to permit this history to be repeated does not make any sense. It is dangerous in the long run for the continued viability of the States and the Federal system. In addition, it is specifically dangerous to the minority groups, particularly Negroes, who most drastically feel the impact of the urban problems which I have mentioned. In fact, the proposed amendments seem to me to endanger very seriously our entire effort to give these groups an effective political voice in asking their States for help.

In the first place, none of the proposed amendments explicitly bars racial considerations as a factor in determining the apportionment of representation in a State legislature. I assume that it is not the intention of the proponents of the amendments thus to dilute or eliminate the effect of the 15th amendment. Nevertheless, even if this is made clear, the choice as to method of apportioning under the amendment would necessarily be given in the first instance in some States to legislators who have been put in office by an electorate that has excluded large numbers of Negroes. This is certainly true now at least in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Further, the effect of past discrimination in other States, whether or not Negroes can now get registered, has been to cause disproportionate underrepresentation of the Negro population.

Thus the initial decision itself in these States, whatever the amendments say, will be made with racial history in mind. And at least until the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been passed and given a substantial period of time in which to work, the electorate in passing on the system of apportionment in any referendum would be an unrepresentative electorate. In my judgment, it would ignore reality to believe that race would not be a major factor, if not the controlling factor, in any referendum on the apportionment question in several of our States for a considerable time to come.

Further, some of the proposed amendments, including that suggested by Senator DIRKSEN, fail to make any provision, and perhaps cannot effectively do so in any event, for reviewing decisions about apportionment that are made by the legislatures in power at the time that the amendment becomes ratified. Decisions that will affect, and intimately affect, the lives of future generations will thus be made by legislatures

which are now malapportioned and in which Negroes are grossly underrepresented.

Finally, there are many ways in which racial considerations can enter into these decisions without violating a prohibition against discrimination.

Apportionment on any but a population basis, for example, has always discriminated against city dwellers, and this fact proportionally deprives Negroes of political voice more than any other identifiable group. In 1960, over 72 percent of Negro Americans lived in urban areas. There is every indication that this percentage is increasing, and increasing rapidly. In Alabama, for example, the percentage of nonwhites living in urban areas went up 23 percent between 1950 and 1960, while those living in rural areas went down almost 20 percent. In Mississippi, the comparable figures were 27.6 percent increase and a 17.7 percent decrease; in North Carolina, 26.4 percent as against 2.5 percent; in Louisiana, over 200 percent as against 8.6 percent. Of all the Southern States, only Florida showed any increase in the nonwhite population in rural areas, and that increase was slightly over 1 percent as against 71.3 percent in urban areas.

If it be assumed that the discrimination permitted by the proposed amendments may be based on other factors than giving rural voters a greater voice than urban voters, there are available many other ostensibly nonracial criteria which would result in depriving Negroes more than whites of a voice in their government. If property qualifications are used, for example, only three out of eight nonwhite households owned their own homes in 1960, as compared to five out of eight white householders. These are national figures; the disparity would be much greater for the Southern States. In terms of education, in 1960 the median school years completed for whites was 10.9, while the comparable figure for nonwhites was 8.2 years. The 6.7 percent of whites in the country have had less than 5 years of elementary school, but this was true in 1960 of 23 percent of the nonwhites. Similar disparities can be found in any educational standard that is chosen. And they can be multiplied in terms of any economic, social, or even regional interests, not related to population, which might be used as a test of representation.

It is to be noted that the use of property, educational, or other objective criteria for apportionment purposes cannot really be answered by tampering with the language of the proposed amendments so as to appear to prohibit racial discrimination. At the least, efforts to preserve white political supremacy in some States would lead to endless litigation over the methods of apportionment chosen. The gerrymandering of Tuskegee, Ala., which was the object of the court's opinion in *Gomillion v. Lightfoot*, is only the most blatant of racially motivated political action. More probably, however, whatever language was proposed could not in fact prevent the devising of some methods of apportionment which would in effect deprive the Negro minority of a real political voice.

Nor is this a matter which is in any sense cured by the requirement that the method of apportionment be submitted to the people by way of referendum. We have seen again and again in the States I have referred to, and in others, the lengths to which the majority of voters will go—even complicating very seriously the methods by which they become registered themselves—to find ways of keeping Negroes from gaining any political voice. It is for this reason that the Constitution thus far has prohibited the majority, even through democratic means, from depriving members of a minority group of their right to be treated fairly under the law. Further, as I have already pointed out, in

several States the electorate that would in fact approve any apportionment system in the next few years will be an electorate which is already in imbalance because of existing or past racial discrimination in registering and voting.

These are some of the specific problems which are clearly discernible in the proposed amendments. But in conclusion, I would like to point out that the question goes far beyond mere technical underrepresentation of this one segment of the population. The question is whether or not the States will have political systems capable of action to meet the most urgent problems of our society, of which the most pressing and most difficult is that of low-income Negroes and other nonwhites living in the blighted and congested parts of the urban centers. However the language of these proposed amendments is changed, they plainly contemplate the possibility of a malapportioned house in every State legislature which will at the very least have veto power over welfare, economic, educational, and civil rights measures aimed at remedying urban problems, and particularly the condition of the urban Negro. And if our experience in past years means anything, it is unrealistic to expect responsiveness to these needs by a legislative body whose members owe little or no political allegiance to the people in need of help.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, knows of the respect in which I hold him. I do not want now to encumber the Record with a long colloquy on a highly controversial issue which the Senate and House of Representatives will face later.

I simply say to the Senator that, in our society, we must place our trust in the people. It is the people at the ballot box who must, in the final analysis, make many of the very basic policy decisions which confront them.

It has seemed to me, therefore, that if a constitutional amendment were to place the right in the people to make a decision at the ballot box with reference to the manner in which they would desire to apportion their legislative branch, the ends of our type of society would be very well met, and the people themselves would be making the choice.

People make mistakes on occasion, but not very often. Therefore, it has seemed to me, I say to my friend, that giving the people in each State a continuing right on election day to make their decision with respect to the reapportionment problem is in the very essence responsive to the type of society which our Founding Fathers envisioned.

I make this comment obviously in no spirit of rancor, but because I do want to point out that when we debate as he sees the light, my able friend—who has devoted himself to principle record here—I and others will have an opportunity to debate at close range whether Congress should recommend a constitutional amendment to the people and have the people in each State make that decision.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from

California. He has hit upon the crux of this debate. Last year, it was the analogy of State government with the Federal Government and the Senate; the so-called Federal analogy. This time it will be whether the people should decide the matter in a referendum.

The position of the Senator from Wisconsin is very simple on this matter. The fact is that the Senator from California and I have responsibility as Senators. It seems to me that we must pass on the merits of legislation and whether it should be submitted in a referendum to the people or not. We could have a referendum which would enable the people to pass a national lottery, to legalize gambling, or legalize selling of harmful drugs. We could say leave it to the people, pass the buck, let the people decide these and all issues. Why not? Can we walk off and forget our duty? Do we have no responsibility once we submit an issue to the people? Do we approve or anything?

I believe that the Senator from California knows that even if the people can act, we are given the responsibility under the Constitution to express our own position on the merits of these matters. And we cannot get off the hook by simply saying let the people decide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when a Senator must decide how to vote on a matter which runs so completely counter to a principle in which he deeply believes—the principle that every man should have an equal vote—then he certainly has a right to stand on the floor of the Senate and fight as hard as he can for his beliefs, whether or not the issue is also to be put before the people in a referendum.

I also remind the Senator from California, and I am sure that the Senator from California knows, perhaps in the history of California, that a referendum can be worded in such a way and promoted in such a way in the newspapers, on the television, on the radio through the use of an enormous amount of money, that people can be deceived.

I have great faith in the people. I would not be a U.S. Senator today if I did not have. We must realize that on a matter as complicated as this, and as removed from their immediate interest—since it is not a matter of taxation or war—people can be deceived. It is a duty, a fundamental, inescapable duty for Members of Congress to vote on the merits of the matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the latter part of my friend's comment, I completely agree. I must say, alas, that the techniques of deception and deceit are constantly available to those in our society who would try to mislead, whether the problem be an issue on the ballot in a State or in a presidential campaign, or, indeed, in a senatorial campaign.

I speak now as a Californian. The record of the people of my State in passing judgment on multitudes of issues deemed by them to be serious is an excellent record. While occasionally deception has done its work effectively and successfully, the people in the long run have been able to rectify the errors which may have crept into their votes in prior elections.

This is a very crucial issue. I would not equate it with many of the other problems which we have before us, all of which are important. This is a fundamental question concerning the form of government in the several States.

I look forward—as I am sure will be the case when the issue is pending—to spending time on open and constructive debate with my friend in order, in the public interest, to attempt to find out specifically the arguments in favor of the proposal, as well as the arguments that are not in favor of the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from California is one of the most reasonable as well as one of the ablest Members of the Senate. With respect to these basic matters—and this is a basic, fundamental, and most important principle—I would never vote to deny people the right of religious freedom, the right of freedom of speech, the right of assembly or to abridge other basic rights on the ground that I would leave the decision to a referendum in all of the 50 States. And I would be basically reluctant to vote for a denial of the right to equal representation of each man—black or white, rich or poor, literate or illiterate—in his own State legislature.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROMPT ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SAVED LIVES

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the President of the United States has been criticized on our intervention in Santo Domingo, and there has been a great deal of confusion about it. One of the clearest reports on the instant situation which preceded the President's action was written by Virginia Prewett in the Washington Daily News. I read from that article briefly:

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic country team in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

This is a fine and concise report on the incidents leading up to the President's decision on Santo Domingo which I think should be called to the attention of the

Congress and the American people, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

L.B.J.'s PROMPT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACTION SAVED AMERICAN LIVES

(NOTE.—This is the last of three articles in which Virginia Prewett, prize-winning Washington Daily News columnist on Latin America, gives a behind-the-scenes report on how President Johnson decided to send U.S. forces into the Dominican Republic. Miss Prewett received information from a high source, who cannot be identified.)

(By Virginia Prewett)

When President Johnson between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. on April 28 quickly telephoned or called in the Nation's top officials about landing marines in the Dominican Republic, a conversation was being held between our Embassy there and the Washington message center.

News was relayed to the President that the Embassies of El Salvador, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador had been fired on. The U.S. aid mission had been raided. The evacuation zone around the Embajador Hotel had been broken into again.

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic "country team" in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

THAT CUTS IT

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

He took the position that if he did not act, he risked immediate blood guilt for the Americans. The vision of another Cuba was strong in his mind.

He said later of the moment: "We know there are evil forces everywhere—in this country and everywhere else. But here in the United States they're not in control. At that moment, in Santo Domingo, they were in control."

Mr. Johnson ordered multiple messages to go into effect at 6:30 p.m. The marines were to land. The first pathfinder group did land in LCT's at Haina seaport not long afterward. By 7:50 p.m., 405 marines were ashore.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

With the military order, Mr. Johnson stressed his urgent hope for a cease-fire and a settlement of Dominican differences.

He also called for congressional leaders to meet with him at 7:15 p.m.

When he issued the landing order, he directed the area officers of the State Department's American Republics Division to notify all Latin American ambassadors that many Latin American embassies and diplomats in the Dominican Republic had called on the United States for help, that the U.S. Marines were landing to save American and other lives, and that the United States urgently requested an OAS meeting the next day.

REDS SPOTTED

The congressional leaders stayed with the President until 9 p.m. When they asked about Communist influence, Mr. Johnson told them that the Communist apparatus had been spotted emerging.

At first two known members of the Communist apparatus were spotted seizing strategic command of groups or objectives, then nine were spotted, and more and more. During the day the pro-Castro talisman cry of

"Paredon" (to the wall) had multiplied as mobs sacked, looted, and killed.

After 6:30 p.m., nine State Department area chiefs for Latin America were called to their offices. Their instructions were to telephone the President's message to every Latin American Ambassador. This the nine diplomats did. Not only OAS members, but also Jamaica and Trinidad were called.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, has critically compared President Johnson's procedure with the Latin Americans with that of his late brother during the Cuban missile crisis.

WHEN J.F.K. SPOKE

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation at 6:30 p.m., announcing his intention to order a naval quarantine around Cuba. That night he had the Latin American Ambassadors notified and, like Mr. Johnson, called an OAS meeting for the next day. After the meeting officially approved his action, he ordered U.S. Navy units, already in position, to impose the quarantine.

President Kennedy could do this because the United States had the initiative in this crisis. This permitted him to control the timing.

President Johnson, in contrast, was at the mercy of timing imposed by the wild mobs in Santo Domingo. If he had announced he meant to send in marines the next day, it virtually would have invited a mob attack on the Embajador Hotel—and the emergence of a regime of some kind controlled by Communists.

REASONS DISCUSSED

On Thursday, April 29, at 10:30 a.m., the OAS met and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reviewed the landing and the reasons for it. The OAS asked the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo to arrange a ceasefire. Late that night the OAS called an emergency foreign ministers' meeting and approved establishment of an international safe haven in the Dominican Republic.

On April 30, the special meeting sent Secretary General Jose Mora to Santo Domingo. The next day the OAS named a special five-man peacemaking team and sent it to Santo Domingo on a U.S. military plane.

Acting at its swiftest, the OAS thus managed to get its peace team in 4 days after the crisis peak when a thousand Americans were in danger at the Embajador.

The OAS simply did not have the machinery or the precedents to go in quickly and protect the foreign nationals. The hope is that it will develop the needed muscles out of the Dominican crisis.

CONTRADICTIONS SHOW

A significant feature of the U.S. press criticism of the order to land the marines is that it comes from the same spokesmen who most vociferously and tenaciously defended the Castro regime. "Anti-war" crusaders condemn the order to land the marines in one breath and call for Cuba-type revolutions throughout Latin America in the next.

But what President Johnson recalls is that thousands of American lives were in danger. He sees a new and vicious subversion creeping into the Western Hemisphere, the kind we are fighting in Vietnam.

If he had to do it over, he would land the Marines again.

Important in the story is the fact that U.S. forces in Santo Domingo have evacuated many more nationals of the other countries than our own countrymen.

MANY MOVED OUT

In all about 2,000 Americans were moved out. And more than 2,500 citizens of 45 other nations.

They include people from Canada, China, Europe, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria—the world. Latin Americans evacuated include

Argentines, Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Colombians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Haitians, Panamanians, Nicaraguans, Mexicans, Peruvians, Uruguayans, Venezuelans, and Jamaicans.

These are the people you might ask whether Mr. Johnson should have sent in the marines.

DESPERATE NEED FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT COUNTERINSURGENCY COMPETENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one matter that I am sure has concerned all Members of Congress has been the success of the Communists in South Vietnam with their subversive tactics. Recently an excellent parley took place at Airlie House in Virginia, attended by university professors, business leaders, officials of the Federal Government, journalists, and others, to discuss our experience with counterinsurgency.

Max Freedman wrote an article on this subject, which was published in last night's Washington Star. I quote from the article:

At present the men working on counterinsurgency are found in marginal positions in various departments and agencies of the Government. They are usually remote from the centers of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us. They lack the power and prestige inside the bureaucracy which come only from an established commitment, a large budget, and a purpose which visibly commands the support of the President.

He goes on to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I quote further from the article:

The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion, while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Max Freedman, which seems to me to support the Freedom Academy which many of us have supported or something much like 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:

PARLEY STUDIES FUTURE U.S. POLICY (By Max Freedman)

For 3 days the recent conference at Airlie House in Virginia had drawn about 100 people into an examination of the major problems in world affairs. The participants came from universities and from business, from the Federal Government, from journalism, and from other disciplines. Divided in their training and experience, they were united in their determination to confront the problems that will face the United States in the next 10 years in its "Strategy for Peace," the theme of the conference.

This Airlie conference, as distinct from the recent gestures and demonstrations on university campuses, was not concerned with the mere expression of academic anxiety and protest. Its discussions all had a practical purpose—to make scholarship relevant to the actual agenda of the Government and to set that agenda in a larger perspective than it is usually possible for harassed officials to achieve.

Nowhere was this purpose better realized than in the report of the discussion group on Asia. The chairman was Dr. Kenneth Young, formerly Ambassador to Thailand and now the president of the Asia Society. Its rapporteur was a scholarly officer from the Air Force, Col. Edward Foote, now working with the Council on Foreign Relations.

In its report, which will be published some time from now, the panel assumed that the problems of subversion and sabotage and insurrection will fill the next 10 years and present new challenges to the United States. It believes the time has come for the U.S. Government to abandon the concept of counterinsurgency and to accept a new philosophy that gives a much higher priority to Communist subversion.

Perhaps it is true that counterinsurgency has had its day because it is essentially a negative doctrine. It waits for the Communists to make their thrust and then tries to counter the trouble. It does not anticipate the trouble, try to avert it by a process of self-help in the threatened area, quickly mobilize diverse forms of U.S. aid, and seek to pluck out the Communist mischief at its roots. All these criticisms may be valid but it would be unjust to bury the doctrine of counterinsurgency without some praise for its services. It is easy to recall the stubborn skepticism and entrenched opposition that met the pioneer efforts of men like Walt Rostow of the State Department as they pointed to the more dangerous character of Communist subversion. If we now can move beyond counterinsurgency, it is only because of the foundation for success already achieved.

At present the men working on counterinsurgency are found in marginal positions in various departments and agencies of the Government. They are usually remote from the centers of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us. They lack the power and prestige inside the bureaucracy which come only from an established commitment, a large budget, and a purpose which visibly commands the support of the President. Yet Vietnam, and the unrest in the Dominican Republic, clearly show that subversion is a greater threat than direct military aggression.

The panel recommends that a new agency be established, preferably in the Executive Office of the President, to direct and manage the campaign, to forestall subversion and defeat it. The establishment of such an agency would in itself be a powerful weapon in the U.S. armory. It would embody the long-term commitment of the United States to deny easy victories to subversion. It would mobilize the scattered energies of U.S. officials and give them concentrated purpose. It would give the threatened nations the assurance of American help before the subversion had actually done its mischief. Wise planning of this kind involves a smaller and cheaper U.S. effort than large-scale intervention after the troubles have occurred, as in Vietnam.

The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment. The Communists would then know that we have at last accepted the

challenge of subversion with the same firmness and constancy shown by the United States years ago when it responded to the more open challenges of aggression. The Airlie House report will certainly be studied by many offices of the Government and not least in the White House.

CEILING PRICE FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, once again I join many others in requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to act within his own regulatory authority to increase the ceiling price at which Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural products can be sold.

Under section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 this agency of the USDA could not sell any wheat for unrestricted use at less than 105 percent of the county loan rate. In the case of feed grains, CCC must sell for the county loan rate plus carrying charges. I am confident that should the Secretary increase this present ceiling to 110 or 115 percent our farm population would reap financial benefits before the year's end. Such a move, it is generally agreed, is within the discretionary power of the Secretary.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill which would provide that the sellout price be increased to 125 percent. The percentage in that proposed legislation may be too great, but it was introduced in the effort to further protect the farmers price in the open market. My measure included feed grains and all agricultural commodities under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The purpose of this legislation was not to hamstring the CCC, but, rather, was intended to provide another source of strength for the market and provide the farmer with more flexibility within the marketplace.

Although I understand that the CCC presently is not selling any wheat for unrestricted use, there has been some evidence that in past years some surplus wheat has been dumped into the market at a time when such action was not unrelated to farm referendum votes. Certainly such actions should be restricted, if not halted, and this purpose would be served if the sellout price could be increased as proposed by my bill or in accordance with action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, to repeat, I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to seriously consider using his own broad power to issue an increase in the ceiling on CCC commodities. Such a move on the part of the Secretary would give the farmer an opportunity for increased income in a freer market.

MEDICARE REVOLT?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Ohio State Medical Association claiming to represent some 10,000 Ohio physicians and surgeons, by a vote of 77 to 71 recently adopted a resolution urging physicians and surgeons not to participate in the forthcoming medicare program, so-called. This action is a dis-

graceful violation of the public trust and of the obligation of the medical profession to the public. It is sheer stupidity. I am confident that the great majority of doctors in Ohio will disregard the fiat of the 77 doctors who voted for this absurd resolution. I understand that the medical societies of Arizona, Louisiana, and Texas have taken similar positions.

Mr. President, medicare will be enacted and will be a reality regardless of the opposition of the political doctors who control the house of delegates of the American Medical Association and many State medical associations. Apart from the fact that it borders on blackmail, their attitude is completely out of character for professional men of integrity.

Doctors in the past, as a rule, have not been too particular as to how they got paid—just so they were paid. Witness the large number of collection agencies employed by physicians and surgeons in pursuit of uncollected medical bills owing, and the fact that the legislatures of most States of our Union have given preference to the physicians and surgeons when it comes to collecting those claims by garnishment proceedings.

If any Senator has reservations about the intensity with which the medical profession approaches its fee-setting and collection problems, I suggest that they read any issue of the magazine, *Medical Economics*—a publication received by practically every physician in the country. However, many doctors have apparently developed "instant religion," and for them money issued by the U.S. Government will no longer be considered legal tender.

When I say these doctors have developed "instant religion," I mean just that. The doctors who are so concerned over Federal payments for medical care provided to 18 million older people have no qualms whatsoever about accepting funds under the Kerr-Mills program—and they come directly from the taxpayer, the Federal employee health insurance programs, the health program for dependents of members of the armed services, and similar plans. Also, many of these doctors did not suffer pangs of conscience over the Federal Government's direct or indirect contributions toward the costs of their medical education. These same physicians exhibit no hesitancy over practicing medicine in medical facilities built with Hill-Burton Federal funds. However, in all fairness, it must be conceded that the various positions assumed by the medical profession during the past several years have not been characterized by logic, equity, and good will.

A number of conscientious and informed members of the medical profession have expressed concern over the deterioration in public respect and regard for doctors. This is directly attributable in large part to the activities of the political doctors who rule the American Medical Association. The image of the healer is too often overlaid with the image of the heel. This will be the predominant image if the stupid plan of a doctors' boycott, or strike, ever became a reality. Such a situation would be intolerable; and Government would have the responsibility of acting promptly and decisively in such a situation.

I admire and have confidence in the qualifications and integrity of a majority of the physicians and surgeons of our country, and of the State of Ohio. Very definitely, the political doctors of the AMA and of the Ohio State Medical Association do a disservice to these fine professional men and women, and misrepresent their views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired. Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, unfortunately the delegates, so called, of the Ohio State Medical Association and of the American Medical Association are political doctors who really do not represent the many fine physicians and surgeons.

For example, a few years ago the Ohio State Medical Association took a referendum of all physicians and surgeons in Ohio, asking the question: "Do you desire to be included under social security coverage?"

Of some 8,000 physicians and surgeons in my State who responded to that question, 68 percent stated that they desired to be included. But, of course, the political doctors in the State house of delegates quashed the information and never reported the results of the referendum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Medicare Revolt" which was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 21.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 1965]
MEDICARE REVOLT?—MANY DOCTORS DECLARE THEY WON'T PARTICIPATE IN U.S. HEALTH PLAN: THEIR RESISTANCE MIGHT UPSET HANDLING OF PATIENT CLAIMS, REKINDLE OLD CONTROVERSY—BUT MOST MD'S WILL COOPERATE

The revolt against medicare by the Nation's physicians may be far more serious than scattered reports indicate.

A surprising number of doctors declare they won't participate in the program, leaving patients to seek their own reimbursements for medical bills from the Government. A few even say they will not accept new patients coming to them under the program.

It's not likely that such resistance to medicare will kill, delay, or force major changes in the bill, which is expected to become law soon; nor is it likely that the program could be rendered ineffectual once it has begun. But the budding "nonparticipation" movement could inconvenience many medicare patients and confront any insurer handling medicare with major problems in administration.

Dr. Robert England, a physician practicing in Carlinville, Ill., holds views typical of those doctors vowing nonparticipation. "I don't plan to refuse to treat anybody," he stresses. But neither will he bill any Government-appointed medicare insurer for services or accept payment from such an organization. Instead, his elderly patients will have to pay their own bills as usual and then

wrestle with the insurer for their compensation.

WON'T TAKE NEW PATIENTS

A Wall Street Journal survey of scores of physicians from coast to coast discloses that roughly 25 percent intend to follow Dr. England's course—or, in the case of a few, take even stronger measures. "I know I won't take any new patients under the program," declares Dr. Walter Sackett of Miami. "I think it's detrimental to good medical care, will destroy the physician-patient relationship, place medical treatment in the Government's hands, and increase the cost of medicine."

The survey is far from scientific, of course, and doesn't indicate precisely how many of the Nation's 178,000 full-time practicing physicians will refuse to cooperate in medicare. But it clearly indicates a far deeper trend toward nonparticipation than had previously been thought to exist—and suggests that the doctors' revolt may grow even wider in weeks to come.

Disaffection among doctors has been reflected lately in heated debates over resolutions, brought before local and State medical societies, calling for nonparticipation in the medicare program. In most cases these resolutions have been voted down, with many doctors opposed to medicare voting against them because of fear that such actions would be misinterpreted as threatening a doctors' strike.

However, the Ohio State Medical Association recently passed a nonparticipation resolution by a 77-71 vote, causing an open split in the organization. The Arizona Medical Society has taken a similar stance, and it's possible that more such resolutions will follow when the medicare bill assumes its finished form.

AMA PRESIDENT'S POSITION

Dr. Donovan F. Ward, president of the American Medical Association, has been urging medical groups to delay voting on such measures till then, saying that earlier action would be premature and might turn public opinion against the profession. "I would think it good strategy not to let anyone know what's going to take place in the event medicare is adopted," he recently told the Oklahoma Medical Association.

The Oklahoma group decided to defer action on a nonparticipation resolution "because the Washington situation is still fluid," a spokesman says. Other State groups, including New Jersey's, also are waiting to see what shape medicare finally takes. The Ohio group plans to press a vote for nonparticipation as a national policy when the AMA house of delegates meets June 20.

The issue could easily rekindle the nationwide controversy touched off 3 years ago by a group of physicians in the Point Pleasant, N.J., area. At the time, 44 doctors there signed pledges that they would not participate in any Government medicare-type program, and more than 2,000 physicians in other parts of the country quickly signed similar pledges, recalls Dr. Bruce Henriksen, a leader of the Point Pleasant revolt and still a strong advocate of nonparticipation. The movement drew widespread criticism from legislators, other physicians, and medical groups. The doctors involved were protesting against all such programs, including those operated under the King-Anderson law, a much more limited piece of legislation than the proposed medicare bill.

It's likely that much of the hullabaloo over nonparticipation represents a tactic by which many doctors can openly demonstrate just how strongly they oppose medicare. But if a significant number of those who now say they won't participate hold to their views when the program starts, a king-sized monkey wrench may be put into medicare's machinery.

TERMS OF BILL

In the version of the bill already passed by the House, medicare would aid eligible persons over 65 in paying hospital and nursing home expenses, and offer them the option of buying low-cost, federally backed health insurance to cover many medical services by physicians. As the legislation now stands, a doctor's patient would have the choice of asking the doctor to bill the medicare insurer directly, or of paying the bill out of his own pocket and filing a claim for reimbursement himself with the insurer. Either way, the medicare insurer involved would pay a specific amount determined by a schedule of fees set up to cover a variety of services.

The mechanics of how a claim is to be made are still to be worked out. However, health insurance carriers usually require forms and statements from physicians testifying to the precise nature of the services performed and the necessity for them; insurers say this is vital to prevent abuses and payments for unnecessary care, both of which can send costs—and premium rates—soaring.

The medicare bill as drawn up now states only that a "receipted bill" from the physician need be submitted for a patient to get reimbursement. Doctors assume this will have to be some sort of Federal form they will have to fill out, requesting data comparable to that sought by private insurers now. So, presumably, patients of many a nonparticipating doctor may be stuck with filing claims supported by nothing more than the usual cursory bill (often stated under the catchall "for services rendered").

Can the medicare insurer honor such a bill? It could cover all sorts of ineligible services or unnecessary treatments. On the other hand, how can the insurer refuse payment to an eligible olderster who may have gotten the same care as a neighbor who collected compensation? Some private insurers suggest that the forms doctors willingly fill out for patients now could be easily used, with little or no change, in filing medicare claims—but whether nonparticipating doctors would consent to do this is doubtful.

Some physicians who say they are willing to cooperate with medicare hint that the program could create problems that may push even more physicians into nonparticipation. Dr. William Rial, of Philadelphia, foresees a "new mountain of paperwork" that will force many doctors to throw up their hands and refuse to process it. "A lot of that goes on now in public assistance cases," he notes. "You get a \$1.50 visit and it takes more than \$1.50 of my secretary's time to fill out the forms."

WILL CASELOADS GROW?

Others predict a sharp increase in case-loads, burdening many doctors whose waiting rooms already are crammed with patients. "Many old people who have nothing wrong with them will want to consult a doctor. Many will seek the doctor's attention just because they want to talk to somebody," predicts Dr. Nathan Cotlar, a Houston physician who expects to participate in medicare. "I've got all the work I can handle now," says a Pittsburgh doctor. "I may have to consider moving to another position, like a veterans hospital, where I wouldn't be so pressed for time."

The position of the nonparticipating doctor appears unassailable both legally and ethically under AMA codes. There's nothing in the medicare bill requiring doctors to cooperate with any medicare agency that may be set up or even to see medicare patients. And in the wake of the New Jersey doctor's "revolt" 3 years ago, the AMA House of Delegates pointed to the ethical principle that a physician "may choose whom he will serve." The AMA body then declared that a doctor "should not dispose of his services under terms or conditions which tend to interfere with or impair the free and complete exercise

of his medical judgment and skill"—a statement which has suggested to some doctors that participation in medicare may be a breach of ethics in itself.

A Pittsburgh physician says: "I've had some experience with socialized medicine when I worked under a union program. I finally gave up the practice because I felt the restrictions placed on me interfered with good medical judgment. I think I'd turn away medicare patients because as the program now stands it would interfere with my judgment."

To the great majority of doctors, however, nonparticipation is an unrealistic doctrine, though many remain opposed to medicare in theory, they intend to cooperate fully with the program. Says Dr. Henry I. Fineberg, executive vice president of the Medical Society of the State of New York: "I think this talk of physician nonparticipation is unfortunate. Regardless of the outcome in Congress, we are sure that the primary concern of New York physicians will continue to be the welfare and health of their patients, including the elderly—regardless of their ability to pay. Physicians are citizens as well as doctors and will, of course, cooperate with whatever laws are enacted."

A Detroit physician, Dr. I. Walter Silver, puts it a different way. "This is a lot of hurrahing about nothing," he says, "and I'm not putting on any armor to go out and joust with windmills."

Some doctors suggest that the flare of resistance to medicare will burn out quickly, and that nonparticipating physicians will, sooner or later, adjust themselves to filling out the Government forms and sending in bills. One doctor in Orange County, Calif., notes that physicians in his area reacted to county medical aid programs for the elderly and indigent in the same way many M.D.'s are now reacting to medicare. "At first, they said they'd refuse to take money from the county; truth is, when they started seeing the patients, they started sending in the bills. The same thing is going to happen here again," he predicts.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Chair and my colleagues for an opportunity to briefly review some of the circumstances which have existed in this country so far as national disasters are concerned in recent months. I fear that I shall transgress the 3-minute time limitation, although I shall try to keep my remarks brief, but I ask unanimous consent to be allowed a few additional minutes to make my presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How many minutes does the Senator from Indiana request?

Mr. BAYH. Whatever I may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Indiana is recognized for an unlimited amount of time.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chair. I shall keep my remarks brief.

Last year and in recent months, the country has experienced national disasters, such as those in Alaska, the Northwest section of the country, and encompassing more recently six States in the Midwestern area.

My State was inundated by floods and tornadoes.

The President of the United States, Senators, Representatives, and the Governors of the several States involved toured the stricken areas. I had the opportunity to join the President of the

United States with my Senate colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], as well as members of the congressional delegation from Indiana to tour the affected areas of my State.

I later returned to the affected areas. I believe it is fair to state that I have had an opportunity to visit almost all of the disaster areas which were affected by the extremely damaging tornadoes on Palm Sunday, April 11.

In Indiana, the tornadoes rent asunder houses and churches. Industries, farms, and cities were not spared by this horrible force of nature.

Approximately \$200 million is the estimated loss in Indiana. One hundred and thirty-eight lives were claimed.

Although the Alaskan disaster has been called the worst disaster we have ever had, I point out that this one brief storm, claimed more lives than the Alaskan earthquake.

In Indiana, 1,369 persons were injured. An additional 337 were injured seriously enough to require long-term hospitalization. A total of 3,875 families suffered losses because of the force of the tornadoes.

Our Governor, Roger D. Branigin, aptly likened the scene of destruction to Hiroshima after it had been struck by an atom bomb.

Because of the severity of the storm and subsequent floods, and the recognition of need on the part of many Senators, some 30 of us joined in studying a comprehensive approach to revising the Nation's disaster laws.

Several days ago a measure was introduced to try to improve Federal disaster relief provisions. There is a great need for improvement in these provisions.

We have kept in almost daily touch with the agencies involved. The President has also expressed his great interest in the situation. The Office of Emergency Planning has been given the specific assignment of forwarding the study. The Bureau of the Budget has asked for reports, which are now in the process of being made. The Committee on Public Works, the distinguished chairman of which, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], is now present in the Chamber and is about to present another vital piece of legislation to the Senate, has taken a lead in requesting that reports be given to the committee which will further study the bill.

I believe that we are fast approaching the time when the reports will be submitted, and it will be time for Congress to act. This legislation is designed to ease the burden of all those who have been and will be, through no fault of their own, subjected to severe loss, damage, and hardship due to acts of nature.

In the meantime, let me briefly point out that there are existing laws which we have been trying to use in the affected areas to ease the burden of those whose property has been damaged.

For example, we have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to reopen the feed grain program so that the farmers in the affected area might have an opportunity to comply with the program which had already been closed. I believe that the closing date was March 26 in our State, also in Illinois, Michigan,

and other Midwestern areas affected by these sudden tornadoes. The tornadoes which struck Indiana came on April 11, about 2 weeks after the closing of the program.

I received a letter about a month after the tornadoes had struck in Indiana stating that our request had been denied, and that it had been denied because the Secretary was fearful that it would not accomplish the purposes of the program but would turn the feed grain program into a relief program.

I believe that this attitude is wrong. It is a misjudgment, because we made the request for the very reason that we felt that it would not only help those in the affected area but would also help to achieve the objectives of the program. First, it would provide considerable financial assistance to farmers in need; and second, and perhaps most important of all, as we look at the farm program, it would help to reduce production.

I do not direct this criticism at the Secretary of Agriculture in person, but rather I direct it to those who are advising him. The content of his letter is indicative of the fact that those who are advising him did not even realize that the land which had been flooded and affected by the tornadoes would be in production this year.

As a result, we shall have increased production. This production will be achieved at a considerably higher cost.

I therefore say to the Secretary that I believe it would be in the best interests of the Department as well as all of us if he would root out those who are giving him this erroneous advice, or at least shake them into reality.

Most of us realize that when land has been flooded or ravaged by tornadoes, it costs more to put it back into tillable condition. Consider the silting that exists after a flood, and the real clearance problem involved, with parts of barns, houses, and shattered glass strewn all over the fields. We have had penal inmates brought into the area to help clear up the debris. The cost of putting the land into production has been tremendous.

I was in one of the affected areas and talked with one farmer who destroyed five tractor tires while plowing only 20 acres.

I do not need to tell the Presiding Officer what a tractor tire costs, but it ranges upwards of \$100. To have one repaired often costs almost \$50. Therefore, this is an extreme burden to place on the farmers; yet, the Secretary did not let them have the opportunity to let the land lie idle so that they could clear it in a more efficient manner and at the same time keep it out of production.

I should like to point out also that there are grant provisions in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service under which farmers may get assistance for damaged fencing. The ASCS led the farmers of Indiana to believe that they could obtain relief to restore and replace fences which had been destroyed by the tornadoes. They were urged to come in and apply, so that when the funds were made available they could receive relief. Yet yesterday they were informed that the provisions of the Act

were to be applied so restrictively that they would not be able to receive any benefit from such grants.

It may be difficult for some of my colleagues in the Senate, who have not had the opportunity of living on a farm, to realize what a burden it is to replace or repair fencing. It involves more than what is seen while driving along a highway. In one county in Indiana alone 300 miles of fencing was destroyed by one tornado. Three hundred miles of fencing was destroyed, yet the provisions of the act would not be administered with sufficient flexibility or compassion to provide what I feel would be just compensation for this loss.

In the bill to broaden disaster relief which we have introduced, we went to great lengths not to put the Federal Government in competition with insurance companies, and to use normal existing financial institutions so far as possible. For that reason the bill which we introduced did not provide outright grants to individuals, but rather long-term low-interest loans. No farmer ever insures fences. It is not possible to obtain insurance on fences. Therefore there is no danger whatever of the Federal Government competing with the insurance companies.

I should like personally to invite the Secretary of Agriculture to come to Indiana. I intend this afternoon to write a letter to the Secretary inviting him to come out to our State, to show him that he is getting poor advice.

We are confronted with a great need. The rubble-strewn fields and the destroyed barns and fences all indicate to me a need to administer these measures in a manner which is consistent with the best interests of the public involved.

I have one last complaint that I should like to make. This, too, concerns the Secretary of Agriculture. The Farmers Home Administration has gone to great lengths in urging farmers to take advantage of the 3-percent interest disaster loans, which provide 1-year loans for operating expenses, for seed, and fertilizer, 5-year loans for machinery and equipment and other capital goods, and up to 20 years for replacing buildings and other real property.

The number of loans that have been granted to farmers in Indiana can be counted on one hand. The Department of Agriculture has not used existing provisions of the Disaster Act to help the farmers to meet this great personal need that exists in Indiana. The program has been administered in such a way as to give the impression that the administrators are looking for excuses not to use the provisions of the act.

Again I say that this is not a personal attack on the Secretary of Agriculture, because I know him to be a man of great compassion and a man who wishes to help people when it is necessary.

I make this critical statement, not with respect to him personally, but to call his attention to the fact that he has been sold a bill of goods; he has not been given a true picture of the great need that exists in the Midwestern States. I call upon him to administer the disaster provisions of the agricultural statutes based on the facts, in order to help solve

the problems that confront many of our citizens.

I close by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, for his patience, and also for his interest in this subject. I also recognize the fact that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has been one of the leaders in this area. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] also have joined in this effort. This is not a solo effort. It is a recognition on the part of the majority of the Members of the Senate that we need to look into this problem and to revise our disaster relief laws.

In the next few days we shall be asked to consider foreign aid authorizations and appropriations of more than \$3 billion, which will be sent to areas around the world. Frankly, although in the past I have been a supporter of foreign aid and a Senator who has felt that a well administered foreign aid program is in the best interests of this country, it will be very difficult for me this year to vote more than \$3 billion in funds needed in other nations unless we in Congress recognize that we must take care of some of our own people who are affected by terrible disasters in this country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana on an excellent speech. He is dead right. He took the leadership in trying to draft new disaster legislation. He called a meeting of Senators from the Midwest, from the devastated States. He drafted legislation, introduced it and followed through on it.

I give one quick example in support of the Senator to show how ridiculous the present law is. Farmers can obtain loans for conventional building purposes from the Farmers Home Administration for 33 years at 4 percent. However, when it comes to floods and tornadoes, the best terms that a farmer can get are 20 years at 3 percent interest. That interest rate is less, but the terms are such that the payments have to be bigger, because the amortization period is shorter. What a travesty! The payments are bigger on the disaster relief loans than they are on conventional farm borrowings.

That is one reason why the disaster program is not being used by farmers, and is one of the reasons why the distinguished Senator from Indiana is absolutely right in calling for a reform of our disaster legislation.

LABOR'S POLITICAL ACTION PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in Wisconsin recently a distinguished Wisconsin labor leader, Carl W. Griepentrog, made an excellent speech on labor's participation in politics. Unfortunately this subject has been too little considered, and the intellectual justification for it has been rarely offered. Mr. Griepentrog made a remarkable speech. He explores the history of labor's political activity. He provides an excellent intellectual justification. I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WISCONSIN STATE AFL-CIO COPE FUND-
RAISING CONFERENCE

We are assembled here this evening to raise funds which will help finance organized labor's political action program. In doing so we are lending our support to the most controversial and the most misunderstood activity the labor movement is involved in.

This lack of sympathy for the labor movement's political action program is not confined to observers and commentators outside the movement. The critical view of our political action program reaches into the labor movement itself to a substantial degree. Those of you who have served as COPE committee members at the local union level know what I am talking about.

Every union member, by definition, agrees to the need for collective action at the bargaining table. But it is not true that every union member sees the same compelling need for collective action in the political arena. The feeble response we get to our COPE dollar drive campaign each year serves as constant reminder of this fact.

Why it is that this is still true in the face of the evidence, I will never understand. Personally, I look upon politics as the "right arm" of collective bargaining. An effective political action program is just as vital as an effective picket line. When the economic scabs start stealing our jobs we are indignant. Our survival as a significant force in our economy requires us to be just as indignant when the political scabs steal our right to fully represent our members, when they enact laws which require us to represent "free riders," when they delay enactment of needed social legislation, when they enact tax laws which soak the poor and pamper the rich, when they seek legislation which would subvert the "one man, one vote" principle.

We need to instill in our members appreciation of the fact that politics is not like the four seasons, coming and going as the months pass by. We need to instill in our members the realization that politics affects our lives every day in every way. The very air we breathe and the water we drink; the schools our children attend and the roads we drive on; the cost of living and the cost of dying; all are influenced by what transpires in city, county, State, and national legislative bodies.

And surely, after Governor Reynolds' gruesome experience with the refusal of Republican State senators to approve dozens of key appointments, we are all thoroughly aware of the impact of administrative agencies on our daily lives.

I know that, in part at least, lack of sympathy for the American labor movement's political action program stems from lack of understanding. Because of this, even at the risk of treading already familiar ground I would like to take this opportunity to restate the case for organized labor's commitment to political action.

BACKGROUND

To begin with, when we discuss labor's role in politics we should be aware of the fact that we are engaged in a strictly American pastime.

For instance, European unions have always been deeply involved in politics. They have tended throughout their history to place a great deal more emphasis on legislated solutions than negotiated solutions. Vacations are legislated. Medical care is legislated. Holidays are legislated. Pensions are legislated.

In contrast, American unions have tended to place a great deal more emphasis on negotiated solutions.

Historically, the American labor movement has tended to play down political action and play up collective bargaining.

Don't misunderstand me. I am not saying that labor's interest in political action is of recent origin. On the contrary, American trade unionists have had an interest in politics for at least 135 years.

As far back as 1828 organized workers in Philadelphia were supporting candidates for city, county, and State office.

In 1834 and 1836, Ely Moore, president of the National Trades Union, was elected to Congress from New York.

Between 1866 and 1872 the National Labor Union strongly urged union participation in politics and in 1872 nominated candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

When the Knights of Labor was flourishing back in the 1880's trade unionists supported hundreds of candidates for public office.

Samuel Gompers, the first president of the AFL, made an unsuccessful try for election to the New York constitutional convention in 1893.

In 1906 the AFL announced its famous policy of "rewarding friends and defeating enemies."

Every 2 years the AFL, under Gompers' leadership, published a congressional voting record.

The AFL endorsed Bryan in 1896 and 1908; Wilson in 1912 and 1916; Cox in 1920, and Robert La Follette in 1924.

Back in 1922 trade unionists in this State and in Minnesota even formed an alliance with farmers.

However, in spite of this evidence of political activity, it is still fair to say that unions in the United States, at least from the founding of the AFL in the 1880's through the early post-World War II years, did not place heavy emphasis on political action.

Labor historians and labor economists tell us that there is a reason for this. European unions and unions in other parts of the free world are products of a class-conscious society. Workers have been thrown into a natural political alliance because they are members of a particular class and will remain so throughout their lives.

American unions are the product of a society in which class consciousness is almost nonexistent. The common interest of American workers is their job. Workers are drawn together not by class consciousness but by job consciousness. Therefore there is no ready-made foundation for a common political alliance. The political affiliation of American trade unionists has been determined by inheritance, by religion, by whether you were born on a farm or in the city, by a dozen different forces—but not by class.

Samuel Gompers recognized this fact when he founded the American Federation of Labor. Early attempts to form a national federation of trade unionists had failed because leaders had tried to transplant the European variety of trade unionism in American soil.

Gompers succeeded, where others failed, because he realized that job interest, not class interest or political interest, was the binder which would hold together a national federation of unions.

If Gompers was right three-quarters of a century ago, why isn't he right today? Why should organized labor be placing so much emphasis on political action today? Is there any reason why we should discard our historic emphasis on collective bargaining? Should we now seek legislated solutions at the expense of negotiated solutions?

As I see it, we are not faced with an either/or choice. We don't have to choose between negotiated solutions and legislated

solutions. No responsible trade union leader is advocating formation of a labor party and no responsible trade union leader is suggesting that we relax our vigil on the collective bargaining front.

But the facts of life make it crystal clear to me that the labor movement must apply at least as much skill and effort to political action as it applies to organizing and negotiations.

Let's just take a look at the record.

Workers have had the right to organize and bargain collectively throughout the history of this Nation. Even so, our Government has recognized this right for no more than a few short years.

Back around the turn of the 19th century when workers were first beginning to organize, the Government was openly hostile to unions. Workers who chose to organize were held by the courts to have engaged in an unlawful "criminal conspiracy" in restraint of trade.

By 1842 the courts had rejected the criminal conspiracy doctrine in favor of money damages against workers who combined to improve wages and working conditions. Then in 1871 the view that the techniques of unions constituted a "prima facie tort" emerged. The courts held that if there was "intentional infliction of harm" the activities of a union could be restrained. Since by definition a strike is calculated to get more out of an employer than he will give willingly, the effect of this doctrine was to severely hamper trade unions.

Toward the latter part of the 1800's courts began to use their injunctive powers to restrain unions and, when the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1890, courts brought unions under the provisions of this legislation.

In 1914 Congress enacted the Clayton Act. Labor hailed this law as the "Magna Carta." Its purpose, among others, was to free unions from the Sherman Antitrust Act on the grounds that labor is not a commodity or article of commerce.

Unfortunately, the courts didn't see it this way, and many courts continued to apply the Sherman Act to unions. Employers were able to obtain injunctions, restraining concerted activities on the slightest pretext.

Some relief was finally obtained in 1932 when Congress enacted the Norris-La Guardia Act. The use of injunctions in labor disputes was finally outlawed, and yellow-dog contracts were made unenforceable.

Nevertheless, our Government still had not specifically affirmed the right of workers to form and join unions of their own choosing.

An attempt was made in 1933 when the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed. This law was short lived, as you may recall. The U.S. Supreme Court struck it down in 1935.

Congress came back again in 1935 with another attempt in the form of the Wagner Act, which the Supreme Court sustained in 1937.

Finally, after 150 years of strife and turmoil, with the Government aiding and abetting the employer's fight against unions almost every step of the way, our Government clearly affirmed the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively.

Just 10 short years later, Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley Act. Now I don't propose to debate the merits of this legislation at this time. That's a subject in itself. However, I think it is safe to say that this law was not passed to strengthen unions.

In my mind there is a clear lesson in this recitation of history. It took 150 years to clearly establish the right of workers to form and join unions and bargain collec-

tively and just 10 years to substantially reverse that trend.

Under the circumstances, organized labor must jump into the political arena with both feet. When hard-won gains can be lost so easily and so quickly, it is foolish for trade unionists to turn their backs on politics.

The truth of the matter is that today labor unions are regulated from the cradle to the grave by local, State, and National legislative bodies and administrative agencies. We couldn't turn our backs on politics now if we wanted to. The labor movement of yesterday, today, and tomorrow is largely a product of law and politics. We would further imperil our own existence if we choose to isolate ourselves from politics.

So far I have been talking about labor-management law. There is also the equally important area of social legislation.

Not too many years ago the AFL was opposed to workmen's compensation laws, unemployment compensation laws, minimum wage laws and a whole host of regulatory social legislation. This opposition stemmed not from opposition to the principle of the legislation but suspicion of Government action on any subject.

In the eyes of trade unionists of the early 1900's, the Government couldn't be trusted to administer social legislation fairly.

However, as time passed, union members and leaders gradually recognized the futility of attempting to solve industrial injury problems and unemployment problems at the bargaining table. The need for minimum wage legislation became apparent as unions realized that negotiated benefits were being restrained or threatened by unorganized firms paying substandard wages.

We have also learned that it is not possible to negotiate full employment. We know that many problems arising out of technological change cannot be solved at the bargaining table.

Believing that the problems of workers are the problems of unions, we have fought for free public schools, we have fought against child labor, we have advocated reduced hours, we have sought retirement benefits which are national in scope, we have, to make a long story short, supported many measures which have benefited all workers, member and nonmember alike.

These are the reasons why organized labor is in politics to stay. We need to be in order to preserve our right to organize and bargain and we need to be because collective bargaining cannot solve all the problems workers are confronted with.

PROCEDURE

When we speak of labor's political action program and the degree of or lack of support for it, precisely what is it we are talking about?

One of the fundamentals of our political action program is our registration and get-out-the-vote campaign.

Union members are citizens first and members second. We recognize our obligation to make our form of government succeed. In a world so desperately threatened by totalitarianism it is shocking to realize that in presidential elections as many as 40 million Americans don't bother to vote. Many of them, all too many, sad to say, are union members.

You might think that there would be little or no opposition to this phase of our activities. From a philosophical point of view there isn't. Very few union members oppose a registration and get-out-the-vote campaign in principle. But in practice—that's another matter.

Next to the low degree of citizenship participation in politics is the incredibly low level of understanding of important issues.

This is one of the most serious defects in American political life today.

It isn't just the act of voting itself which fulfills a citizen's responsibilities. A voter must also be informed. This is why, in addition to our registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns we also conduct educational programs on legislative issues by means of our newspapers, pamphlets, and conferences.

In the absence of labor's voice on the issues of the day, I doubt if there would be a proper balance to the views expressed on major issues. The business community has its spokesmen. The farmers have theirs and the doctors have the AMA.

We believe that labor's advocacy of legislative action in various fields makes possible the debate which is so vital to the health and vigor of a democracy. Stifle union political action and we cut off a significant source of information and opinion.

There is more to our political system than getting out the vote and understanding the issues. We have a representative form of government. We are required to elect men and women who will represent us in the councils of government. It isn't possible in a complex society to maintain the direct representation which characterized the old town meeting. It follows, then, that representatives must be elected who are capable of exercising independent judgment and reflecting the will of the people.

This doesn't just happen. It takes money and hard work. With television playing such a prominent role in political campaigns, the cost of winning an election—or losing—has skyrocketed. This is why we collect COPE dollars. And this is why we are meeting here today. The dollars are needed to buy TV time, campaign buttons, and the literature for candidates we support.

Registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns, education on the issues, and financial support for endorsed candidates—these are the three legs which make up labor's political action program. Like a three-legged stool, labor's political action program will not stand up with one leg missing.

Some critics complain that we are too closely identified with the Democratic Party. This is understandable when you consider the fact that COPE very seldom endorses Republican candidates. It is also understandable when you take note of the fact that some prominent labor leaders are closely identified with the Democratic Party.

There is a reason for this and it has nothing to do with allegiance for allegiance's sake. We do not support Democrats because they are Democrats. We support candidates who support the views we believe in. We cannot be held accountable for the fact that more Democrats than Republicans support labor's position on social, economic, and political issues.

In essence, I am saying that our political action program is issue oriented. We study the issues. We take a stand on the issues and let the chips fall where they may.

No, ladies and gentlemen, we are not too deeply involved in politics. If anything, we are not involved deeply enough.

An enormous and disproportionate share of our Nation's wealth continues to accrue in the hands of a very small portion of our population. Over half of all corporate wealth in the United States is controlled by 100 large corporations. The poor grow poorer, by comparison, every day. The schools which our children must attend continue to be starved for funds. Our streams are rapidly becoming conduits for industrial, commercial, and residential waste, and our lakes are turning into cesspools of raw and partially treated effluent. The promise of equal opportunity for all remains largely unfulfilled.

All of these matters, in addition to labor-management legislation are, in my opinion,

of profound concern to the labor movement and require our presence in the political arena.

Many of our citizens, including some union members, as I have already stated, disapprove of what I am suggesting. Some disapprove because they don't believe that unions have a place in a free society at the workplace or in the community. Others are willing to concede that unions have a useful purpose to serve at the workplace but not in the political arena. Usually both groups feel as they do for about the same reasons, prominent among which is the belief that individualism and unionism are contrary philosophies. Our free society will fail if we don't make ample provision for individual initiative and achievement, they say. Unions, they continue, sound the death knell for individualism. I couldn't disagree more. Nothing could be further from the truth. Individualism is a cruel hoax and an illusion if you have no voice in society. I ask you. How much do you or I have to say about even the most trivial aspects of the affairs of State, local, and Federal Government if we do not present a united, organized front? Do you think for 1 minute that any progressive legislation would be enacted, even if each of us individually supported such legislation, if we did not do so in an organized fashion?

We live in a world in which only the voices of the organized are heard. You don't believe me? Then where is the voice of the unorganized 3.5 million unemployed? Where is the voice of the unorganized poor? Where is the voice of the unorganized aged? Where is the voice of the unorganized Negro, Indian, Puerto Rican, or oriental who suffers indignities and humiliation every day? Do I need to say? Isn't the answer obvious?

No. Those who call themselves individualists and oppose organized labor's political action program do not stand as defenders of a great cause. Cut away the trimmings and you'll find that they really stand for selfishness with a capital S. What they really want is freedom to feather their own nests. The idea of sharing our great wealth with those who have no share is repulsive. The poor must pay the penalty for failure. There must be a reward for success.

We in the labor movement can't buy this point of view. We must become the voice for those who have no voice. We have done a pretty good job of providing a voice for workers on the job. We have created an industrial democracy which parallels our political democracy. We have provided many organized workers with a modest share of the economic pie. But there is much which remains to be done.

As the late President Kennedy said: "All this will not be finished in the first 100 days."

"Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet."

"But let us begin."

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. HART. Mr. President, following passage of the voting rights bill yesterday several Members spoke kind words of me. I was not in the Chamber at the time but have read their words in the RECORD. To each who spoke I now express my thanks. It made wonderful reading, even though I saw the excess which friendship built into the remarks.

And I want also to thank every Member for bearing with patience and understanding the weeks of discussion and development of the voting rights bill. It is to the distinguished authors of the bill,

the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and the minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, that all of us owe thanks. Even though we may not be able to voice it, I hope they sense our appreciation for their leadership, leadership which was never harsh but at all times effective; leadership, in short, in its finest meaning.

BANK MERGER LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement made today by Mr. Paul R. Fitchen, executive vice president of the New York Clearinghouse Association, to the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Fitchen has had 40 years of experience in banking and is the operating head of a banking agency that daily handles checks totaling \$4½ billion or more.

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

STATEMENT OF PAUL R. FITCHEN

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee in support of S. 1698, a bill which is of substantial importance to the sound development of the banking system of this country and to the banking public. This bill has the firm support of the New York Clearinghouse Association, an organization formed in 1853 primarily to facilitate the clearance of checks and the settlement of balances among New York member banks, but which has also throughout its history taken an active interest in the development of sound banking and has been called upon by State and Federal regulatory authorities in recent years to undertake particular studies for their benefit.

S. 1698 has been incorrectly characterized by some as a measure to exempt bank mergers from all antitrust laws. This characterization is an obvious distortion of the bill which makes clear that the antitrust legislation governing bank mergers is that adopted specifically with reference to banks in the Bank Merger Act of 1960 and is to be applied by the specialized Federal banking agencies responsible for the soundness and growth of our banking system.

It is not my purpose to review the merits of the Supreme Court's decisions in the Philadelphia Bank and the Lexington Bank cases which have created the need for the present bill. I do, however, want to stress that these decisions must be ranked among the most controversial antitrust decisions and that, in view of the virtually unanimous contrary understanding prior to those decisions of the respective roles of the Federal banking authorities and of the Department of Justice in respect of bank mergers, they have caused considerable confusion over matters which most persons believed had been carefully studied and resolved at the time of the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

As a result of the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank decisions we are presented today with an anomalous and unsatisfactory system of regulating bank mergers. The Federal banking agencies charged with responsibility for the successful functioning and development of the Nation's banking system—the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—are required by the Bank Merger Act to consider at length the proposed merger or acquisition of any insured bank, and the approval of whichever of these agencies has primary re-

sponsibility for the surviving institution must be obtained before any such merger or acquisition can occur.

In acting upon a proposed merger or acquisition, these banking agencies are explicitly charged with determining "the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly)" in addition to the several other considerations peculiar to banking which are set forth in the act, and "in the interests of uniform standards" the agency charged with reviewing the proposal must obtain the views not only of the two other Federal banking agencies but also of the Attorney General, who is thus afforded a full opportunity to present the Department of Justice's views on the competitive consequences of the transaction. Yet, despite this considered determination, which must fully take into account probable competitive consequences and which is made by an agency with specific expertise in the structure and functioning of the banking industry, a merger or acquisition duly approved under the Bank Merger Act may today be challenged by the Justice Department under the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, or both—and this challenge may come years later when the relief sought will be the breaking asunder of the institution formed by the duly approved merger or acquisition.

It is clear to me that such a system would never have purposely been created by the Congress. Having reached this undesirable posture through two surprising Supreme Court decisions which were wholly unforeseen when the Bank Merger Act was enacted, there seems every reason to rectify the situation.

I respectfully submit that the agencies which regulate banking are more competent to judge competitive factors in banking than an agency which seeks to regulate competition in many other lines of endeavor. For example, although a merger of two banks eliminates one competitor from the market, it may well, and often does, greatly enhance competition between the banks in the area through the greater competitive strength of the resulting institution and the challenge to the other competing banks to meet it. As was shown in a study published in 1964 by the New York State Banking Department, entitled "Branch Banking, Bank Mergers, and the Public Interest," the public has almost always benefited from recent mergers in my State.

New York City banks are in direct competition with banks all over the country and to some extent with banks in foreign countries. We therefore believe in encouraging competition between banks both in New York and elsewhere because only through competition can we in New York maintain our position in the financial world.

The application of the general antitrust laws, particularly to mergers and acquisitions, is fraught with difficult economic questions and many uncertainties at best. To have these laws applied to an industry as unique and as subject to State and Federal regulation as is banking, by enforcement agencies and courts having little experience with or responsibility for the functioning of our banking system, greatly compounds these difficulties. The confusion is complete when one tries to reconcile why Congress has directed the Federal banking agencies reviewing proposed mergers to consider several important factors affecting the public interest and the soundness of the banking system in addition to the probable competitive consequences of the transaction, whereas the courts are now able to reverse an approval of a banking agency on the basis of the latter factor alone. If this situation goes uncorrected, the Congress, by default, will have given to an unspecialized enforcement agency what in practical

effect will often amount to a veto over bank mergers which qualified and experienced Federal banking agencies find to be in the public interest and without offsetting adverse effects on competition.

The regulatory system which the present bill would reinstate—and which corresponds to that which (prior to the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank decisions) most persons thought existed—appears to me unquestionably superior.

Banking has long been regarded as quasi-public in nature and so affected with the public interest that extensive governmental regulation is necessary. Thus, entry into banking is regulated not only by the normal competitive demands of the marketplace but by State and Federal banking authorities which grant charters for new banks only if convinced that the public interest dictates; and the establishment of branches is similarly restricted. Banks are also subject to close, continued, and detailed examination and surveillance by State and Federal banking authorities and are subject to legal lending limits, reserve requirements, restrictions on rates of interest paid for time deposits, restrictions on engaging in activities such as underwriting and on making investments, restrictions on directorships, and a host of other regulations. And although banks are free to select their customers and, within limits, to set the interest rates they charge, they are necessarily responsive to Federal monetary and other policies affecting the national economy and well-being.

A bank is simply not in the same category as a food processor or a chemical manufacturer, and the economic soundness and probable consequences of a bank acquisition or merger cannot be judged in the same manner. Banking is far more akin to the communications, railroad, airline, and marine shipping industries in respect of each of which the approval of a merger by the Federal agency charged with responsibility for regulating that industry exempts the merger from later attack under the Clayton or Sherman Acts. These agencies, like the Federal banking agencies, are in turn given the authority to disapprove mergers and acquisitions which are not found to be in the public interest, and the applicant companies generally have no recourse to the courts to ask that the unfavorable determinations of these regulatory agencies be reversed.

The Federal banking agencies, as specialized regulatory bodies, are in a far better position to make what should ultimately be the controlling determination in respect of a proposed merger or acquisition—will it be in the public interest, taking into account the relevant considerations set forth by the Congress in the Bank Merger Act? These agencies are directed by men appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who are selected because of their competence in banking or related matters. They have developed permanent staffs with an experience and understanding of the banking system unparalleled in our Government and they have the ability and the responsibility to make complete statistical and qualitative analyses and studies of proposed mergers. They are acutely aware of current trends and problems in commercial banking and of its interrelationship with other segments of the financial industry, and they bring to bear in their determinations an expertise born of a continuing responsibility rather than one developed largely for the purpose of attacking the proposed transaction and built upon analogies to the economics of, and competition in, wholly unrelated industries.

The desirability of assigning this role to these agencies was recognized, of course, at the time that the Bank Merger Act was adopted and was clearly reflected in the directive to those agencies to test proposed bank

mergers by the several criteria enumerated in that act rather than by considering probable competitive effects alone. I want to emphasize again most vigorously that the Bank Merger Act and S. 1698 are not anti-trust exemption statutes. They simply place the final determination of the favorable or unfavorable competitive aspects of a bank merger in the hands of the expert bank regulatory agencies.

The Federal banking agencies have, of course, placed considerable importance on probable competitive effects in reviewing proposed mergers and acquisitions under the Bank Merger Act. I believe it is fair to say that this factor has been of paramount importance in their determinations.

Further, it should not be overlooked that under the Bank Merger Act banks must justify an acquisition or merger as being in the public interest. Thus, where no affirmative public benefits can be shown, a bank merger may be disapproved upon a finding of probable adverse competitive consequences which would not be sufficient to cause the transaction to violate the Clayton or Sherman Acts.

The state of competition in the banking industry at the present time certainly does not indicate that the banking agencies, in approving bank mergers during the considerable period of time when such mergers were not challenged by the Justice Department because of the assumed inapplicability of the Clayton Act, permitted mergers which affected competition in banking adversely. It is true that there have been a considerable number of bank mergers since World War II. But given the very high degree of diffusion of the banking industry in 1945, the need for larger banking units to provide adequately the more extensive public banking services required and to meet the larger credit requirements and business needs of commercial customers, and the increasingly high degree of competition from nonbank financial institutions, these mergers and acquisitions appear not only to have been desirable but probably to have been essential to the sound development of our banking system as we know it today. If this development had been thwarted by the application of generalized theories of competition to an evolving banking system whose needs the courts and enforcement agencies were not directed, and were ill equipped, to evaluate, the injury to banking and to the public could, I submit, have been great.

I can speak with most familiarity of banking in New York City and, to a lesser extent, New York State. There have probably been as many bank mergers in New York City since 1946 (there have been 43 such mergers) as in any other community of the country, and yet I know of no place in the world today where banking competition at all levels is more intense, and the resultant extent and variety of banking services provided to both retail and wholesale customers is so great, as in New York City. Over 60 commercial banks serve New York City through more than 700 offices, and the competition among them is intense.

To illustrate the extent of this competition, New York City banks have consistently charged materially lower interest rates on short-term business loans than banks outside the city. For the first quarter of 1965, for example, the average rate charged by New York City banks was 4.74 percent, while that reported for banks in 19 large cities averaged 4.97 percent, in 7 northern and eastern cities other than New York averaged 5 percent, and in 11 southern and western cities averaged 5.27 percent. Similarly, although published statistics are not available, it is generally believed that rates on personal installment credit extended by New York City banks are as low, and in most cases are lower, than elsewhere in the country.

Banking in New York City has not become unduly concentrated in the hands of its largest banks. As of the end of 1963, in all but 3 of the 15 most populous cities of the country (on the basis of the 1960 census), the 5 largest banks held a greater proportion of assets, deposits, and loans than did the 5 largest banks in New York City. Further, in the area in which, under State law, New York City banks may have branches—New York City and the adjacent counties of Nassau and Westchester—there are now over 80 banks with approximately 1,050 offices. It may interest the subcommittee to know that as of December 31, 1960, the five largest New York City banks had 59 percent of the branches in this area and that as of March 1965 this percentage had declined to 57 percent.

Banks have not been deterred from securing charters or opening initial branches in New York City. Since 1960, 21 banks have opened their doors in New York City for the first time, including 4 newly chartered banks, 2 large suburban banks which opened branches in the city, and 15 foreign banks which established branches pursuant to amendments to the New York banking law which were sponsored by the New York Clearinghouse Association and which authorized them to provide a full range of banking services through such branches. Further, the growth in assets experienced by the moderate and smaller sized State and National commercial banks in New York City during the past 5 years has kept pace with that of the larger banks of the city.

In competition for customer patronage New York City banks have expanded their services and facilities aggressively. Branch offices have been opened at a rapid rate not only in Manhattan but in the four other boroughs of the city and, since authorized by State law in 1960, in the adjoining counties of Westchester and Nassau. In New York City alone the number of commercial banking offices increased from 609 in 1955 to 718 in 1964, and 55 offices have been opened by New York City banks in Westchester and Nassau Counties since 1960. Competition for deposits led New York City banks to become innovators in the widespread use of time certificates of deposits and other means for stimulating deposits, including many designed to appeal to small businesses and individual depositors. Intensive campaigns for saving deposits have been instituted and rates paid are the highest permitted by Federal Reserve regulations. Competition in consumer, automobile, real estate, and business loans has been similarly intense and has prompted increased efforts by New York City banks to provide better and more extensive services to the public.

That the mergers of New York City banks approved by the Federal agencies did not impair competition is, however, but part of the picture. The Banking Department of New York, in its report on "Branch Banking, Bank Mergers, and the Public Interest," which I previously mentioned, has concluded after a study of the effects, other than competitive effects, of 205 bank mergers in New York State (including 18 in New York City) from January 1, 1951, through December 31, 1961, that: "the great majority of bank mergers in New York State have been, on balance, beneficial to the interests of the public both in terms of their immediate and overall effects, including the longer range effects, although some mergers have had detrimental effects, on balance" (p. 29).

The supporting findings underlying this conclusion confirm the desirability of permitting bank mergers when the bank regulatory authorities responsible for the banking system conclude, after giving full consideration to competitive and other factors, that such transactions will benefit the public interest. The study found that, judg-

ing these mergers in terms of whether they produced banking benefits to the public, but without attempting an analysis of competitive consequences, the mergers produced immediate overall beneficial effects to the public in 87 percent of the cases examined and resulted in beneficial changes of bank policies in 95 percent of the cases. Most of the mergers found to have had overall detrimental effects occurred prior to the passage of the New York Omnibus Banking Act which set forth criteria for approvals of mergers (including consideration of competitive factors) similar to those contained in the Bank Merger Act, and no consideration was given to individualized beneficial factors such as the solution of management succession problems.

More specifically, these mergers were found generally to have resulted in new services being provided to the customers of the acquired bank, to have increased the ability of the acquiring bank to service larger borrowers and to have opened the way for added competition through the elimination of the statutory home office protection of the acquired bank. Although few changes in service charges, interest rates, and loan policies were found to have occurred in the case of mergers, the study found that such changes as did occur on balance benefited the public and resulted in lower charges and rates and more liberal loan policies.

The foregoing remarks concerning the effect of bank mergers in New York City and New York State are not, of course, submitted in order to justify any particular merger or to suggest that any banking agency—State or Federal—will be infallible in its judgments in respect of bank mergers or acquisitions. I do submit, however, that the State and Federal banking agencies charged with the responsibility for administering our banking laws are conscientious and skilled professionals whose understanding of the banking system and its needs uniquely qualifies them for this function, and whose past record, independent for the most part of the Department of Justice and the courts, clearly demonstrates an ability and will to perform this function in a manner consistent with maintaining vigorous competition while at the same time authorizing mergers and acquisitions beneficial to the banking public. Under these circumstances, it seems clear that the confused regulatory scheme which was brought into existence by the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank cases should be rectified.

I would like to address myself to one further and important deficiency in this present regulatory system which, even standing alone, would warrant adoption of the present bill. The Bank Merger Act wisely established a system which prohibits bank mergers and acquisitions without prior approval but which insures finality to the transaction if it is thus approved. The two merging banks and the public could, until the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank cases, proceed with the assurance that the transaction, and their actions taken in reliance on it, would not be upset at a later date.

This stability, so highly desirable in banking where public confidence in institutional dependability is of great importance, vanishes to the extent that the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act can later be invoked to challenge the completed transaction and require the complete divestiture by one bank of another. That such a disruptive event can occur long after the merger or acquisition in question is eloquently illustrated by the now famous Du Pont-General Motors decision by which Du Pont was forced to divest itself of its interest in General Motors almost 40 years after that interest was acquired. Thus, even if not immediately challenged by the Department of Justice because of the Department's preoccupation

with other matters, its current view of the law or otherwise, a bank merger could be challenged under the antitrust laws at a later date when the Department's interest may shift, later cases delineate new legal criteria or, perhaps, a subsequent merger or other event draws attention to the acquiring bank.

Further, even if the Department of Justice challenged a bank merger through the prompt initiation of judicial proceedings, the considerable delay usually involved in a de novo trial on the merits (with possible appeals) of so complicated a question as whether a proposed bank merger violates the antitrust laws would often of itself necessitate abandonment of a proposed merger or acquisition which, it must be remembered, will have been pending for a considerable time prior to its submission to, and the review and determination by, the Federal and, in most cases, State banking authorities.

To illustrate the periods of time involved, the merger of Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Hanover Bank was approved by the Federal Reserve Board in September 1961, almost 9 months after the boards of directors of the two banks agreed upon the merger in principle. Litigation of that merger under the antitrust laws commenced immediately, but it was not until March 1965—or about 3½ years later—that the trial court rendered its decision. Proceedings before the trial court on the issue of relief are still pending and no appeals have, of course, as yet been taken. It is questionable how many banks could hold a pending merger in abeyance for even a portion of what is now over 4 years after the merger was first agreed upon without jeopardizing important customer and correspondent relationships in the interim, disrupting the staffs of the two banks, hampering plans for development and adversely affecting the value to stockholders of their investment.

The lack of finality in bank mergers and asset acquisitions is not a problem confined to mergers which were consummated before the Philadelphia Bank and Lexington Bank decisions, although the invoking of so radical a remedy as divestiture would seem particularly harsh and inappropriate in those situations in view of the prior understanding of the finality of approvals by the banking authorities under the Bank Merger Act. Equally important, this current lack of finality will have highly undesirable consequences in the future for banks contemplating a possible merger and will, I believe, be a serious deterrent to bank mergers or acquisitions which would be of public benefit.

In concluding, I would like to emphasize to the subcommittee that the New York Clearinghouse Association and its 11 member banks believe strongly in the necessity for preserving a vigorously competitive banking system. The high degree of competition in banking has been a major factor in the economic progress of this country and is essential to the vitality and growth of a banking system which can adequately meet the expanding needs of the public. I believe you will find that bankers in New York City are as vitally interested in fostering efficient and competitive banking as are the Congress and the State and Federal banking agencies.

We do not support the present bill because of any belief that banking should be immune from regulatory controls designed to insure the continuance of this high level of competition. On the contrary, we endorse the emphasis which was placed on the preservation of competition in the Bank Merger Act, and we support this present proposal because we believe that a regulatory system providing for the sound application of these controls in respect of bank mergers by banking agencies uniquely qualified to

administer them is the best and soundest means of assuring that such competition is maintained.

THE NORTH AMERICAN FISHERIES: A CHALLENGE AND A PROMISE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from April 30 through May 5, the National Fisheries Institute, a trade organization representing the fresh and frozen industries of the U.S. fisheries, called together the first North American Fisheries Conference. It was an unqualified success. The United States, Canada, and Mexico were the official participants, but the agenda also included speakers from as far away as England. Government officials, and private citizens, scientists, and laymen, and members of the fishing industry all presented their views of the present situation and the future promise of the North American fisheries.

Many times individuals have testified on the sad plight of the U.S. fisheries. We in the Congress have heard time and time again of the precipitous decline of this industry at various hearings. The conference was in many ways a unique session. Here the industry took a long hard look at itself. No holds were barred, no punches pulled. The industry and the conference participants were honest to themselves, positive in their outlook, and determined to see the entire American fisheries competing successfully in the world market. The agenda was taut and reflected excellent planning. All aspects of the industry were covered, from international conservation and regulation through marketing and distribution.

Those in attendance at the conference were, indeed, privileged to hear Donald L. McKernan, Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, present a summary of the various papers. Because I feel that this conference was of such importance to all concerned with the future of the North American fisheries, I ask unanimous consent that Director McKernan's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

I have been given the honor of summarizing the papers presented at the Conference. This could be done quite simply by saying "very good" or "excellent." Some, of course, might even say "poor" or "lousy." I am not going to take the easy way out, because I have found the past 3 days' discussions in the general sessions so stimulating and so thought provoking that the opportunity of having the last word about subjects so close to our hearts has stimulated me thoroughly.

In discussing the future of North American fisheries resources we have quite properly considered first the North American fishery potential. In this consideration Dr. Peter Larkin reviews some of the background of world fisheries production, compares this with current and potential North American production, and points up clearly some realistic concepts in achieving and sustaining this potential.

The next series of speakers, Drs. Kask and Chapman, posed both questions and answers relating to the key issues raised by citizens industry, participants, politicians, and governments. If, as Dr. Larkin states, the po-

tential of food production from the sea is far greater than now realized, Dr. Kask asks how can this potential be reached? How can the countries of North America participate more actively in utilizing the resources of the world ocean? What problems face these countries in reaching their goals, and what measures need be taken to improve the possibilities for success in increasing fish production at a profit? Obviously, such a discussion of the potential resources of the sea and our thoughtful inquiries as to how we can achieve improved production leads next to the problems of harvesting, processing, and marketing.

Dr. Schaefer has discussed the role of the study of the oceans in the harvest of the resources, and Mr. Basil Parkes has added both constructive and practical suggestions about future improvements in fish harvesting. He also raises, from a practical point of view, the urgent need for effective conservation regulations and enforcement on an international basis.

But our questions have probed far beyond this point, and so have our inquiries in this meeting. After considering the resources, the role of which a study of the oceans can play in improving harvesting these resources, and ways of improving our present fish-harvesting methods, Mr. E. Robert Kinney discussed the need for and possibilities of keeping the catch in good quality. He also raised the question of processing fish better and in more ways which will make it attractive to the consuming public. But even the processed product must be marketed, and Minister Sharp, the Fish and Seafood Promotions Division of the National Fisheries Institute—including speakers from various segments of the industry—and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall have examined, and in an optimistic vein I might add, the potential markets within our own countries and abroad and the need for opening these markets more widely.

One can only conclude from the discussions of marketing that opportunities are present and, if one is not careful, we might be lulled into a false sense of security. Dr. Kask, on the other hand, points out in the early questions raised by him that, despite the potential resources available, the consumption of fisheries products in our countries has remained low and has failed to keep pace with the increased consumption of meats and poultry.

Several speakers mentioned the developing international scene, and Minister Robichaud as well as Mr. Jackson have raised the unique and urgent problems posed by man's race for the resources of the sea. Jackson pointed out the unique role which he believes FAO can play in resolving the conflicts arising among fishermen of various nations harvesting common resources.

I am impressed by the breadth of our discussions, the penetrating questions raised by our speakers, and the imaginative, although sometimes embarrassing questions which have been raised but by no means completely answered as a result of our discussions.

I should like, in the few minutes allotted me, to discuss more fully the general course of these discussions as I have followed them, and while I presume I should act as a mere reporter, I do not find it possible in my heart to refrain from adding my own views. Thus, I hope I will be forgiven if my reporting and summation of this Conference is shamelessly colored by some of my own prejudices. My only excuse is that perhaps by this means I can bring together what seems to me to be the mainstreams of thought brought to this Conference by our previous distinguished speakers and perhaps make the various discussions tie together into a recognizable picture.

One must accept the consensus of our speakers that there is an unused potential

of fish products in the world ocean and that it is probable we can increase the fish catch near the shores of our respective countries, using existing methods and available gear, by a factor of from two to four times the amount of fish now being produced by our industries. It has been pointed out that this potential increase in catch is not a certainty but only a possibility—a possibility which can only be achieved with certain changes occurring among the habits of our people, policies of our Government, and action by our industry.

It was pointed out by Dr. Larkin that our North American fishery potential will largely depend upon what the consumers decide. He believes there to be a substantial demand for seafoods but that the full potential can be achieved only if the consumer wants it. Dr. Larkin further points out that the concepts of fisheries management are rapidly changing from those which in the past were considered the maximum sustainable yield alone to a more sophisticated approach to conservation and management which considers the maximized economic yield or the greatest value of production from the least effort within prevailing circumstances.

I agree with Dr. Larkin that there is a great potential in the world ocean and that the North American Continent is in a favorable position with regard to the fisheries productivity. It seems quite obvious that our quite specific and unchanging tastes in fisheries products have limited the catch to a very few of the available species. At some time in the future when we have learned to efficiently catch and process our latent resources in a usable yet new form, prepare them for customers who have been conditioned to demand new products, products from herring, codlike, and flounder species now lying fallow on and over the edge of the Continental Shelf, then and only then is it likely that our fishermen will be encouraged to turn their efforts to these species.

There can be no question about the demand. I believe that the greatest fisheries market in the world exists within our three countries. In fact, there is little question but that the United States by itself is the world's most important fisheries market, dollarwise, at least.

We in the United States are importing 62 percent of the fisheries products we consume in North America. If we can learn how to efficiently harvest and process the underutilized species adjacent to our coast, we can increase the consumption of our domestically produced fish. I believe this can be done without reducing the imports; it can be done by increasing the consumption of fish within the United States. To date we have been unsuccessful in increasing the per capita consumption of fish and some of our speakers have raised questions about this lack of success and others have pontificated about how we might overcome our difficulties.

Dr. Kask raises some of these important questions. He asks, "Why, when world fish production has more than doubled in 1950, have the North American fish producers barely held their own in spite of the fact that effective demand for fish products has continued to increase?" Second, he has asked, "Why hasn't the per capita consumption of fish improved along with the consumption of bread, meat, poultry, eggs, and cheese?" Third, "Is one of our problems the overadministration of our resources?" That is, the basic administration of the States are overlaid with the administration of the Federal Government and international commissions. He summarizes this question by asking, "Are we doing the right things with the increasing funds we are spending?" And, fourth, "Can we justify the increasing costs of national research programs in the face of the lagging developments of North American

fisheries?" These are important questions. They touch upon the heart of the problem. He might also have asked whether our present systems of dealing with developing international fisheries problems are entirely adequate, and he might have gone further and asked, "Are our concepts of and mechanisms for the conservation and utilization of the living resources of the sea adequate for the future?"

Dr. Chapman, in discussing these questions, does so somewhat indirectly. Perhaps he purposely avoids the direct questions asked by Dr. Kask. He addresses himself to the general question of "Politics and the marine fisheries." He discusses in some depth the problems involved in the full use of the living resources of the sea. Just as Dr. Kask's primary question involved the broad question as to why the United States and Canada, especially, have not increased fish production in spite of the fact that there was an effective and increasing demand for fisheries products in their countries, so Dr. Chapman has approached this broad question from the standpoint of what he calls "institutional problems," barriers our society has raised to the more full use of the fishery resources off our coast. His paper points out, among other things, that the manifestation of our problem is the inability of fisheries products to compete with other products, such as the red meats, poultry, etc., mentioned by Dr. Kask, for the consumer's dollar. A number of these institutional problems are proposed as major barriers to the increased domestic catch. State laws which discourage the development of new fisheries and inhibit the efficient growth of existing fisheries are listed as being a major cause. The countrywide question of sportsmen versus commercial fishermen, and the inefficient versus efficient fishermen both tend to inhibit the opportunities of American fishermen. It was pointed out that many of these conflicts are forms of gear conflict, wherein a less efficient user of the resource wants to prevent a more efficient user from gobbling up the allowable catch, whatever that may be. While Dr. Chapman's contention seems to be that the recreational fisherman must always win out, I am not so certain of this conclusion. I would wonder whether the public interest in some areas does not lean toward making the healthful food products of the sea available to all citizens rather than to a selected few. Obviously, these resources can best be made available to all citizens through the medium of efficient, modern, commercial fishermen. Nevertheless, Dr. Chapman's point that these are problems is well taken.

It is also true that the critical conflicts for the use of species of fish are few, and if reason rather than emotion were applied to the problems, solutions could easily be found.

Dr. Chapman points out that State fisheries research agencies and the academic institutions, as well as the Federal organization of ocean research, all leave much to be desired in bringing together information which could bear upon more logical conservation regulations and upon the more efficient capture of fish. He presents a rather bold and new approach to the Federal organization of fishery research in recommending a Department of the Oceans, composed of various civilian agencies having an interest in the sea. He points out that this civilian agency would provide for the civilian sector a function parallel to that which Navy's oceanographic program provides for defense. He points out essentially that the National Science Foundation is well suited to adequately promote the ocean activities of academic institutions, but what is needed is a Cabinet-level organization within the Executive to stimulate the coordination and

development of research and use of the ocean's resources for the civilian economy.

Dr. Chapman does not for one instant question, as Kask does, the present expenditures of funds for research. He expresses the belief that the expenditures are too low and that State fisheries research agencies as well as academic fishery research groups should be strengthened both in staff and financing. His answer to Kask's question about the justification of present expenditures of research is that we need more research, and if more dollars are spent along these lines we might expect dramatic results such as have occurred in agriculture during the past century. He also tends to answer the question raised by Dr. Kask about the success of present fishery management efforts by indicating that there needs to be a general overhaul of this function within the States, a greater use of research results, and a willingness of State legislatures to leave to the specialists the job of conserving the resources.

He considers that, if we are to compete in the American food market, the cost per ton of fish must be reduced by the greater application of science and technology, along with overhauling and eliminating State laws which have no factual basis nor conservation effect. He would strengthen State and academic fisheries organizations, and would reorganize the ocean research and development in the Federal establishment.

Lastly, he has little sympathy for the proposition by many that the jurisdictional fisheries limits of the United States should be extended. His view, quite obviously, is that the American fishing industry—with the proper application of money, brains, and existing scientific and technological information—can compete successfully with fishermen from any other country for fishery resources on the high seas and ought to start doing so.

Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, in discussing ways in which the study of the oceans—oceanography—can contribute to the increased catch of fish, quotes optimistically from a recent National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council publication to the effect that we could double our fish catch within the next 10 to 15 years and quadruple the overseas fisheries within the next decade. He develops the thesis that oceanographic research is one of the essential elements in realizing these potentials and he lists five ways in which oceanographic knowledge will assist in increasing the harvest of the sea. First, he points out that until recently, fishing grounds were discovered in almost a haphazard fashion, at least by trial-and-error means, but that a knowledge of the ocean currents and ocean environment may well lead to the rapid location and development of rich, new fishing areas.

Second, he points out that even in areas where commercial fisheries have long been exploited, systematic studies of current systems may well lead to major new discoveries. He uses as an example the discovery and delineation of the standing stock of some 2 to 4 million tons of anchovy, which he claims could sustain a harvest of perhaps a half million tons a year or more off the southern coast of California. He cites other examples on both coasts to indicate that careful, systematic oceanographic studies in existing fishing areas have provided information leading to the development of more efficient use of these resources or to the discovery of entirely new resources not understood to have been present in abundance previously.

Third, Dr. Schaefer points out that a knowledge of fish behavior in relation to ocean conditions and properties in the ocean environment can lead to more efficient capture. There is no question about the fact that fish being cold-blooded animals react more specifically to their environment than do warm-blooded animals of the sea or land

and that a knowledge of such simple parameters in the sea as temperatures has been shown to be a tactical advantage to fishermen. He points out that albacore fishermen off the North Pacific coast and cod fishermen in the North Atlantic have used the distribution of temperatures in certain layers of water to find concentrations of fish. Dr. Schaefer cites the almost obvious relationship between harvestable fish and aggregations of food supply as being a useful tool which fishermen might in the future use to improve fishing operations, although he recognizes these relationships have not been well developed.

Fourth, Dr. Schaefer recognizes that a knowledge of the oceans is giving us information on predictability and that variations in ocean conditions provide a forecast of expected good or poor runs of fish in many circumstances. He believes that a knowledge of the oceans will provide a basis for rational management of heavily exploited fisheries and this cannot be debated. Obviously, if we can predict the large and small runs in advance of the fishing season or trip with sufficient accuracy, conservation regulations can be tailored to the size of the runs and commitment of funds and labor held to an optimum.

Dr. Schaefer's view, in summary, is that, with the proper application of ocean science, fishing can be put on a more efficient basis, leading from the hunting economy of the past toward a system of fish husbandry in the future.

The discussion by Mr. A. B. Parkes, a vessel operator from Hull, England, was refreshing. The British have had a history of long and successful experience fishing the eastern North Atlantic in the east with constant and intensive competition from their neighbors in Europe. In addition, they have developed distant-water vessels to fish the north and northwest Atlantic. Thus, their experience is of great value to us, especially at this time when many of us in North America are contemplating the construction or reconstruction of major segments of our fishing fleets, and, what is more important, some of us are looking to the North Atlantic. Unlike some of the preceding speakers, Mr. Parkes sounds a word of warning with his discussion of the efforts of the British to develop the most efficient vessels and more efficient gear in order to maintain their harvest from the sea; he points out that the catch per unit of effort of the trawlers has declined 30 to 40 percent in recent years despite the improvement in ships and gear. One must recognize that the British developments in fisheries in recent years have been somewhat different from those in Japan and the Soviet Union. The British, rather than develop new fishing grounds and new fishing methods in other parts of the world, have tended to remain on their well-known and established grounds, expending their energies toward making their fishermen, vessels, and equipment more efficient. In this respect, I consider them to be perhaps the most advanced fishing nation in the world.

Mr. Parkes has done us the great favor of discussing the development of the distant-water trawlers of several types, including stern-ramp trawlers, and he points out that there soon will be in the general neighborhood of 20 or 25 of these in operation. His discussion of the experiments in icing, freezing, superchilling, and filleting aboard these new vessels indicates quite clearly the systematic efforts of the British industry to maintain a competitive position on the North Atlantic fishing grounds and on the world market. He points out that one of their concerns is whether or not these new classes of large vessels can find enough fish in the North Atlantic to enable the ships to work profitably. With the size of the ship under consideration, vessels from 210 to 250

feet in overall length, a minimum of about 12 tons per day must be caught while on the fishing grounds before breaking even. This is an important statistic and one which gives us much food for thought. Mr. Parkes points out that the British are not the only people who are developing these long-range, efficient trawlers; France, Belgium, Holland, U.S.S.R., and West Germany, among others, are rapidly developing distant-water factory trawlers to maintain their competitive position on North Atlantic fishing banks.

The degree of consideration of economics of these large vessels is indicated by his discussion of the questions before them at the present time to determine how much processing equipment must be placed on these vessels. He speculates that the answer may well be to install no more processing facilities for the production of fish blocks and/or fillets than those which can be kept approximately 90 percent employed continuously while on the fishing grounds. His logic is inescapable. The heavy expense of labor and equipment makes it mandatory that on the fishing vessels the equipment be kept in almost continuous operation.

Mr. Parkes states that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find commercial quantities of sizable and edible fish of the types in popular demand. He states that many of the grounds around the coasts of Europe, which were prolific as recently as 30 years ago, are now commercially barren. He states categorically that the cause is overfishing and the failure to take precautions to allow small fish to pass through the nets. He points out that there can be no worthwhile harvest in the long run if there is not good husbandry of the available stock. His picture of conditions in the North Atlantic—at least the Northeast Atlantic—is pessimistic. He states that management is virtually absent. The industry has received warnings from the scientists, but effective international control is wanting. He suggests that there is urgent need of international control of the fishing effort and pleads for effective international enforcement of conservation measures. Essentially, Mr. Parkes says that the increased efficiency of the larger vessels and better gear is simply being used to maintain the previous level of catches. In doing so, he describes some new techniques that the British are using, with sounding and sonar devices as well as trawler speedometers and other electronic equipment of very modern design.

Mr. Parkes emphasizes throughout his discussion the need for more effective international control of fishing intensity and the need for more effective measures of conservation and enforcement. Without these, he sees little future in the fishing industry on those stocks of fish which have been the basis for the major catches of fish throughout the world. He puts it this way: "Let us hope that our effectiveness as fish killers does not for long continue to outpace our effectiveness as fish conservers." Mr. Parkes has sounded a familiar warning, one with which we can concur. I am sure that I speak for those of us from the three North American countries at this Conference in believing that, in addition to the development and full use of new resources of the sea, there is great potential benefit from effective conservation programs to conserve and sustain the economic optimum yield from our fisheries resources.

Moving now to the matter of processing the catch once it is aboard our vessel and reaches our port, Mr. E. Robert Kinney points out that with the tremendous number of trained engineers and scientists in North America one can look toward new knowledge upon which to base new food products for the consumer of tomorrow. This paper, as have some others, points up the urgent problem caused by the exploding human population

on the earth and the ultimate need to look to the sea for food. Mr. Kinney points out that in considering the resources of the sea we must become internationally minded and that our research on fishery resources is minimal at best. He points up the responsibility of the processor to watch carefully new developments. The case is made that fish supplies only about 1 percent of the calories needed for food by our population. As he sees it, the fishing industry must compete more successfully and it can do so by improving present methods, developing new products, controlling and reducing labor costs, and recognizing the market for convenience. He goes on to discuss these in more detail, pointing out that the industry must upgrade its products in order to get more of the consumer's food dollars. He thinks that the fishing industry must become more imaginative and creative and that they must watch new developments—such developments as the radiation of seafoods, freezing with liquid nitrogen, and freeze drying—and keep a close watch on the development of fish protein concentrate. There is the thought expressed that the industry itself spends too little for research and that most of the research done by industry is in the general field of quality control rather than in evaluation of developments made possible by basic research efforts of scientists throughout the world. Mr. Kinney points out that in order to keep competitive we must increase production efficiency, and he believes that this can be done by automation and production efficiency through design and construction of new equipment and new methods.

It was pointed out that the future will bring computers into the fish production lines, with automated filling and dispensing equipment controlled by these computers and with more uniformly high-quality products of uniform formulation of texture, color, and flavor. This he sees as the channel to the greater consumption of fish in North America and greater profits. He makes a plea for positive attributes in our marketing and thinks that the fishing industry must in the future give the consumer, at some greater cost to the industry, more products, more convenience, more nourishment, and more flavor for her money. He concludes, optimistically, that if the industry is wise enough to utilize fully the research available from our own and sister industries, the rewards in profits and growth will be great.

Speakers on the marketing panel projected their thinking into the future so far as marketing was concerned, and presented their views on potential markets and profits if full advantage of opportunities are grasped. The discussion primarily related to the developments in the markets for fish and shellfish within the United States, although there was a recognition, albeit not a great one, by these men of the opportunities for overseas marketing development. It was pointed out that within the last 10 to 15 years the marketing of seafood products has been revolutionized. A decade or so ago, the bulk of the products, except for a few canned or solid products, was sold on the seacoasts, and relatively little fish was consumed in the Midwest. There, most of the population was unaware of the advantages of fish on the menu.

Mr. John Mehos pointed out that today from one end of the country to the other a large variety of fish and seafood items are to be found on the menus of hotels and restaurants and other mass-feeding establishments. Everywhere, homes and restaurants serve sea products—domestic as well as foreign—from every corner of the country and globe. While the domestic consumption of fish has not increased substantially in the United States, he points out that the value of fisheries products consumed in the United States has increased substantially. Ten years ago the retail value of fish and shellfish products was about \$900 million and

today it has reached about \$1.3 billion, an increase of over \$400 million within the past 10-year period. It was pointed out that, although this appears fine on first glance, another look shows the expenditures by our citizens for food increased 60 percent, which was half again as much as the increase for fish and seafood products. In examining population growth and comparing this with the increase in total supply of fish and seafood, it was shown that the total supply consumed in the United States just about kept pace with the population growth. This corresponds very well, of course, with the constant rate of consumption of between 10 and 11 pounds per capita in this country. I would add that if one looks closer, and considers the change in the value of the dollar during the past 10 years, we can scarcely be complacent about the increase in sales of fisheries products during the past 10 years.

It was also shown that the amount of imported products consumed in the United States has gone up tremendously. In 1953, the value of fishery products imported into the United States was approximately \$200 million. In 1963, the imports were valued at \$400 million—an increase of 100 percent. Shrimp was used as a specific example. In 1950, the United States and Mexico produced practically all of the shrimp consumed in the United States. Today, 20 percent of the consumption comes from over 48 countries other than the United States and Mexico. Data show that to a considerable degree the increased imports occurred subsequent to the development of frozen fillets and fish sticks and blocks. With the tremendous increase in the consumption of such products as fish sticks, fish portions, breaded shrimp, and other frozen products, there has been a radical change in the type of fishery product consumed in the United States. In addition, it was pointed out that there has been a radical change in the method of marketing. The revolution in marketing fisheries products has altered significantly the kind of product consumed in the home, the packaging of the products, and the distribution throughout the country. Mr. Eric Turnill talked about looking into the future and visualizing the marketing prospects in the years ahead. He concludes, much as did Mr. Kinney, that there will be approximately a 23-percent increase in our population by 1975, or about 230 million people in this country alone, not counting the rate of increase in our neighboring countries—Mexico and Canada. But Mr. Turnill also points out that there will be a great deal more money in the pockets of each family, and that the spare money is increasing at a faster rate than the basic income. To him this means that Americans are going to be in a position to spend more money for food and they are going to want better, higher-priced, and more convenient foods to serve. He foresees that the American housewife of the future will buy more precooked portions of shrimp, lobster, crab, halibut, salmon, and other products which may be produced in the future.

He estimates, and I assume his statistics to be correct, that Americans will probably spend 75 percent more for foods in 1975—just 10 years from now—than at the present time. He also points out, and it seems quite logical, that people will be spending more for food away from home at hotels, restaurants, clubs, and drive-in restaurants. He foresees that the housewife will buy almost completely in self-service supermarkets. Mr. Turnill predicts, on the basis of Bureau statistics, that there will be more than 5½ billions of pounds of fish and shellfish available to sell in 1975. Since the statistics come from our Bureau, I take them to be correct by definition. On the other hand, these statistics are only true if we continue to sell fish at the same low rate as today. He then con-

cludes that in the next 10 years the size of our market will increase by 25 percent; that Americans will have 75 percent more money to spend on food; that we are going to have more products to market than at the present and that the important point for the American fishing industry to remember is that the housewife must be presold before she shops, and this will be tough to do because there will be more competition for the consumer dollar than at present.

Dr. Wendell Earle presented a stimulating discussion of "Marketing at a Profit." The thrust of his argument was that, while there were bound to be changes in marketing practices in the next few years, these will not be of a radical nature but will involve further evolution in the growth of the frozen and convenience foods markets. Dr. Earle is critical of present-day practices and he quotes a speaker who wrote of marketing men persisting in marketing a product as though the population was made up of "white Protestants, middle class, young, suburban corporation executives and their wives," when in fact present-day markets are composed of many quite distinct groups, each becoming a separate market in itself.

His picture of the great numbers of Americans who do not eat fish at all, or very seldom, strikes at the heart of the marketing problem of the fishing industry.

I would say Dr. Earle accuses us, and I judge us guilty, of utter complacency after hearing his arguments. His answer to the industry's problem is that we need more outstanding products and an advertising program of a different order of magnitude than that now underway. Here Dr. Earle is not talking about increasing the industrywide promotion allowance from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per year. He talks in terms of \$500,000 per year. I think he is way too low.

I am well aware of the advertised brands expenditures for advertising canned and frozen fish, but since the fishing industry is still essentially composed of small businesses, it seems obvious that they must join with the larger components of the industry and support a significant program. I don't believe this is being done now and obviously neither does Dr. Earle.

Dr. Earle raises another very significant point when, in again quoting a colleague, he points out that profits come from three sources in the food chain: the markup on commodity, improvements in production efficiency, and increases from marketing services. He believes the fishing industry is neglecting the profits to be gained by marketing services and his arguments seem sound to me.

In summary, Dr. Earle presented stimulating arguments which tend to corroborate the consumption statistics: we are not doing a very good job of marketing our products; we are overlooking profitable ways in which to improve the marketing of our product; and we as yet are not putting one-tenth enough effort (money) into industrywide promotion. With these arguments before us, there is little wonder that the per capita consumption of fish remains constant in the United States and Canada, at least.

Mr. Murray Wheeler, with Mr. Frohman, reviewed some of the excellent advertising and promotion work that has been done over the past year, and I must confess that his report was most encouraging. There can be no question but what well-supported promotion and advertising will sell high-quality fishery products. My résumé of this section of the marketing presentation is that there is a great enthusiasm, a tremendous opportunity—an opportunity which requires two things: a greater quantity of high-quality fisheries products for the market and increased support by the fishing industry of marketing promotion and direct advertising. I am reminded here of the oft-repeated poem about the codfish. I believe our marketing

experts who have spoken during the course of this Conference mentioned the promotion activities of the poultry and dairy people. What they meant to say is that we in the fish business could do a great deal more crowing. I think we can too, especially when I think of the poem about the codfish and the hen.

"The codfish lays a thousand eggs,
The homely hen lays one,
But the codfish never cackles
To tell you what she's done.

"And, so we scorn the codfish,
While the humble hen we prize.
Which only goes to show
That it pays to advertise."

I suggest if we can't put more money into industry advertising, that as a last resort we attach airhorns to the airbladders of codfish. At least we will make more noise.

Minister Sharp discussed, in general, the advantages of increased trade among all nations, and especially among American nations. He pointed out that about \$1 of \$5 Canada earns comes from exports. It was quite clear from his discussion that Canada is very dependent upon trade, and her trade in fisheries is very large.

The Minister discussed the Kennedy round tariff negotiations now underway in Europe. He was cautiously optimistic that this would be successful after periods of disappointment and trials. It was his view that these talks would lead eventually to an improved trade climate among nations and he saw fisheries trade expanding as a result.

While the preceding gentlemen talked primarily about domestic markets, Secretary of the Interior Udall talked about the developing world markets and the challenge the U.S. fishing industry faces in competing for the world markets of tomorrow. He pointed out that the international trade in fisheries products is growing, and growing rapidly. It was noted that the volume of world exports in 1963 was almost three times as great as in 1948, and was 60 percent larger than in 1958. North America and Europe combined bought about 83 percent of the total volume of world imports of fish in 1963. In contrast, Africa, Latin America, and Asia together—these, of course, are countries with a relatively low purchasing power—accounted for only 14 percent of the world import totals. Secretary Udall recognizes that the current negotiations, called the Kennedy round tariff negotiations, will undoubtedly pose some immediate economic hardships on our domestic fishing industry, but, provided the fishing industry accepts the challenge, it is his view that a reduction in trade barriers will make possible new opportunities for overseas trade by the American fishing industry. He views the increased world harvest of fish as a possible means of meeting the problems of hunger throughout the world. With the recent accumulation of scientific information about the sea, it seems obvious to him that our industries—the industries of the three countries here at this Conference—can be made ready for ocean development programs, translating scientific knowledge into an ever-increasing harvest of mineral, food, and water resources from the sea.

In order to make this vast potential food resource available to hungry people, we in our three countries must develop more highly sophisticated systems of trade and aid—systems which require international cooperation as well as cooperation between Government and private business. He believes that fish can play a decisive role in these programs through the development of private trade as well as through overseas aid, such as food for peace and other programs. Secretary Udall believes that as developing countries achieve economic growth, active markets for fisheries products develop. He points out that industry must develop new

kinds of products—those based upon new technology, such as freeze drying, irradiation, and reduction products along with conventional, economic canned and cured products as being the kinds of use in developing markets in rapidly developing countries. He looks upon fish protein concentrate as providing great opportunities for industry in this country. He believes that we are on the threshold of marked improvement in both developing a fish protein concentrate as well as finding uses of it in human diets. He looks upon this as a way of bringing into commercial use many species of fish now entirely or partially unutilized. In summary, Secretary Udall believes that the American fishing industry has a tremendous challenge to develop world markets for fishery products. He, like a number of our speakers on the panels over the past 3 days, sees improved technology and increasing efficiency as the key to successful competition on the world market.

There were two additional papers of great interest and concern to the Conference. The first of these was by Mr. Robichaud, Minister of Fisheries for Canada. Mr. Robichaud's message at this Conference involved a most stimulating discussion of the need for conservation and wise management of world fishery resources. He warns us that the mobile fleets of large fishing countries pose a serious challenge to the somewhat inadequate world organization for conservation of international fisheries research and regulation. He points out that although there are some outstanding examples of the conservation of fishery resources, examples in which both the United States and Canada participate, there are storm clouds overhead brought about by the increasing competition for common resources. His discussion of various fisheries commissions in which Canada participates leads him to conclude that, in order to meet the challenge, some kind of mechanism much broader than the regional commissions now in being must be developed in order to safeguard the living resources of the sea in the future.

Mr. Robichaud sees an important role for the fisheries activities of FAO to play in gathering comprehensive statistics of all fisheries and stimulating the exchange of scientific information on a very broad basis. He emphasizes that the rapid expansion of world fisheries will continue; that this creates an urgent need for strong unified conservation efforts; and that we of the Americas face a great challenge. He points out that if we meet this challenge effectively, future generations will benefit. But, if we fail, our generation will share the blame. Minister Robichaud expresses Canada's determination to play her part in winning the battle for international cooperation in fishery conservation.

Mr. Jackson has spoken to us this afternoon about the role of FAO in world fisheries. I need not repeat his summary of the explosive character of world fisheries today, but I should mention that Mr. Jackson quite clearly lays out the imbalance in the harvest of fish by a very few countries. For example, he points out that nearly one-third of the world catch in 1963 was taken by 2 countries—Peru and Japan—and that two-thirds of the world catch was taken only by 10 countries out of some 220 countries in existence today. He presents some other interesting statistics to show that there is an imbalance in the catch of food from the sea, not only in the amount taken by a few fishing countries but by the distribution of fish catch.

Mr. Jackson points out that world fisheries are in the midst of a technological revolution. The catch has increased, vessels are increasing in number and in size, the number of products and their distribution has increased exponentially in the last few years. This, however, is happening only in few places; the overwhelming majorities of na-

tions and people have been left far behind. This results in 95 percent of the world catch being taken by about 20 percent of the countries.

Mr. Jackson also deals with the international trade problem. His general arguments are much the same as those of Secretary Udall. He points out, for example, that if one considers the live weight equivalent of the fisheries catch, one-third of the total world catch was entering international trade 7 years ago, and in 1962, the figure had risen to about 40 percent. Another way of putting this is that for every 5 tons of fish caught now, 2 of these are exported. A surprising statistic came from Mr. Jackson. He estimates that the volume of fish and fishery products traded internationally is now of about the same order of magnitude as the international trade in meat. He points out, quite rightly, that fisheries differ from agriculture and meat production in that for the most part the fisheries stocks of the world are common property of mankind and, therefore, they are highly international in nature.

After reviewing the general kinds of work that FAO does, Mr. Jackson strongly implies, and it is an implication that I am perfectly willing to accept, that the FAO fisheries group is wholly inadequate to accomplish the task before them. Their problems of dealing with regional fisheries bodies and technical assistance of various kinds, and attempting to be responsive, not only to the needs of the developing countries, but to others by bringing together scientists as well as scientific information for the developed countries, poses a task far beyond the capability of their present staff. He has pointed out that there are moves on foot, and I am pleased to be able to say that the U.S. Government has been in the forefront of these moves, to upgrade fisheries and provide adequate tools for this potentially important international organization. He believes that FAO's role should be one of leadership through service, and he has summarized some of the duties of this organization as he sees it. My own view is somewhat similar to that of Minister Robichaud's. In the future, fishing countries must look to some kind, or kinds, of international organization, broader than those now in being, to provide a common forum for fishing nations to wisely consider conservation measures for the living resources of the sea. I am not sure that FAO is, in fact, one of these organizations of the future, but I insist they should have the opportunity to develop along these lines.

I have tried thus far in summarizing the Conference to more or less highlight the papers of preceding speakers; inserting what appeared to me to be pertinent comments; to others they may have seemed impertinent. Now I should like to attempt to summarize the Conference in my own words.

Turning to the resource, it seems quite obvious that there is ample opportunity for a twofold to tenfold increase in the sustainable catch of fishery resources from the world ocean and from the seas surrounding our shores. The question raised by several of our distinguished speakers is how to achieve this increase economically; by what means; and several have pointed out that this can only happen when products and a market for those products have been found.

There is no simple answer to the disturbing questions raised by Dr. Kask. It seems quite obvious that the fishing industries of at least Canada and the United States have not kept up either with other food-producing industries in our countries or with many important fish-producing nations of the world. It has been shown that the reasons for this are complex. They involve the political, economic, and social customs and regulations of our countries. The rules under which we can fish and sell our products have been so ma-

nipulated that we are handicapped in relation to other fishing nations in developing the most efficient kinds of gear and harvesting the resources to the maximum extent possible, consistent with proper conservation.

Several speakers have pointed out that the resources off our coasts were being utilized by large fleets from foreign lands. One speaker has told us, in a sense, to get off our pants and start fishing before we lose our industry. It has been suggested that the organizations of our Government—Federal and State—are not completely adequate to handle the problems of complex international fisheries of tomorrow, and that certain changes ought to be made in order to improve our chances. I do not quarrel with these views nor for the need for change. However, I am not certain that we have considered all the roadblocks to increased production nor the changes in our fisheries which are taking place. For example, there is a move towards the consolidation of the small, independent fishing unit within our own country, and I presume the same thing is happening in Canada and Mexico.

The problems of the small, independent operator—be he fisherman or processor—have been pointed out by at least one of our speakers in the last 3 days, and it seems to me that whether it is good for the country, good for the fisherman, or good for the processor, there are some business advantages in the larger units within the industry. The larger entrepreneurs have more capital for adequate investment, for carrying large inventories, and for withstanding the shock of fluctuating supply and demand which is so characteristic of the fish business.

The consensus of our Conference seems to be that we need better and more diversified products. These seem to be developing slowly in the form of fish portions, shrimp products, fish protein concentrate, and others. Most of our experts did not think we were doing nearly enough to develop new products nor to improve the quality of those we now sell.

Some speakers were optimistic about the marketing potential, but neither Dr. Earle nor I am very happy. We see our countries falling hopelessly behind other fishing nations in catching, marketing, and in the consumption of fish—despite the rosy picture of fish sticks and portions, shrimp products, canned tuna, and another one or two products.

I conclude that we must gain markets in relation to other protein foods and we must begin looking aggressively toward world markets if we are to prosper as an industry. We've obviously been looking inwardly for too long.

Ample warning has been sounded by several of our speakers about the need for additional knowledge of the fishery resources of the ocean, better regulation of the catch and the effort, especially on those common grounds fished by many nations, and the need for effective international control and enforcement. One need only to reflect briefly upon the course of this Conference to recognize that competition for the markets is going to be greater in the future than they have been in the past. More adequate rules which safeguard the resource and give ample opportunity for marketing ingenuity are needed on an international basis. These are not the things we can solve today, although it seems obvious that much thought is being given, not only in our three countries, but throughout the world on those problems of international conservation of resources and international cooperation at the marketplace. If I may be allowed to sum up the results of this Conference in a few simple sentences, I would say that within the hearts and minds of the fishing industries of Canada, Mexico, and the United States there is hope, there is optimism, but there is caution. Our guests have shown us that opportunities are

present, but that serious barriers to the development of the full use of the resources of the sea by fishermen of all nations exist. There is optimism for improved fishing and that the harvest from the sea can help make the world a better place in which to live. There is also a feeling that too rapid development, with a lack of adequate research and understanding of the sea and its inhabitants, may well lead us to deplete our resource and destroy our hopes and aspirations.

I would echo the hope of those who have spoken here that the thoughts and ideas which have been expressed over the past 3 days may be made available to us so that we may reflect upon them again and again. And out of these reflections we must urge actions by our respective governments, in cooperation, with the industries of our three countries, leading toward strong and prosperous North American fishing industries, harvesting our share of the bountiful food resources of the sea in a manner consistent with the highest conservation principles; making these products available to our own citizens, for the profit of our businessmen and for the strength of our governments, but also for the long-range welfare of mankind everywhere.

FINANCIAL PRESSURES ON VETERAN POINT TO NEED FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the educational plight in which the veteran of cold war service in this Nation's Armed Forces finds himself has been created and fostered by the Government, and it continues to take a heavy toll of that large group of able men and women. The cold war GI bill is needed now if the injustices of the past are to be converted into the intellectual and cultural assets of the present and future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached letter from Mr. Joseph Falati, Jr., of 1519 Annunciation Street, New Orleans, La., and dated May 10, 1965, in support of the cold war GI bill (S. 9) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW ORLEANS, La.,
May 10, 1965.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I wish, again, to take time to thank you for all you are doing in behalf of those who have served after the expiration of the GI bill.

It is only by passage of this bill that many who have served since 1955 will be able to complete their education and see it clear to buy a home.

Before I was drafted in 1956, I attended night school. But now, with a wife and five little girls to care for, I find it financially impossible to continue.

Please advise me of anything I can do to assist you. I am writing to my Congressman, Hon. RUSSELL LONG, and to my Representative, Hon. HALE BOGGS, to support your bill. I am also encouraging my many friends, who are also in the same boat, to do likewise.

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,

JOSEPH FALATI, JR.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THE REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, last week the Subcommittee on Administrative

Practice and Procedure continued its diligent and scholarly work on what is one of the most significant tasks now confronting a congressional committee—the revising and updating of the Administrative Procedure Act. Under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the subcommittee has received testimony from many expert witnesses and its staff has been painstakingly studying the intricate problems involved.

I have submitted to the subcommittee a brief statement on the measures pending before it, and would like to share with Members of the Senate some of the information in it with the thought that it might be helpful to others interested in this important area of the law. I have cosponsored two of the measures considered by the subcommittee: S. 1160, to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and S. 1758, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys before Government agencies. It is my belief that these measures are meaningful and significant for the protection of constitutional rights. Based on sections of the omnibus bills to revise the Administrative Procedure Act, they were approved by the Senate last year, and I hope that they will receive as prompt consideration this year.

I also introduced a third measure which is pending before the subcommittee. This bill, S. 1879, is an omnibus measure to recodify the Administrative Procedure Act. It is similar in principle to S. 1336, but embodies a slightly different approach on certain matters. It was introduced so that the subcommittee could have both measures before it during the hearings.

S. 1160 and S. 1758, as well as the omnibus bills, are directed essentially to different aspects of the same problem—the individual's right to be informed. This involves his right to access to information in Government departments and agencies; his right to an attorney who knows what information will affect his interest; his right to notice and confrontation; and, in fact, his right to be informed what his rights and privileges are.

The issues and problems involved in this monumental task of revision of the Administrative Procedure Act are complex and innumerable. While I am not now wedded to particular language, I shall study carefully the different opinions presented to the subcommittee. I do, however, wish to register my support of the efforts to amend the act to take into account the experience under it since 1946, the increase in the number of agencies and the broadening of the scope of Government activities. I am sure that any draft reported by the subcommittee will be the product of the most careful study.

A noted legal scholar has said that liberty is wedged in the interstices of procedure.

The studies by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee over the last 10 years and the investigation by the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee have dramatically illustrated

the threats to individual rights and liberties which may be posed in the name of the administrative process. Studies and hearings have documented, for instance, such administrative threats to the right to privacy as lie detectors, psychological personality tests, mail censorship, employment questionnaires, interviews for personnel clearance, and many other practices. Complaints received by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee show that Government employees, Indians, the mentally ill, military personnel, indigent defendants, and many other citizens from every walk of life have found to their sorrow that substantial liberties may become wedged in the vise of administrative procedures. As a result of administrative failings, wrongdoing, neglect, or delay, the lives of these people, their reputations and their employment prospects, have sometimes been damaged beyond repair. As we have dealt with these cases, I have been shocked to find how often the redtape of our bureaucracy, the maze of procedures, the written and unwritten precedents, the rules, the regulations, and the myriad policy statements can defeat the unwary citizen, who has been led to believe that under our system, the individual has a voice in the administration of his Government, and that the administrative rules will take into account his particular needs and demands.

Because we believe in the consent of the governed, each citizen expects that public administration in this country will be imbued with that spirit of rationality and fairness which is basic to our traditions. And he has a right to expect this. Whenever he deals with the agencies of his Government, or whenever he is affected by their rulings, he has a right to expect that decisions affecting his welfare and interests will be made rationally, fairly, and efficiently, with a minimum of cost to him and to other taxpayers.

The thousands of complaints received by our subcommittee amply demonstrate that this is not always so. Furthermore, it is not only the unwary citizen who is often vanquished by the requirements of administrative procedures. It is often the attorney, supposedly initiated into the secrets of the administrative maze, who is attempting to represent his client. It is often the Member of Congress seeking to prod a weighty, lethargic bureaucracy into action, attempting to acquire simple facts from a department, or undertaking to guide a bewildered constituent through cumbersome procedures and mountains of regulations. I feel sure that many in this body share my frustration in this respect.

There is, I have sometimes found, inherent in the Federal administrative process of today a tyranny more subtle than any danger to our liberties which our Founding Fathers might have envisaged. It is self-generating and, in view of the rapidity with which Congress has multiplied the number of Federal activities it is, to a great degree, unavoidable, for each new agency requires countless hundreds more rules and regulations. As Congress has been the creator of these administrative bodies, so it has a duty

to see that in performing their assigned tasks they do not, in the process, violate or threaten rights which are sacred to a free people.

Congress has attempted to minimize these threats by stipulating that there be in the decisionmaking, rulemaking process some semblance of organization, reason, due process, and fairplay. It did this on a grand scale in 1946 when it enacted the Administrative Procedure Act. But the great expectations of Congress have not been entirely fulfilled. As so often happens when an entire new system is created, there were procedural gaps. In some cases, the intent of Congress has been circumvented or distorted or ignored.

A case in point is the freedom of information section of the Administrative Procedure Act. Through this provision, Congress meant to guarantee that the public's right to information would be respected. Instead, this section has been cited frequently by Government officials as authority for withholding information from the Congress, the press, and the public.

Far from "taking the mystery out of administrative procedure," therefore, this section has been used to increase it. This is not entirely the fault of the executive departments and agencies. The terms of the statute were less than precise and left considerable leeway for administrative discretion.

Access to information about the activities of Government is crucial to the citizen's ability to cope with the bigness and complexity of Government today. It is his grasp of the facts about those Government activities which affect not only the general welfare, but his particular interest as well, which is the counterweight which tips the scale in his favor.

There is no validity therefore to the frequently heard argument that this proposal impinges on executive privilege, for it would not affect the proper exercise of authority of the President and department heads. Certainly, the exceptions go very far in meeting the objections of the departments regarding administrative problems, confidentiality, privacy, and national security. Even these stated exceptions, however, cannot be relied on to withhold information from Congress. If, indeed, this proposal might entail a bit more paperwork, require a little more time on the part of our civil servants, I think the principle involved here far outweighs these considerations.

I have cosponsored this legislation for several years, and have found solid and widespread support for it, especially in my State. In this connection, I have received hundreds of letters from newspaper editors and publishers, owners of radio and television stations, businessmen and lawyers, and many other citizens with no special interest beyond their determination that Government officials shall not deny, distort or delay Government information.

The value of the individual's privacy in our society can have meaning only as long as we have a free society, and we shall enjoy such a society only as long as the Congress, the press, and the public

have complete access to information about the activities of the executive branch of our Federal Government. Everything in our common law heritage and the history of our Constitution demands that this be recognized as a "right to know," endorsed by Congress, that it not be a privilege granted at the passing whim of Government officials. Congress has a duty to safeguard this right and to see that the administrative procedures of our Government respect it. S. 1160 will go far to achieve these ends.

I would also like to give my support to section 6(b) of S. 1336 which provides that any person who is a member of the bar of the highest court of a jurisdiction may represent others before any agency. This section is identical with S. 1758, which I have cosponsored. In addition to the myriad rules and regulations, many agencies have established special enrollment procedures for those attorneys who must represent a client before the agency. Even if an attorney has only an isolated matter before one of these agencies he must complete a complicated application form, swear to its accuracy, pay a substantial enrollment fee, and then wait several weeks before he can represent his client.

If a person must appear before an agency he should have the right to be represented by the attorney of his choice. However, the formal enrollment procedures and the attendant trouble and delay often discourages many highly qualified attorneys from taking a single case before the agencies. Such unnecessary formalities have some earmarks of an unspoken conspiracy between the agency and the attorneys who habitually practice before it to restrain the practice of law before the agency.

The studies of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have shown that the right to counsel in administrative proceedings is often less highly regarded than it is in criminal cases. There have been, in fact, instances wherein the right has been qualified to such an extent by rules promulgated by the agencies that the individual is denied effective representation.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I have been concerned about possible deprivations of due process where the Federal Government exercises any control over the choice of counsel; a Federal limitation on the choice of counsel abrogates the right to counsel itself.

This legislation would recognize that a license to practice in State or Federal courts would be proof of an attorney's qualifications to practice before an agency tribunal. Moreover, it would be recognition of the right of the individual to make his own choice as to who will represent him and would make the client sole judge of an attorney's qualification for representing him before an administrative board. Whether a hearing is considered to be investigative or adjudicative, the individual's property rights are necessarily involved, and due process requirement in the fifth amendment demands that close scrutiny be given the conduct of the proceedings.

A few distinctions between S. 1879 and S. 1336 are worth noting. I have intro-

duced in several Congresses the Code of Administrative Procedure drafted by the American Bar Association, and it has received substantial recognition in the process of revising the Administrative Procedure Act.

As I have indicated, S. 1879, the code, and S. 1336 to a large degree now recommend the same or very similar changes in the present act. Both would dispense with many of the exceptions which were written into the present law, exceptions which have proved to be either meaningless or unfortunate. Evidently this time we can expect to have a general statute which will truly have general application. The definition of rules will be limited to statements of general applicability. This is certainly a proper change. Rulemaking has been described as legislative in its nature and legislation should have a general rather than a particular objective.

Both bills have improved on the act in dealing with rulemaking, and accord the public more than an illusory right to be heard. Provision has been made to insure that petitions for rules, if they are not granted, will have at least the courtesy of a prompt and specific denial. This section also provides a procedure for issuing temporary rules that seems a workable compromise between the needs of the agencies and the public.

The bills attempt to free the members of the various agencies from the burden of deciding a host of cases that are now largely brought before them. Both bills allow a wide delegation of the decision-making power to hearing examiners, and, on review, to appeal boards. In theory, this should free the agency members themselves to deal primarily with broad questions of policy and, to the extent possible to deal with them through the rulemaking process. As for the process of adjudication itself, it would now provide for the more liberal use of subpoenas, greater use of discovery, and more effective pleading, to name only a few of the significant changes. There is also language designed to make the declaratory order an available and effective instrument. Much was hoped from the use of such orders under the Administrative Procedure Act; the new language should insure that such orders will become of increasing importance.

The section on judicial review in both bills represents, I believe, an advance over the present law. Both state more clearly the very narrow limits within which administrative discretion is not reviewable. Moreover, both bills—with S. 1879 doing more—revise the present law with respect to standing to seek review. S. 1879 does not qualify the right to seek review by requiring, as does S. 1336, that one be adversely affected in fact.

The new subsection on the form of judicial review is also an improvement over the similar provision in the Administrative Procedure Act. Both bills are in agreement on this matter, as on most of the other issues of substance involved in judicial review.

There are, of course, a number of differences between S. 1879 and S. 1336. Many of them are no more than stylistic. S. 1879 is an altogether new version of the present statute. S. 1336 maintains

much of the language and framework of the original statute, but revises and rearranges it. S. 1879 thus is free from the existing language, but there are advantages to refashioning the present law in the manner of S. 1336.

Although the major differences between the two bills are few, three of them are worth noting in detail. First, the code takes a stricter line than S. 1336 in dealing with the separation of functions. The code provision applies to agency members; the provision in S. 1336 does not. Agency adjudication has by now become litigation of major importance. S. 1336 forbids the decisionmaking officers at the lower level from talking informally to third persons about the facts in a case before them, while the code forbids such consultation on issues both of fact and of law. S. 1336 gives agency members complete freedom to consult outside the record as to issues of both fact and law; the code applies to agency members as it does to the other decisionmaking officers of the agency.

A revision similar to section 1009(g) of S. 1879—proceedings in excess of jurisdiction—should also be considered. There was similar language in one of the earlier versions of S. 1336. We are all aware of the doctrine of exhaustion of remedies, but this is to prevent a party from going through long and expensive proceedings when—to quote the language of S. 1879:

The proceeding itself or the action proposed to be taken therein is clearly beyond the constitutional or statutory jurisdiction or authority of the agency.

Such an issue is one of law and since it is ultimately one for the courts to decide, the bill makes it possible for them to dispose of it sooner rather than later. The code, according to the drafters would restore rights that were formerly recognized as a matter of law. The law today is uncertain at best. In revising the Administrative Procedure Act we have an opportunity to establish and clarify the law in a way to benefit both the agencies and the public. S. 1879 is designed to give relief in those instances when agency action is clearly ultra vires.

The provision in S. 1879 gives a party to an informal adjudication the right on request to receive a statement of reasons in support of the agency's decision. This is also a matter which should be seriously considered in any redraft of S. 1336. It relates to the individual's right to know as do most of the provisions in these measures.

The drafting and enactment of a good revision of the Administrative Procedure Act will improve the administration of the business of government.

More important, it will provide greater protection for the rights of the individual whenever he deals with the Federal Government.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER ASSOCIATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the spring conference of the Massachusetts Consumer Association, held in Framingham, Mass., on May 15, adopted three resolutions

which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions dealing with the truth in packaging bill (S. 985), the proposed legislation dealing with the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate interstate electric power companies (S. 218), and the Massachusetts truth in lending bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION, MAY 15, 1965, SPRING CONFERENCE AT FRAMINGHAM, MASS.

Whereas present law, both State and Federal, does not assure consumers of truth in labeling and packaging of products; and

Whereas deceptive packaging and marketing of products makes it impossible for consumers to make intelligent choices in retail markets; and

Whereas Senator HART has introduced legislation at the Federal level and hearings are now being held on this subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the annual spring conference of the Massachusetts Consumers Association, That full support of this association for Senator HART's bill, S. 985, be conveyed to every member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation with a request for a vote and support for this piece of consumer protective legislation.

Whereas the Senate Commerce Committee is currently considering S. 218, a bill which would deprive the Federal Power Commission of its existing authority to regulate interstate electric power companies; and

Whereas this bill would end effective regulation of the Nation's major electric utilities, which are growing more and more interstate in nature; and

Whereas S. 218 would turn back the clock to pre-1935 days and would weaken one strong source of effective regulation of electric utilities, the FPC: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Consumer Association is on record in opposition to S. 218; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senate Commerce Committee and to Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Whereas there is no regulation in this Commonwealth adequate to protect consumers in retail installment sales contracts and rates; and

Whereas consumer studies and the reports of the Massachusetts Consumers Council have revealed widespread consumer abuses and complaints in the field of consumer credit; and

Whereas individuals and groups from both our major political parties have filed legislation to correct these abuses and the Committee on Banks and Banking of the Massachusetts General Court has reported an excellent committee draft of this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each member of the Massachusetts House and Senate be requested to vote for and support H. 3900 and H. 3901, two bills which will establish comprehensive regulation of retail installment sales and force the full disclosure of true annual interest charges now being hidden from the public.

ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN TO THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the annual meeting of the American Law Institute is one of the outstanding events in the legal world. I have made it a

practice to attend as many of these sessions as I could, and still participate in the regular functions of Congress.

It was my privilege to hear the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, address the institute at its opening session. I commend his address to all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE, MAY 18, 1965

I am happy to welcome the members of the American Law Institute this morning. It is always a pleasure for me to attend this meeting and participate at least to some extent. I note that your agenda is once again a very full one. I am very pleased to see that it includes both a continuation of last year's discussions on the diversity of citizenship phase of the study on the division of the jurisdiction between State and Federal courts and the commencement of discussions on the Federal question jurisdiction. As I stated to you last year, the judicial conference and the entire judiciary should be very grateful to the institute for undertaking this monumental study. We look forward eagerly to its completion.

It has been my custom in the past in reporting to the American Law Institute to give you an overall picture of the workload in the Federal courts as we near the close of another court term.

The number of cases brought to the Supreme Court continues at approximately the same level. In fact, it is remarkable how constant the dockets and the work of the Court are. This year, for example, there are 2,520 cases as against 2,557 at the same time last year.

The Court's regular appellate docket has risen only from 1,129 last year to 1,176 during the current term. The miscellaneous docket, on the other hand, which is largely made up of applications by indigent prisoners seeking correction of what they consider unfair convictions, dropped from 1,428 to 1,344 cases.

The Court has thus far disposed of 1,918 cases on both dockets this term as against 1,915 at a comparable point at this date last year. It has heard arguments in 122 cases in a period of 177½ hours as compared with 144 cases in 225 hours last term.

The Court is well along with its work in this term. It has heard arguments in all cases which were ready to be heard and these cases will all be disposed of before the end of the term.

The criminal caseload in the district courts has remained fairly stable. During fiscal year 1964, 29,944 criminal cases were brought in the district courts as against 29,858 in the prior year. There was a slight increase last year in the number of prolonged criminal trials but criminal dockets, generally, are current.

The district courts are facing increasing difficulty in disposing of their civil litigation. During the first 9 months of the current fiscal year, ending March 31, 1965, the number of civil cases filed was 50,142 and the number terminated 47,815, leaving the pending caseload at the end of March as 74,522, the highest figure on record. These filings and terminations compare with 48,789 civil cases filed in the first 9 months of the last fiscal year and 45,714 terminated. Not since 1960 has the number of cases terminated exceeded those filed. In fiscal year 1960, 59,284 cases were filed and 61,829 were terminated,

leaving the ratio of terminations to filings at 1.04. By 1963, this ratio had declined to .98. In that year, 63,630 cases were filed and 62,379 were terminated. The ratio for the first 9 months of the current year has dropped to .95.

A number of the courts of appeals are also facing increased difficulty in disposing of their current workload. The caseload for all courts of appeals on March 31 of this year was 20 percent higher than on the same date in 1964, with 4,711 pending as against 3,902 pending a year ago. During the first 9 months of this fiscal year, 4,945 cases were filed in the courts of appeals as compared to 4,459 in the comparable period of 1964 and 4,014 cases were terminated in both 9-month periods.

The heaviest number of filings in any circuit during the first 9 months of this fiscal year was in the already overburdened fifth circuit. Although nine judges are authorized in this circuit, one vacancy has existed for more than 13 months and another for over 6 months. Thus, seven judges have had to meet the fastest expanding caseload in the country. I am happy to say that their fellow judges in other parts of the country, despite their own crowded calendars, have been willing to serve in the fifth circuit for short periods of time to assist in carrying a share of the intolerable burden in that circuit. Over a 6 months' period in this fiscal year, 17 judges from other circuits sat in the fifth circuit. The judicial conference last September and again in March of this year took note of this situation and urged the Congress to create four temporary judgeships for the circuit.

Year after year, I have had to report to you the ever increasing workload of our Federal courts and the backlogs which have accrued in the judicial process. It had been my expectation that with the authorization of 73 new judgeships in 1961, we would by this time have seen a substantial decline in these serious backlogs. I must admit to disappointment and grave concern, however, that we have made so little progress in conquering this situation. This is not a problem solely for the judges. Every member of the bar, every practitioner in our courts share this responsibility.

This year, it has become necessary for the judicial conference of the United States to recommend to the Congress the creation of new judgeships. These 42 positions, which include the temporary judgeships recommended for the fifth circuit, were agreed upon only after most careful analysis of the statistics compiled for each district and for each circuit by the administrative office for the use of the judicial statistics committee of the conference. The conference was satisfied with the demonstration of need, and for that reason has recommended this additional judgeship. I must, however, express to you my feeling of alarm that our solution to the mounting workload of the courts seems to depend so largely on the creation of additional judgeships.

The time has now come when we must probe more deeply than we have in the past and with a much higher degree of inventiveness into the diagnosis of the problems of judicial administration to assure that our system is responsive to the demands of the age in which we live. We must utilize the aids, devices, and techniques which this generation has developed, as do the other professions, so that we can assure to our people the prompt and effective administration of justice to which they are entitled. This is the responsibility of the entire legal profession—professor, practitioner, and judge. The need for action is immediate and urgent. I hope and urge that the bar associations of the country and the learned societies will devote their talents and efforts to seeking a solution to this critical problem. We cannot afford to go on pyramiding judgeships

periodically without making our judicial system responsive to and part of the times in which we live.

Years ago—even a half century ago—before the advent of the judicial conference and before provision was made for circuit conferences of judges, it was not unheard of that a judge might serve his entire tenure without meeting a brother judge of a neighboring State or district in his circuit. The judicial conference and the circuit conferences broke down this isolation, and in recent years the seminars we have conducted for new judges have served a most useful purpose in this respect. The first of these seminars was held in 1962 in Monterey, Calif., and three have been held since that time. Another seminar for newly appointed judges will be held in June of this year in Denver, Colo.

The same problem which once existed among judges has until recently been true of our referees in bankruptcy. As a result, there has been a marked lack of uniformity of procedure among the referees. This lack of uniformity extended beyond the requirements of local conditions to all phases of administration. Last year we held our first seminar for referees in bankruptcy. These seminars are conducted by experienced referees who speak from practical experience and deal entirely with matters of procedure and administration within the framework of the Bankruptcy Act. This first seminar, followed by a second a month ago, has already begun to promote greater uniformity of administration. The published proceedings have been made available to all referees who have not yet attended these seminars, but it is our hope that in due time we will have an opportunity for the older and more seasoned referees to meet with the newer referees with the end result that better service can be afforded to the public in spite of variations in local laws and conditions.

Much work has been done by the Judicial Conference of the United States in the field of pretrial procedures, in the trial of complicated cases, the trial of multiple cases emanating from a common cause, statistics, court administration, the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act and Rules of Practice and Procedure by Chief Judges Biggs, Murrah, Johnsen, Hastings, and Senior Judge Maris, and their committees. But for most of them it has been a slow and hard grind in order to make progress. Really I believe the time has come when the bench and bar should join with vigor in finding ways and means to keep us current with our work. We do not want to change established principles of decisionmaking, but it stands to reason that if courts fail to keep pace with the workload, further inroads on the judicial process will be made through administrative procedures that will water down the rights of our citizens to their day in court.

I am pleased to be able to report significant progress on the part of several advisory committees which have been studying and working on revisions of the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure. Five of the advisory committees have been working over a period of nearly 5 years on this important task and four of them are about to send the products of their labors to the Standing Committee of the Judicial Conference on the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules and the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules have made a thoroughgoing study of the existing civil and criminal rules. Their recommendations were circulated, as were those of the other committees, at least twice to the bar generally and to scholars throughout the country, and the comments received have been given the fullest study and consideration by the committee members.

The Advisory Committee on Admiralty Rules has prepared amendments to the civil

rules designed to merge the admiralty procedure into the civil procedure.

A complete set of appellate rules has been prepared by the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules and these rules are also designed to reach the standing committee when it meets this summer.

It is probable, therefore, that the reports of these four advisory committees will reach the judicial conference and the Supreme Court for consideration later this year.

At the close of the last session of Congress, legislation was enacted authorizing the promulgation of Rules of Practice and Procedure under the Bankruptcy Act. The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, which has also held several meetings over the past years, now has a new charter for action which will require it to make a new start in some areas of its activities.

Earlier this year, at the request of the judicial conference, I appointed members to an advisory committee to study the possibility of adopting uniform rules of evidence in Federal courts. This committee, under the chairmanship of Albert E. Jenner, Jr., of Chicago, is, like the other advisory committees, broadly representative of the legal profession across the country. Prof. Edward W. Cleary, of the University of Illinois, will act as reporter for this committee. Their labors are certain to be long and arduous, but they are fortunate in having available to them the results of the studies of the American Law Institute in formulating its Model Code of Evidence and the subsequent work of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. A few States have also made extensive studies in this area, which will be available to the committee.

The bench and bar are deeply indebted to our colleagues on these advisory committees. They have given fully and conscientiously of their time and efforts to the work of the committees. This has involved many hours of controversy and long hours of study of the many comments which have been received from all parts of the country on the proposed revisions of the rules.

On August 20, 1964, the President signed the Criminal Justice Act, a statute which will have profound implications for the administration of justice in this country. There are two major innovations in this statute. First, when defendants are financially unable to employ counsel of their own, the court must appoint counsel for them as early in the proceedings as possible, which means in most cases when the defendant is first brought before the U.S. commissioner. Heretofore, counsel was rarely appointed in Federal criminal proceedings until arraignment in the district courts.

This will be a new burden on the U.S. Commissioner and raises serious questions as to the ability of many commissioners to cope with this added responsibility.

The commissioner system is as old as the Republic. It was established by the first Congress. It has grown and developed differently as the Nation has expanded, so that today the functions and activities of the commissioner lack consistency, as do the qualifications of the commissioner himself. A recent survey showed that of the approximately 1,100 commissioners, only about two-thirds were lawyers.

Proceedings before a commissioner have generally been informal, conducted without a stenographic record, and without counsel being present. The commissioner's only compensation has been through small fees which he has collected. Once the Criminal Justice Act becomes operational, the question arises whether the proceedings before the commissioners will not have to become formal and be adequately reported and, if so, whether our commissioners are qualified and competent, especially the one-third who are not lawyers, to conduct formal hearings.

Undoubtedly, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act will bring to light many inadequacies in our commissioner system. I believe our experience may well demonstrate the need for a thoroughgoing study of the system not only to assure the effective administration of the act at the commissioner level but also to assure that the position of U.S. Commissioner is a meaningful one viewed in the light of current needs.

The second major innovation of the Criminal Justice Act is the provision for at least partial compensation for assigned counsel in criminal cases. It also provides for the appointment and compensation of expert witnesses. The judges of each district have been required by the act to make appropriate plans for the disbursement of public funds for this purpose and the circuit councils are given supervision over the program. This requirement places a difficult administrative burden upon the courts and the successful discharge of this new function will require the active cooperation of the bar. The act must be administered in a manner that will be both fair and adequate to the defendant as well as equitable to the members of the bar. This act poses a real challenge to our profession because we have had no similar experience. It cannot be the problem of the courts alone. The local bar associations must participate both in the making and administration of the plans. The members of those associations must each accept a measure of responsibility, and it should not be delegated to those in our profession who are willing to accept the partial compensation because they find difficulty in making a living otherwise. To permit this would convert the objective of affording legal assistance to indigents to that of affording assistance to indigent lawyers.

Recently, the President sent to the Congress a challenging message calling upon the Nation for a renewed and increased effort to combat the problem of crime and delinquency. As lawyers, we should accept this challenge as being particularly directed toward us. The judicial branch of the Government is necessarily involved in every aspect of this effort because criminal cases are processed through the courts and because the judiciary is deeply concerned with effectiveness of our correctional system.

In furtherance of the President's message, the Attorney General and I discussed the desirability of reorganizing Federal corrections into an administrative system which would have jurisdiction over the entire Federal correctional process from beginning to end, including the training of all correctional personnel, both those in correctional institutions and those engaged in supervision in the community.

To me, this is a challenging idea and one that seems to offer an opportunity for a vast improvement for dealing with people convicted of crime in Federal courts. A correctional agency thus broadly organized should participate with other agencies in Government, including particularly the National Institute of Mental Health, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and, of course, the U.S. judges through the Judicial Conference of the United States in continuous practical research and development in the correctional field.

More and more, modern legislation has been giving the sentencing judge opportunity to adopt flexible programs to meet the particular needs of the individual before him, programs which combine the facilities and techniques now under separate administrations.

More and more, institutional administrators and probation officers have felt that the ultimate success of their work depends upon their understanding of and coordination with what is done in other phases of the correctional process.

Perhaps most important, we are realizing that the hope for continued progress in corrections rests on the development of programs of research and evaluation which will create and test against alternatives a large number of techniques to be matched with the individual offender.

We are proud of the advances recently made in corrections. The Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Probation System, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Parole Board have been imaginative in their response to the development of knowledge and technique. The steps which they have taken lead logically to the creation of a unified Federal correctional service.

Continuous research and development is the lifeblood of a successful correctional system. This requires continuous experimentation, constant research. It is important in any system which is created that the research and development be separately organized within the correctional system so that its personnel will not be diverted from their research functions and become involved in daily operations. Its work must, of course, be closely integrated with the system.

An important advantage which would result from a unified service would be the strengthening of the professional character of correctional personnel. The new system would break down and eliminate the present administrative barriers and distinctions and it would require intensive basic training.

Proper training programs are a vital part of any correctional system. They would result in making the services of our probation officers of even greater usefulness to our district court judges.

By providing promotion from and to institutional and field positions and by transfers from one part of the country to another, new opportunities would develop for the infusion of knowledge, the gaining of experience and the rewarding of excellence with responsibility equal to ability.

Another function which a unified service can uniquely perform is the administration of new correctional techniques which plainly cut across traditional lines. We have long known that the present investigation is invaluable to institutional classification and treatment and to the Parole Board in making its decision. We have also known, and acted on the knowledge, that prerelease planning and counseling are essential to community-based treatment. These simply illustrate the inevitable interdependence of the parts of the process. It is new programs, such as work-release and halfway houses, which bring this interrelationship to the forefront. You can easily see how difficult it would be to place and administer these hybrids in a system which drew lines between the institution and the community.

It goes without saying that the services of all personnel now engaged in one or another part of the Federal correctional field would be needed in the operations of a unified system. The functions they now perform would be continued, and often expanded, but for the first time all functions would be conducted on a coordinated basis and within the concept of a career service.

The renewed interest of the Department of Justice in improving our corrections system has been most gratifying. I hope the judiciary will play its proper role in achieving these necessary and important changes.

We note a tendency today to blame the courts and the rulings of the courts for the vast amount of crime. Thinking persons, and especially lawyers, know that this is not the fact. They know that crime is inseparably connected with factors, such as poverty, degradation, sordid social conditions, the weakening of home ties, low standards of law enforcement, and the lack of education. The courts, law professors and lawyers everywhere have a deep responsibility, however, to see that the rules which guide our criminal

trials are fair, adequate and capable of efficient administration. We of the legal profession must consider this as one of our major responsibilities, as must every bar association, national, State or local.

Every lawyer has taken an oath to dedicate himself to the preservation of the rule of law. He must, therefore, realize that it is his responsibility not only to perfect procedures in the law but as a citizen to see that the conditions that give rise to crime, vice and violence are not permitted to exist in his community.

No nation, regardless of its general economic prosperity can continue to prosper unless its citizens in all walks of life are dedicated to law observance, not merely by the other fellow, but by all. In a free society such as ours, this is the only secure foundation upon which we can build our home and business lives. Otherwise, we build upon sand.

There are other things that I could properly discuss with you, but time is precious and you have your own agenda to which I must now leave you, with the knowledge that your discussions will, as usual, be purposeful. I hope they will also be satisfying to you and contribute to the better administration of justice throughout the land.

LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION LAW IGNORED BY ICC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter which has been of concern to me and to many others. It involves the Interstate Commerce Commission and the operation of the locomotive inspection law. That law, as we know, provides that there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a director of locomotive inspection and two assistant directors. Following the provisions for these appointments, their respective duties are defined and spelled out in this public law.

From information made available to me, it appears that offices of these Presidential appointees have in effect been stripped of their authority and their autonomy, and have been relegated to a status not contemplated or provided for by law. To me, this is not in keeping with either the spirit or the letter of the congressional act, and is not in keeping with the significance Congress placed on railroad-equipment safety, in providing specifically that these should be Presidential appointees, requiring Senate approval.

More than a year ago, in an order dated April 6, 1964, the Interstate Commerce Commission reorganized various bureaus. In so doing, the management and technical direction legislatively assigned to the Director of Locomotive Inspection, his assistant, and the district locomotive inspectors, were transferred to regional managers of the Commission itself and/or the office of the Managing Director of the Commission and the Commission's Bureau of Safety and Service.

Such a transfer of authority and direction is clearly in direct violation of the Locomotive Inspection Act, which was enacted by Congress to assure the greatest possible safety to the shipping and traveling public and to engine-service employees on the Nation's railroads.

The Locomotive Inspection Act provides that there shall be appointed, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of Locomotive Inspection and two Assistant Directors, who shall have general superintendence of the inspectors.

In precise language, the act instructs the Director of Locomotive Inspection as to his duties and responsibilities.

The act also defines the relationship between the Director of Locomotive Inspection and the Interstate Commerce Commission, by providing that the Commission shall, first, furnish the Director with such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as he may require; second, set his salary and the salary of his assistants in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949; third, appoint district inspectors, after civil service examination, questions for which were prepared by the Director; fourth, review appeals from the Director's findings or orders; and fifth, review rules and regulations drafted by the Director.

It is obvious that the act intends and provides for an autonomous Director, with powers, duties, and responsibilities in keeping with the importance of this area of Federal regulation. But the Commission's reorganization order derails the legislative intent, and wrecks the possibility of economic and efficient administration by the Director of Locomotive Inspection.

What does the Commission have to say for itself, when questioned about the changes? I am advised that the Director of Locomotive Inspection has complained to no avail, and that representatives of the highly responsible and reputable Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, as well as railroad labor generally, also have complained. They are told to go to court if they do not like the new way of doing things.

A court appeal, with its attendant delays and expense, should not be necessary, in a situation in which the executive and legislative intent are clear and unequivocal.

I remind the Interstate Commerce Commission, the oldest of the independent agencies, that it is a creature of Congress; that its members are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; that its budget is subject to scrutiny by this body; and that it is not free to disregard the law.

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with American troops now being withdrawn in large numbers from the Dominican Republic, it is well for us to realize and appreciate the good they have done there, and the good services rendered mankind by our President when he decided, on April 28, that the Marines and paratroopers should go to Santo Domingo.

Mob rule was the situation in Santo Domingo. Foreign embassies, includ-

ing our own, had been fired upon. The lives of many—again including Americans—were in jeopardy, as the cry of "Pardon," or "To the wall," caught on with the mobs.

Mr. President, Virginia Prewett, who writes for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, is an acknowledged authority on Latin America. She is a prize-winning reporter. In a series of articles which concluded yesterday, she has detailed the chaos in the Dominican Republic and the wisdom of President Johnson's decision to intervene. I ask unanimous consent that the concluding article in Virginia Prewett's series, from the Washington Daily News of May 26, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, May 26, 1965]

L.B.J.'S PROMPT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACTION SAVED AMERICAN LIVES (By Virginia Prewett)

When President Johnson between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. on April 28 quickly telephoned or called in the Nation's top officials about landing marines in the Dominican Republic, a conversation was being held between our Embassy there and the Washington message center.

News was relayed to the President that the Embassies of El Salvador, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador had been fired on. The U.S. aid mission had been raided. The evacuation zone around the Embajador Hotel had been broken into again.

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic country team in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

THAT CUTS IT

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

He took the position that if he did not act, he risked immediate blood guilt for the Americans. The vision of another Cuba was strong in his mind.

He said later of the moment: "We know there are evil forces everywhere—in this country and everywhere else. But here in the United States they're not in control. At that moment, in Santo Domingo, they were in control."

Mr. Johnson ordered multiple messages to go into effect at 6:30 p.m. The marines were to land. The first pathfinder group did land in LCT's at Haina seaport not long afterward. By 7:50 p.m., 405 marines were ashore.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

With the military order, Mr. Johnson stressed his urgent hope for a cease-fire and a settlement of Dominican differences.

He also called for congressional leaders to meet with him at 7:15 p.m.

When he issued the landing order, he directed the area officers of the State Department's American Republics Division to notify all Latin American ambassadors that many Latin American embassies and diplomats in the Dominican Republic had called on the United States for help, that the U.S. Marines were landing to save American and other lives, and that the United States urgently requested an OAS meeting the next day.

REDS SPOTTED

The congressional leaders stayed with the President until 9 p.m. When they asked about Communist influence, Mr. Johnson told them that the Communist apparatus had been spotted emerging.

At first two known members of the Communist apparatus were spotted seizing strategic command of groups or objectives, then nine were spotted, and more and more. During the day the pro-Castro talisman cry of "Pardon" (to the wall) had multiplied as mobs sacked, looted, and killed.

After 6:30 p.m., nine State Department area chiefs for Latin America were called to their offices. Their instructions were to telephone the President's message to every Latin American ambassador. This the nine diplomats did. Not only OAS members, but also Jamaica and Trinidad were called.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, has critically compared President Johnson's procedure with the Latin Americans with that of his late brother during the Cuban missile crisis.

WHEN J.F.K. SPOKE

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation at 6:30 p.m. announcing his intention to order a naval quarantine around Cuba. That night he had the Latin American ambassadors notified and, like Mr. Johnson, called an OAS meeting for the next day. After the meeting officially approved his action, he ordered U.S. Navy units, already in position, to impose the quarantine.

President Kennedy could do this because the United States had the initiative in this crisis. This permitted him to control the timing.

President Johnson, in contrast, was at the mercy of timing imposed by the wild mobs in Santo Domingo. If he had announced he meant to send in marines the next day, it virtually would have invited a mob attack on the Embajador Hotel—and the emergence of a regime of some kind controlled by Communists.

REASONS DISCUSSED

On Thursday, April 29, at 10:30 a.m., the OAS met and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reviewed the landing and the reasons for it. The OAS asked the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo to arrange a cease-fire. Late that night the OAS called an emergency foreign ministers' meeting and approved establishment of an international safe haven in the Dominican Republic.

On April 30, the special meeting sent Secretary General Jose Mora to Santo Domingo. The next day the OAS named a special five-man peacemaking team and sent it to Santo Domingo on a U.S. military plane.

Acting at its swiftest, the OAS thus managed to get its peace team in 4 days after the crisis peak when a thousand Americans were in danger at the Embajador.

The OAS simply did not have the machinery or the precedents to go in quickly and protect the foreign nationals. The hope is that it will develop the needed muscles out of the Dominican crisis.

CONTRADICTIONS SHOW

A significant feature of the U.S. press criticism of the order to land the Marines is that it comes from the same spokesmen who most vociferously and tenaciously defended the Castro regime. "Antiwar" crusaders condemn the order to land the Marines in one breath and call for Cuba-type revolutions throughout Latin America in the next.

But what President Johnson recalls is that thousands of American lives were in danger. He sees a new and vicious subversion creeping into the Western Hemisphere, the kind we are fighting in Vietnam.

If he had it to do over, he would land the Marines again.

Important in the story is the fact that U.S. forces in Santo Domingo have evacuated many more nationals of other countries than our own countrymen.

MANY MOVED OUT

In all about 2,000 Americans were moved out, and more than 2,500 citizens of 45 other nations!

They include people from Canada, China, Europe, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria—the world. Latin Americans evacuated include Argentines, Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Colombians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Salvadorians, Guatemalans, Haitians, Panamanians, Nicaraguans, Mexicans, Peruvians, Uruguayans, Venezuelans, and Jamaicans.

These are the people you might ask whether Mr. Johnson should have sent in the Marines.

THE BEAUTIFY AMERICA CAMPAIGN—LETTER FROM ARVID D. IDEEN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the campaign to beautify America, to enhance our land for our benefit and for the benefit of those who come after us, can be intensified greatly if America will pitch in. Last week, when volunteers scoured the Potomac River and its banks for litter, we had a good example of the type of citizen effort which can be effective.

The Lions Clubs of Wyoming, too, have joined this effort, with a "let's litter less" program aimed at every citizen of our State and every visitor. Their campaign is a public-relations effort to make people aware of the need to decrease litter. The State is cooperating in a very real way. The State Penitentiary, for instance, is constructing large highway signs to be displayed on major rights-of-way entering Wyoming; and the campaign is intended to be carried, also, into the two great national parks within our borders—Yellowstone and Grand Teton.

Mr. President, I think this is a very commendable effort by the Lions Clubs of Wyoming. To illustrate its scope, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Arvid D. Ideen, chairman of the program.

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

CASPER MOUNTAIN LIONS CLUB,
Casper, Wyo., May 25, 1965.

The Honorable GALE McGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR Mr. McGEE: The Lions of Wyoming have started a "let's litter less" program which will be supported by approximately 2,500 Lions representing 60 clubs around the State of Wyoming. This litter program is the result of a proclamation at our State Lions convention in Rawlins in 1964 and I was selected as the chairman for this program.

I have enclosed a sample of the bumper stickers that will be utilized in this program. We also have 500 window display posters and 150 highway signs to be displayed. The penitentiary is making large signs, 18 feet long, to be displayed on the major roads entering the State of Wyoming. We hope to distribute 40,000 book matches in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Park areas through cigarette vending machines. This will bring the litter program to the attention of the citizens of Wyoming and the many tourists which we anticipate this year.

We of the Lions Club feel that the quotation of John F. Kennedy—"I don't think there is anything that could occupy our attention with more distinction than trying to preserve for those to come after us this beautiful country which we have inherited"—is very appropriate in our campaign.

The Governor of the State of Wyoming, Clifford P. Hansen, is going to give a proclamation to the citizens of the State of Wyoming which will be read at the Lions convention in Cody, Wyo., May 27, 28, and 29.

The International Lions president, Claude DeVores, will be the main speaker Thursday evening in Cody. The International Lions Club represents 800,000 people in approximately 126 countries. It is the largest service organization in the world. We, the Lions of Wyoming, feel deeply flattered that the international president has taken time to come to the State of Wyoming, which is one of the smallest Lions districts in Lionism.

If you have any suggestions or contacts that could be made in connection with our "let's litter less" program, I would appreciate your advising me accordingly.

Your very truly,

ARVID D. IDEEN.

MELVIN RUDER, NORTH DAKOTA NATIVE SON, WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, another North Dakota native son has achieved fame. He is Melvin Ruder, a native of Manning, N. Dak., and now the editor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont. Mr. Ruder was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for general reporting in giving outstanding local coverage to the disastrous Montana floods of last year.

Mr. Ruder was graduated from Bismarck High School and then went on to the University of North Dakota to earn his bachelor and masters degrees in journalism and sociology.

He is the winner of several National and State awards for editorial excellence and service to his community. I believe he exemplifies the excellent caliber of persons we rear on the North Dakota plains. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from Newsweek magazine of May 17, 1965, and another from the May 1965 issue of the University of North Dakota Alumni Review.

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

[From Newsweek magazine, May 17, 1965]

PRIZE FOR HUNGRY HORSE

Melvin H. Ruder was out in a barn last week, covering a high-school conservation tour sponsored by the Columbia Falls, Mont., Grange, when a neighbor burst upon him exclaiming, "Mel, your wife is calling * * * Mel, you won a prize." Ruder—who is publisher, editor, reporter, photographer, and general factotum of his own little weekly, the Hungry Horse News (circulation: 4,271)—did not wait for the rest. He raced to the nearest phone. "The Pulitzer," he shouted at his wife. "The Pulitzer, did I win it?"

Ruder had indeed won one of journalism's most sought after awards. The 50-year-old Ruder, who founded his paper in 1946 with the aid of a GI loan, was awarded the \$1,000 prize for general local reporting for his coverage of a flash flood last June in nearby Flathead Valley. Renting an airplane, and then driving a car along the railroad tracks

("The road was washed out"), Ruder helped warn 400 families. "I lost money on the flood edition," said Ruder. "We just forgot all about advertising."

[From the University of North Dakota Alumni Review, May 1965]

MEL RUDER, 1937 GRAD, WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Melvin H. Ruder, 50-year-old publisher of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont., has been awarded a Pulitzer Prize for general local reporting in outstanding coverage of a disastrous flood last June.

A native of Manning, N. Dak., Ruder received his bachelor of arts degree in journalism and his master's degree in sociology from the University of North Dakota. He taught journalism at the university for 2 years before editing the Westinghouse Corp. publications.

The Pulitzer Prizes, named for the late Joseph Pulitzer, who founded the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and later bought the New York World, have been awarded annually since 1917 by trustees of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. Winners are chosen by a 14-member advisory board.

Ruder was graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1937 with a B.A. degree, and with an M.A. degree in 1942. He is editor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News of Columbia Falls, Mont., a 12-time winner of National Editorial Association Awards. Ruder served as editor of the University of North Dakota News Service in 1938-40 and as assistant professor of journalism in 1940-41.

He was president of the Montana State Press Association in 1957-58, and is currently on the executive board. He is also a member of the Columbia Falls School Board. At homecoming last fall, Ruder was one of six outstanding alumni selected for the Sioux Award honor.

CONSERVATION OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an increasing number of national organizations are currently directing their attention to the Potomac River.

Although these groups have long been concerned with the conservation of the Potomac, their interest has now been greatly reinforced by President Johnson's message on national beauty.

In the May issue of the Izaak Walton magazine, the article entitled "Opportunity on the Potomac," presents a clear, concise statement of what is involved in planning for the development of the Potomac River basin.

As this article points out, the nationwide significance will not be the benefits which will accrue to the Potomac region, but rather the example it will provide for other river basins. A successful plan for the Potomac must be developed and carried out jointly by the Federal, State, and local governments.

Such intergovernmental cooperation is the key to successful river basin planning. I am confident that Secretary Udall recognizes this fact. His recent invitation to the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and the Chairman of the District of Columbia Commissioners is a welcome step toward such cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Opportunity on the Potomac" be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

OPPORTUNITY ON THE POTOMAC

For decades, the Potomac River has flowed under the nose of Congress as a horrible but accurate example of stream conditions all across America; conflicting resource pressures within its watershed are symbolic of those facing every major drainage basin in the United States. Much of the Potomac is terribly polluted—cleanup action has been slow. Real estate speculators would destroy the natural beauty of its banks, and the Corps of Engineers has been trying for years to straitjacket the river with a series of major dams under a plan which conservationists believe is based on narrow and outmoded principles. In many respects, then, the Potomac is little different than other streams—except that its association with Washington has brought continuing national public attention.

Today, it appears that because of this nationwide interest the Potomac will soon become a positive example of what America's rivers ought to be. President Johnson set the guidelines in his message on natural beauty:

"The river rich in history and memory which flows by our Nation's Capital should serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. To meet this objective I am asking the Secretary of the Interior to review the Potomac basin development plan now under review by the Chief of Army Engineers, and to work with the affected States and local governments, the District of Columbia, and interested Federal agencies to prepare a program for my consideration.

"A program must be devised which will: (a) Clean up the river and keep it clean, so it can be used for boating, swimming, and fishing; (b) protect its natural beauties by the acquisition of scenic easements, zoning, or other measures; (c) provide adequate recreational facilities; and (d) complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway on both banks.

"I hope action here will stimulate and inspire similar efforts by State and local governments on other urban rivers and waterfronts, such as the Hudson in New York. They are potentially the greatest single source of pleasure for those who live in most of our metropolitan areas."

The Department of the Interior is already hard at work to implement the President's directive. Locally, conservationists believe that for the first time a truly comprehensive plan will be prepared for the Potomac from mountain headwaters to its mouth on Chesapeake Bay. Presumably, consideration will be given for the first time to recreational and other opportunities afforded by the Potomac estuary—a forgotten part of the river under the Corps' plan. It is expected that the Potomac will indeed be cleaned up, and that major portions of its wild stretches will be permanently preserved. It is hoped that adequate public access to the river will be planned from mountains to bay, so that the Potomac may become a major recreation resource for a heavily populated region.

But the President's program for the Potomac will be most important for its nationwide significance—not for the benefits which will accrue to the Potomac region. Mr. Johnson's words seem to express a clear hope that State and local governments will assume primary responsibilities for action on the Potomac—that his Potomac River program will not be a Federal program, but rather an outline for coordinated local, State, and Federal efforts under Federal guidance.

The Potomac cannot become a national model for river preservation and beautification if the Federal Government undertakes the major job. It will stand as a model only

if States and localities elsewhere are shown by example how they can implement similar programs on other streams—just as it will stand as a model only if the entire river and all its potentials are fully considered.

For too long have the natural values of America's rivers been effectively overlooked or even forgotten by the several States. With rare exception, the only massive river planning in this country has been done by Federal agencies (generally for limited purposes not including preservation of beauty), with the States watching in near apathy if at all.

The President's program for the Potomac provides an outstanding opportunity to change all this. It deserves the assistance and close attention of conservationists everywhere.

NAVAL MUSEUM IN NAVY YARD

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the fact that what happens in and to the city of Washington is of national concern was once again demonstrated when the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] introduced legislation to make a portion of the Washington Navy Yard a naval museum.

The bill, S. 1927, has great merit. It not only calls for a museum, but also for plans to develop recreational facilities and to beautify the Anacostia waterfront.

Certainly the Nation's Capital is the proper place for a naval museum. Not only is the Washington Navy Yard the site of our first naval installation, but it is only fitting that the proposed museum be in the same city as the Nation's great historic documents.

I welcome the opportunity to cosponsor this bill in the interest of preserving that historic site for future generations.

John McKelway, in the Evening Star's "The Rambler" column, has written an interesting article on the history of the yard. I join in Mr. McKelway's hope that the bill will receive favorable consideration, for it would not do to see the yard razed—leaving the ghost of its first commandant homeless.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared May 14, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE RAMBLER: MISSED THE COMMODORE (By John McKelway)

Tried to find the ghost down at the Washington Navy Yard with little success.

He has not been seen since the name of the yard was changed to the "Naval Gun Factory." It apparently upset him. And he may have been altogether forgotten when they changed the name again, to the "Naval Weapons Plant."

But today the original name has been restored, and the Rambler had an idea the commodore might be up and around again and willing to comment on the Bartlett bill.

The other day, Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, introduced a bill to preserve certain areas of the Navy Yard once it is no longer needed for national defense purposes. The land apparently would pass to the Secretary of the Interior and he would come up with a plan, setting it aside as a historic site.

The work of the yard has diminished over the last 10 years, after a series of fights to "save the gun factory" and today it is a peaceful place, filled with a few marines and

civilians, and possibly a great number of spies and a large collection of old cannons.

Gradually, various Government agencies have been setting up shop in the old factory buildings and BARTLETT may be worried the Commodity Credit Corporation, or some such agency, may have its eyes on—well, the commodore's old home.

One of the old buildings dates back to 1801 and the main gate and the commandant's home were built about 1804.

During the Rambler's visit, he noticed more parking places are available today, and no tough-looking security guards asked to see what credentials he had.

Some marines were drilling down near the Anacostia, and the Rambler watched them awhile before paying his first visit to the new U.S. Naval Historical Display Center. It is still being worked on but it does furnish an interesting introduction to naval history. It should get better.

Oddly enough, the most interesting building in the yard is one in the northwest corner, unmarked, its windows bricked up, surrounded by a fence.

The building belongs to the Central Intelligence Agency, and it is all very mysterious. Maybe they are holding the commodore in there for questioning, or something.

The commodore?

This was, and maybe still is, Commodore Thomas Tingey, first commandant of the Navy yard.

An Englishman, who had served some time in the British Navy, he later turned up in what Navy the United States had and distinguished himself. He was picked out to set up the yard in the new Washington.

The Rambler always has had an affection for the commodore. In the early days, Tingey discovered his civilian workmen, under a contract to build 50 gunboats, were spending too much time in surrounding grogshops during morning whisky breaks—a forerunner of today's coffee breaks.

The commodore purchased 100-barrel lots of whisky and had it served to the men on the job as "refreshments." Work progressed.

Commodore Tingey was to stay with the yard and see to its expansion for 29 years.

He apparently considered the yard his own, more or less, and he saw to its restoration after the British swept in and burned most of the buildings, 1814.

He died in 1829, in his home in the yard, and was buried in Congressional Cemetery. But in 1853, the daughter of the then commandant reported Commodore Tingey was frequently seen strolling around the house, or in some of the darker spots of the installation, dressed in a long-white night-shirt, gold-braided top hat, long pig tails and a spyglass under one arm.

The Rambler hopes the Bartlett bill will move. Commodore Tingey deserves no less. And the hopes of maybe catching a glimpse of him should assure a good turnout at the yard if it is ever set aside as a big museum of naval history.

Crowds might even fall off at the Smithsonian.

TRIBUTE TO SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the designation by President Lyndon B. Johnson of the week of May 23 through May 29 as National Small Business Week offers an excellent opportunity for recognition of the contribution which the Small Business Administration has made toward sustaining the strength of our Nation's economy.

On April 9, 1963, I spoke at some length here in the Senate on the interrelationship of free enterprise, small business, and Federal aid to small busi-

ness. I pointed out the importance of adequate funding for the Small Business Administration, as an investment in the future of America, and that the Congress has long recognized that assistance to small business constitutes a contribution toward the success of the private enterprise system rather than an encroachment upon that system.

These facts are equally true today. It is equally true, also, that lipservice tribute to the value of small business in the American economy is simply not enough, for the number of firms doing business in the American economy is nearing the 5-million mark. Of the total number of those firms, over 95 percent are small. In fact, the great bulk of American business is made up of undeniably small enterprises—those without any paid employees other than the owners. Only one out of four businesses has more than three paid employees.

Each year thousands of firms are formed in the United States and begin operations, and thousands are discontinued. These actions are a result of natural forces generated by our American economy in its adaptation to changing demands for goods and services and to the changes in our Nation's position in the world economy.

Congress, in enacting the Small Business Act, recorded its conviction that a strong and prosperous small business community is a basic element in a free and competitive society.

The mission of the Small Business Administration is to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the small business community. That mission is of ever-increasing importance as our Nation moves into action on levels never previously explored in an effort to reach its full productive capacity, to reach a higher employment peak, and to insure a wider range of economic opportunity for all of our citizens.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was pleased to support the recent appropriation of \$100 million for additional capital for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund at the time the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1965 was before the committee for action. I am gratified at the favorable action by the Congress in appropriating this sum, for, as I have stated in the past, what the Small Business Administration needs is adequate resources to do the job which it was designed by Congress to perform. The returns to the Nation are marked in terms of increased employment, increased profits for small businesses, and, at the end of the cycle, increased tax revenues.

PROPOSED ALLEGHENY PARKWAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the introducer of S. 6, a bill to establish the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland, and to authorize connecting parkway roads and trails to permit greater utilization of adjacent national forests and resources, I wish to place in the RECORD a newspaper article published in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., State magazine on May 23, 1965.

Harpers Ferry National Historical Park is a scenic, fitting, and nationally significant area for inclusion in the proposed 620-mile parkway, conceived as a scenic highland route arising in Maryland, traversing the eastern panhandle of West Virginia and winding on through 360 miles of eye-appealing West Virginia hillsides southward through Kentucky to the Cumberland Gap at the Tennessee border.

This bill is under consideration at present in relation to the President's program which would allow West Virginia and other States to use one-third of their annual Federal aid for secondary farm-to-market roads for the development of scenic and recreational programs. The anticipated economic value from increased tourism to the areas contiguous to the parkway is well presented by this news item on Harpers Ferry.

I am hopeful that the President's program will be speedily adopted by the Congress, and that priority can be given to the beginning of engineering studies on the Allegheny Parkway.

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

THEIR HEARTS ARE IN THE HIGHLAND—
EASTERN PANHANDLE SEEKING TO LURE
HARPERS FERRY VISITORS INTO WEST VIRGINIA

(By Ron Wilson and Walt Whittaker)

The Civil War and a long series of floods periodically have wrecked the business center of Harpers Ferry, the town made famous around the world by John Brown's raid.

But in the last 10 years a modern industry, tourism, has made the town named after Robert Harper more prosperous than ever before.

Located on the edge of West Virginia at the intersection of the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers, strategic Harpers Ferry suffered from attacks and occupations by Yankee and rebel alike. Near the end of the war, as many as 60,000 Federal troops at one time occupied the town of 3,000.

As a tourist brochure describing the hamlet in the Civil War reads, "At the end of the war, Harpers Ferry was a ghost town with mills, armory, arsenal, and many other buildings destroyed. It was never fully to recover."

The floods, 26 of them since 1810, continually took their toll. Major catastrophes in 1936 and 1942 almost wiped out the lower part of the town.

Then, following the most recent flood in 1955, the National Park Service set the little town back on its feet with the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. Through Project 66 and a half million dollar budget, the Park Service hopes to recreate the original Harpers Ferry by next year.

And now the area, according to a motel operator, is "jumping" and is likely to keep right on prospering despite the recent closing of the Civil War Showcase.

The showcase, an exhibit of Civil War paraphernalia, closed this year when a principal owner was killed in an automobile accident. His estate, including the showcase, was sold at auction. The three-building exhibit occupies a strategic military position that became the scene of bloody fighting by both rebel and Union forces.

Joseph R. Prentice, head of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, suggests that the showcase was having economic problems. "The many things they did there," he explains, "had too big an overhead."

He also thinks many tourists would not stop to patronize the place because of the location of the entrance on a turn at the peak of a ridge.

"It was in a very dangerous place," he says. "A car had to cut across in front of oncoming traffic and enter a road, the destination of which he couldn't see."

Mrs. John Newcomer, co-owner with her husband of the Cliffside Motel in Harpers Ferry, says the showcase belongs to a group of businessmen in Frederick, Md.

She believes the men are trying to sell it to the State for use in the Job Corps.

"You see, the State must either furnish the grounds, or the Federal Government has to own them, before a Job Corps camp can be set up."

According to Mrs. Newcomer, the showcase had a good year in 1964. A constant stream of tourists still go down the quarter mile of dirt road to find it.

"It's a shame it's closed," she claims, "because it could have been built up into a really nice tourist attraction."

However, she does not believe the showcase closing will have much effect on the rising tide of tourists pouring into the area. Mrs. Newcomer, whose motel began in 1939 with 8 cabins and has grown into a profitable 32-cabin business, explains, "This area is what they call jumping. Over weekends it's impossible to find any rooms in this area."

But, sadly, the major part of tourists move south through the Shenandoah Valley rather than on into West Virginia.

Some business leaders, not too happy over tourists disregarding their area, met in Romney last year to form Potomac Highlands of West Virginia.

Through Potomac Highlands the businessmen—representing the State's 10 eastern counties—hope to attract the tourists drawn in by Harpers Ferry. They, hope, also to encourage other tourists to visit and spend money in their area.

To attract these tourists, Potomac Highlands has embarked on an ambitious campaign to advertise the section comprised of Jefferson, Berkeley, Morgan, Hampshire, Mineral, Hardy, Grant, Tucker, Pendleton, and Pocahontas Counties.

Part of the campaign is a 6-week advertising contract with a national magazine, now underway, and in metropolitan newspapers.

Potomac Highlands is printing about 200,000 brochures, listing three attractions, plus the history, of each county. The brochures will include articles describing the best places for hunting and fishing. They will be financed through membership dues. The State department of commerce will match \$3,800 for other advertising.

After a 2-month membership drive, Potomac Highlands has collected \$5,700 through membership fees and is planning an operating budget for the first year of \$18,000.

But the organization has its problems. According to George Stickler, area extension agent at Moorefield, who has been a guiding force behind it:

"Our biggest problem has been to get people to understand what we are trying to do. We are trying to get an organization off the ground that should have been gotten off the ground 20 years ago."

The organization has been criticized because it "hasn't done anything." But Stickler points out that tangible results will not begin to show until after the advertising campaign has gotten underway. It is expected to go into full swing early this summer.

Another problem could develop if an adequate replacement is not found for Stickler, who has accepted a job elsewhere and will leave in the summer.

Berkeley and Jefferson Counties already are members of the Shenandoah Valley, Inc., and some observers in the Harpers Ferry area believe these counties may not actively support Potomac Highlands. They note the tie of the area to the north-south flow of tourists and the existence of two of the State's three racetracks in Charles Town as evidence that they may not need Potomac Highlands.

Some, like Prentice, believe tourists will not move on into West Virginia because of the absence of a good east-west road through the area.

The Harpers Ferry Park head says, "West Virginia isn't getting the tourists it should because of its roads. They are winding and they aren't scenic."

He says Senator ROBERT BYRD is ahead of his time in proposing the Appalachian Scenic Highway to compete for tourists now going south. A major number of the 800,000 tourists coming each year to the Harpers Ferry Park, he says, are now going on south toward Skyline Drive and other areas more easily accessible by automobile.

Prentice explains that it is a "phenomenon of our time" that a tourist will drive for 2 or 3 hours to visit an attraction for 30 minutes. Because of this driving pattern of the tourist, he believes West Virginia will never get a major share of the tourists until it revamps its road system.

At the same time he points out what he feels to be the real economic future of West Virginia.

He says the large urban complex extending from Boston to Alexandria needs a periodic change of environment and that this need will become greater as the population increases. The need will also become greater as the workweek becomes shorter, giving the traveling public more leisure time to travel.

These urban people want to go, he says, 100 miles or more from their own area. And West Virginia is the only State ideally located for their needs.

But until the type of roads are built that will get tourists into and out of West Virginia rapidly, the great majority of them will continue to stop at Harpers Ferry, then move south, he believes.

Meanwhile, Harpers Ferry is glad that people are at least going as far into West Virginia as its area. With groups such as Potomac Highlands and better transportation facilities, perhaps tourists will go even farther.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 1648.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the hour set for the vote on Senate bill 1648 be changed from 4 o'clock p.m. to 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, June 1, 1965.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, May 27, 1965, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: Provided, That, in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: Provided further, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill except an amendment by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: Provided, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Ordered further, That the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of the bill not later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 1.

MR. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest, or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting, other contractors or subcontractors of contracts theretofore customarily performed by them.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield to himself?

MR. RANDOLPH. I yield myself 15 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. RANDOLPH. The amendment which has been read to the Senate relates to a subject which has been discussed by me with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and with other Members, both majority and minority members of the committee.

In effect, the amendment would tighten the provisions of the bill against the transference of jobs or job opportunities from one area to another when there is a possibility that work in the form of production contracts might be transferred as a result of assisting an employer in a designated area who intends to undertake a work contract being performed in another area.

The measure before the Senate is a vital piece of proposed legislation. It would clearly prohibit the relocation of production facilities which would result in the transfer of job opportunities. But it is my opinion that it does not specifically mention the possibility of the transfer of work contracts, which could also result in a relocation of job opportunities. Therefore, it is important that we provide a specific prohibition against that possibility.

My amendment must not be construed as one which would prohibit a benefiting company, either now or in years to come, from bidding for or taking on contract work as such. The amendment which I offer is intended solely to prevent aid to firms whose principal purpose in developing or improving their production capabilities is to obtain work contracts now or in the past consistently and customarily performed by other known firms. It is not intended to prohibit the assisted firm in the future from bidding on contracts which are now being performed by some other firm, but only to prevent the establishment or the expansion with Federal assistance of firms which are immediately and initially dependent on the pirating of such contracts.

Mr. President, we recall that not only in connection with the Appalachian Regional Development Act, but in other legislation before the Senate, charges have been made of pirating industry—that a plant in a certain State or an area of a State was brought into another State or an area of that State because certain inducements were offered in the location of the plant at its new site as against the location at the old site. We in Congress must be very careful that nothing is incorporated in this legislation which would be an incentive to or would influence in any degree those who would pirate a plant from one section of the country to another.

The various areas of the country are jealous of their economic status. In West Virginia, where we are attempting to attract new industry and to expand industries which are there, we are quite conscious of our responsibility to go out to other sections of the country and interest operators of various enterprises in bringing plants and/or factories into West Virginia. But West Virginians want that done as an expansion of job opportunities. We are not interested in pulling a plant from another State into the State of West Virginia at the expense of employment opportunities in other States. If it involves a voluntary action of the management, of course, of a company to relocate in a State, that is a question of economics and managerial judgment.

I wish I emphasized here today that the amendment is meant to tighten the provisions against the transference of jobs or job opportunities. For that reason I have offered the amendment, and I trust that there is unanimity within the leadership of our Committee on Public Works.

If I may have the attention of the capable chairman of our Committee on Public Works, I should like to have him comment on the position he takes with others on this question.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the primary purpose of this measure is to create new jobs and not to merely shift jobs from one locale to another. We want a net gain in employment. I have had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and have discussed it with others concerned with this problem.

We had discussion on this matter in the committee and our report provides some good guidelines in this connection. The discussion of this problem appears on page 13 of the report (S. Rept. No. 193).

The Senator's amendment would merely add further insurance that there will be no shifting of job opportunities in the operation of the program. I am concerned with this problem, as I know many other Members are. I am sure that the Senator's amendment is acceptable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know that the Senator from Michigan is zealous in his efforts to provide a continuing favorable climate for the employment of people at plants in Michigan. I am sure that, if expressions on the subject were made by other Senators in the Chamber, we would see that they feel the same in relation to their States.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding me time to speak on an unrelated subject.

Yesterday the Senate passed the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior. It was passed so swiftly that I did not have an opportunity to do that which I should do or feel remiss that I had not done. Although I speak for myself, I am confident that I express the feeling of all members of the Senate committee, and, indeed, all members of the full committee. I thank Paul Eaton, the professional staff mem-

ber assigned to that subcommittee, for his invaluable assistance during consideration of the bill. He not only has total recall; he has immediate total recall. At all times he was most helpful and understanding, and the work of the committee would not have progressed as swiftly and as well as it did were it not for the services of Mr. Eaton.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senate will vote next Tuesday on S. 1648. This action will be in fulfillment of a pledge given during our consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act earlier this year. At that time, I associated myself with our esteemed majority leader, with the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and with expressions from the administration, in support of early Senate action to bring relief to other economically deprived regions. Action will be consummated by this body and the pledge will be fulfilled. I commend the principal sponsors of this legislation, the diligent senior Senator from Michigan and the capable senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who has for so long been in the forefront of economic development legislation. I salute the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for his cooperation with the Public Works Committee and for his expeditious manner of treating titles II and IV in the committee of which he is chairman.

It is significant to emphasize and draw particular attention to the third of the purposes of the act enumerated on the first page of the committee report. This purpose is, and I quote, to "Provide loans to Government and non-Government nonprofit agencies in order to make available funds needed as the required local share for public works grants-in-aid programs and the local share of funds necessary for grants for facilities related to area economic development needs."

Mr. President, the provisions of title II of the pending measure would make available loan funds for municipalities or counties to meet their requirements for matching the grant funds provided under title I. Thus, if a town qualifies for a 60-percent or an 80-percent grant for construction of a sewage treatment or water treatment facility and cannot from other resources raise the necessary 40-percent or 20-percent matching funds,

the community would be eligible for a loan under the provisions of title II. This is an extension of the practice which prevailed under the accelerated public works program.

The provisions of titles I and II are particularly relevant to the needs of the State of West Virginia, which has very pressing requirements for water and sewage treatment facilities which cannot be fully met by the recently enacted Appalachian Regional Development Act. Senators will note the record of the hearings of the Committee on Public Works, in which, on pages 28 and 29, are listed the 100 areas of highest unemployment in the United States.

Ten of these—10 percent of the areas of highest unemployment—are counties in West Virginia, with unemployment rates in 1964 ranging from 12.2 percent in McDowell County to 20.2 percent in Clay County. West Virginians, therefore, have a vital interest in the enactment of this measure, and it was for this, among other reasons, that I introduced in committee the amendment which raised the authorization of grant funds under title I from \$250 million annually to \$400 million.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is a measure combining major elements of the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs. The bill includes provisions to encourage the establishment of multi-state economic development regions and provides administrative and technical assistance funds to establish development commissions for other regions of the country similar to Appalachia and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

This legislative package, if passed by the Congress substantially as reported by our committee, admittedly would not be easy to administer. And, in its early stages, I can visualize local and State governments having difficulties in processing and clearing applications.

Even though, under the amendment I sponsored, the public works authorizations were raised from \$250 million a year to \$400 million annually for 5 years, I visualize that this phase of the program will be vastly oversubscribed with applications.

When the accelerated public works program ran out of funds and authorization for expenditures in December 1963, there were approximately \$710 million in unprocessed applications on file with accelerated public works regional and national units. Only about \$426 million worth of those unprocessed project applications were adjudged to be active, pending, eligible, and approvable under the criteria of eligibility and the regulations of the accelerated public works organization. It is estimated that under the criteria for eligibility and other provisions of the new Public Works and Economic Development Act not more than \$250 million of those accelerated public works project applications still on file would be active, eligible, and approvable.

So, I believe it is accurate to observe that the criteria for public facility grants are more restrictive under the new legislation than was the case under the Accelerated Public Works Act, but are

slightly more liberal than were public facility grants under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am proud that I have voted for all the legislative proposals which created the Area Redevelopment Administration and the accelerated public works program. Both have been of immense value in providing jobs for unemployed men and women, strengthening our economy, and creating vitally needed improvements in communities throughout the Nation.

Both of these highly successful programs were enacted to help to deal with unemployment and the economic decline of certain areas of the Nation that accompanied changing economic patterns, automation, and modern technology that arose since World War II. In a sense, both were experimental. We have learned much since their original enactment, and the benefit of that experience is now embodied in the Public Works and Economic Development Act now before the Senate.

The fact is that amidst unprecedented prosperity there is economic stagnation in many areas of the Nation. Many communities and regions have been unable to come to grips with changing economic conditions in this space age of change and challenge. We cannot afford to disregard this problem and consign these regions to perpetual economic deprivation. Not only would this be a callous solution; it would be a foolish waste of immense capital investments already made in these areas—schools, roads, hospitals and innumerable other public and private facilities. As a nation, we cannot permit these economic sores to fester on the generally healthy condition of our national economy.

The present bill combines the best features of the original Area Redevelopment Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act and the Appalachia Regional Development Act. In addition, several improvements have been made over the earlier programs. In the bill under consideration distressed areas can combine into multicounty and multistate economic regions. Grants and loans can be utilized for broader geographical application and thus help depressed areas by linking them with more healthy areas. Also, it does not restrict these programs to county and local boundaries which no longer have any real economic meaning in this modern age.

This bill makes it easier for depressed economic areas to participate financially in the program. It also authorizes financing on a scale more nearly equal to the task. There are many other new items in the bill which would give our States and communities the tools with which they will be better equipped to fight economic stagnation and poverty.

Mr. President, there are some who would say this is a giveaway, that it is state socialism and a further manifestation of the welfare state. Such claim is absurd. The fact is that when we provide legislation of this kind, we are doing no less to strengthen our Nation than

when we vote for appropriations for our armed services. Furthermore, this is no giveaway. As the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so ably pointed out, the return in revenue and the saving in expenditures to Federal, local, and State governments as a result of this legislation will more than pay for its cost. At the same time we will have created new capital improvements and have given millions of our people the opportunity to maintain a decent standard of living. More jobs mean more taxes for our good "Uncle" and for local and State governments. More jobs mean fewer people on the welfare rolls and receiving unemployment compensation. More jobs mean more profits for businessmen.

Mr. President, the bill will help to assure every American who wants to work the opportunity to do so. It is an extremely effective additional weapon in the war on poverty. It will aid in ending the haunting sense of helplessness and despair which is felt by the unwillingly unemployed men and women of our Nation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this proposed beneficent legislation.

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. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] under the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, two things in the bill trouble me. I shall deal first with one which I have already discussed with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who has treated me with his usual cooperative courtesy. That question involves a problem faced by New York and other States which inhere in the 41,000-mile limitation of the Interstate Highway System.

We are discussing the helping of areas which need redevelopment assistance. That is a problem with which I have the greatest sympathy, even though we in New York pay a large part of the taxes and frequently do not get back what we pay. I have been sympathetic with this problem and worked with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and was a cosponsor of the original 1961 Area Redevelopment Administration Act. The Interstate Highway System is also an important illustration of what can be done to improve communities which need this kind of assistance.

I have been urging upon the Senator in charge of the bill the idea of including language in the bill which would require consideration of extending the 41,000-mile limitation.

An important issue involved is the issue of making up for the fact that, in New York, we built many roads which could qualify under the Interstate Highway System—notably the Thruway—before the interstate highway program

went into effect. We have never received equivalent benefit from the Federal Interstate Highway System because we had the foresight to contract roads in advance of the time when the program went into effect.

In other States, including our State, the interstate mileage allocation is very restrictive, considering the needs for development. Even in a State like New York, which some claim is a wealthy State as these things go, there are 30-odd areas which could qualify for ARA assistance as and which might well be eligible for qualification under the bill. For example, I make reference to S. 1056, which I introduced together with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], on February 9, 1965. That bill deals with extending the Interstate Highway System.

With that in view, and following my discussion with the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Michigan, I desire to propound to him, if I may have his attention, two inquiries.

Is it the intent of the Committee on Public Works to follow up closely the making of a study by the Bureau of Public Roads, which I am advised has been or is being currently undertaken on the desirability of extending the Interstate Highway System?

Mr. McNAMARA. We shall follow it very closely. We have already discussed it quite recently. I shall make reference to that later in my remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. So, if I may characterize the answer of the Senator, we have every reason to expect that this will not remain a mere promise, but that such a study will be made, through the cooperation of the committee which will contact the Bureau within a measurable period of time to see that the study is being made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Studies are being constantly programmed. We occasionally receive requests from certain Senators for special attention to certain areas. If we were to receive such a request from the Senator, we would forward it to the Bureau.

Mr. JAVITS. And the committee would get behind the request?

Mr. McNAMARA. We would see that the study was made.

Mr. JAVITS. Very good. The other question is, Does the committee expect the Bureau of Public Roads to submit recommendations to it on the extension of the interstate highway program as the result of the program to which we have just referred?

Mr. McNAMARA. According to testimony the Senate Public Works Committee has received from the Bureau of Public Roads, the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System scheduled to be completed in 1972, already is running \$5.8 billion short. Efforts are under way to meet these increases in highway costs so that the existing program can be completed approximately on schedule.

Any increase in the program before 1972 obviously would compound the financial problem.

But more specifically on the Senator's question, about the Bureau of Public

Roads conducting a study of highway needs, I would like to point out that the Bureau needs no congressional authorization or instructions to conduct studies of this nature. The Bureau has ample authority to study these matters and is indeed studying them all the time.

I would like to direct the Senator's attention to hearings on cost estimates for completion of the Interstate Highway System which were held before the Subcommittee on Public Roads on March 30 and 31. I asked Mr. Rex Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, whether his Bureau was looking forward to the day when the existing program would expire and whether it was making preparation for it. I read a section of the testimony beginning with Mr. Whitton's reply to that question:

MR. WHITTON. We are making studies now to see what the continuing highway program ought to be. I would say we are directing our efforts toward a continuing program that we think will be necessary due to the development of the country and the development of traffic and the development of industry. We see no immediate end to a highway improvement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

MR. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself such additional time as it may require to complete the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

MR. McNAMARA. Let me quote further from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. Are you saying in those remarks that you are anticipating continuation?

MR. WHITTON. We are anticipating a continuing highway program; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. No question about continuing the highway program. The question is, How are we going to pay for it?

MR. WHITTON. That is what the study will develop.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are prepared in your plans and anticipations to face this termination in 1972?

MR. WHITTON. Yes, sir. We are making a study, or hope to make it, we are starting it, at least, to determine what a continuing highway program should be, and how it ought to be financed.

Thus, the Senator from New York should readily see that the Bureau already has actively engaged in studying the country's highway needs.

There is a separate section established in the Bureau for the purpose of looking ahead and taking into consideration all these needs.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, as the Senator has mentioned, if we want some thing for our particular section of the country, the committee will inquire into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have an additional 5 minutes, or I take it out of my own time?

MR. McNAMARA. The Senator may continue under the time allotted to me.

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

MR. JAVITS. I yield.

MR. CARLSON. I would like to stress the urgency of a study. The distinguished chairman has mentioned that

this is under way. Since the Interstate System of Highways began, great progress has been made in the development of that system in the country. In our own State of Kansas, within a short time, a stretch of 400 miles across the entire State will be open for travel.

When the study to which reference has been made is undertaken, I hope thought will be given to this other phase of the problem. A substantial part of Highway No. 70, is a toll road. Persons using that road can use it free of tolls through Missouri, but once past the Kansas line they must pay a toll.

I am not suggesting today that something should be done to take care of that situation, but in the future I believe some provision should be made to make the cost of traveling the same throughout the country. I hope the study will also include that phase of the problem.

MR. McNAMARA. The real problem is not the need for roads or requirements for them, but, How do we pay the bill? We are already well over \$5 billion in debt to complete the 41,000-mile system of highways. The Senate must consider how we are to pay for it. This is one of the most urgent considerations.

MR. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is one other phase of this matter to which I should like to direct the attention of the chairman, and that is the so-called antipirating provisions of the bill, reference to which is contained mainly in the committee report, as to what the committee expects of the Secretary of Commerce in the administration of the bill.

I should like to read into the RECORD, because I think it is critically important to have this expression as a part of the legislative record as we pass this measure, which I hope will be passed, the prohibition against relocation, which appears at pages 13 and 14 of the report;

PROHIBITION AGAINST RELOCATION

The committee in discussing the general purpose of the act expressed its strong belief that no value is gained by shifting existing work from one area to another under this program. The grants and loans provided for in S. 1648 should be used to expand our job market. Thus the Secretary should make every effort to determine that assistance is not extended under this act so as to result in a transfer of work or a relocation of facilities. It has long been a recognized policy of the Government to preclude the use of Federal funds in any form for assisting the relocation of industries, or plants, or work from one locality to another, or for financing subcontractors who relocate for the purpose of transferring jobs previously performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.

The Secretary's task in administering this portion of the act will be difficult at best. The intention here is that economic development should not be used as a guise to obtain Federal assistance in order to obtain a competitive advantage that provides no general benefit to the Nation.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is not intended to authorize the use of Federal funds for grants, loans, guarantees, subsidies, purchases of indebtedness, or assistance of any kind for programs, projects, facilities, or purchases to be used by or for highly mobile, intensely competitive industries, such as the apparel or garment trades within the textile industry, in which substantial unemployment and ab-

normal unused plant capacity exists, and in which labor turnover is high and the prior possession of a specific skill or training is not typically a prerequisite for obtaining employment. The act is not intended to give a competitive advantage to one area over another where it would lead to industrial dislocation.

The committee makes it very clear that it does not expect that the bill will be used for the purpose of raiding business where it is now. The report expressly refers to the apparel or garment trades within the textile industry, in which substantial unemployment and abnormal unused plant capacity exist, and in which labor turnover is high, and the prior possession of a specific skill or training is not typically a prerequisite for obtaining employment, as being precisely an industry in which the antipirating policy should be followed.

I should like, if I may again engage the attention of the manager of the bill, to have from him a reaffirmation of this intention, particularly as this bill contains what I consider to be a very objectionable and unhappy provision, which I fought before, without success, providing for loans and guarantees to obtain machinery and equipment, as contained in line 25, page 10, and line 1, page 11, of the bill.

Unless it is coupled with a very strong policy declaration on our part that the bill shall not be used for pirating industry, notwithstanding the very eloquent statement contained in the committee's report, it could certainly be used for that purpose, considering the latitude granted under the section of the bill providing for loans and guarantees for machinery and equipment.

MR. McNAMARA. I believe it is quite clear, as the Senator has said in his remarks, that it is definitely spelled out in the report. In addition, we have just now adopted an amendment to the bill, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [MR. RANDOLPH], which emphasizes that and ties it down unquestionably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

MR. McNAMARA. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

MR. JAVITS. May I ask the manager of the bill to refer to the words of the bill, in lines 3 and 4 on page 12, which now read—as amended by the Randolph amendment:

Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting other contractors or subcontractors of contracts theretofore customarily performed by them.

Are these words defined as to their intent by the recitals in the committee report on pages 13 and 14 under the heading "Prohibition Against Relocation"?

MR. McNAMARA. That is the very purpose of this language.

MR. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his time and courtesy.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have amendment No. 1 at the desk, and I ask that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 10, line 5, to change the period to a comma and to insert the following:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966 and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The purpose of this amendment is to limit the authorization for title II to the same duration of time as title I.

I intend to submit another amendment a little later, amendment No. 3, which would impose a similar time limitation on the authorization for title III.

This limitation in time is already contained in title I. It is already contained in the Appalachia measure, after which this bill is patterned.

The purpose of having the authorization expire periodically is so that the program as a whole will return to the Congress for later assessment, reappraisal, and reconsideration.

S. 689, which was introduced on January 26, 1965, and which is now pending in the Government Operations Committee, would establish that general policy in subsequent legislation.

I feel that it is sound policy; and for that reason that this amendment to title 2 is submitted.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield briefly?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have checked this with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and as chairman of the subcommittee who handled this title he advises me that he has no objection. Therefore, Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nebraska proposes the following amendment:

On page 22, line 13, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the purpose of amendment No. 3 is to achieve for title 3 what the amendment the Senate has just adopted will do for title 2. The same reasons and the same considerations apply thereto.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for the same reasons which have been indicated earlier, the chairmen of the two committees have no objection to acceptance of the amendment, and I ask that it be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nebraska proposes the following amendment:

On page 11, line 4, after the semicolon, insert the word "and".

On page 11, beginning with the semicolon on line 12, strike out all through the period on line 24.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this is the provision which provides that the Secretary shall be authorized "to contract to pay, and to pay annually, for not more than ten years, to or on behalf of private business entities amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points the interest paid by such entities on loans which are obtained from non-Government sources, which are not guaranteed by any Government agency, which provide for annual amortization of principal, and the proceeds of which are used for purposes for which the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness or make loans under this section: *Provided, however,* That subject to limitations in annual appropriation Acts, the annual cost of new contracts approved in any one year shall not exceed \$5,000,000."

Mr. President, we have had some experience under the Area Redevelopment Administration Act, in which subsidies for this type of business met with a sorry reception at the hands of communities where the subsidy of business was practiced.

All of us can sympathize most earnestly and sincerely with the establishment of businesses which will result in the formation of new jobs. But it comes with poor grace and a great deal of resentment to those businesses in a given

area when they witness the formation of a competing business in their own area, which will have a subsidy from public funds. This is one form of subsidy. Assume a situation in which perhaps the newly founded business would find it necessary to borrow money at 6 percent. The Secretary would be authorized to pay the equivalent of 2 percent of that interest, thereby giving a net interest rate of 4 percent to the newly formed business.

Mr. President, consider the plight and feelings of the man who has put his own money on the line, who has established his own line of credit in a bank and must pay the 6 percent. It does not sit well with him to not only have a new direct line of competition with a man who is being subsidized, but that man is being subsidized in part by the taxes which he has to pay.

To use a homely illustration, a man making broom handles, for example, in the States of Nebraska or Missouri—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this man making broom handles has a little factory employing 12 or 14 persons. Along comes a man who would get the benefit of the provisions of the bill. The broom handle manufacturer finds himself paying 6 percent interest, whereas the new man will have a head start of 2 percent and so will pay only 4 percent.

It is that situation which I believe is unwarranted and certainly would work a greater hardship than any corresponding benefit which would be obtained.

If that business will not be able to make a go of it at the rate of 6 percent, it would not help any to have a reduction to a rate of 4 percent as in the hypothetical instance which was given.

There are other alternatives for handling the situation. It was pointed out in the supplemental views in the committee report that one way to handle the problem would be for the Federal Government to insure the loans made by private lending agencies. However, in the short time allowed for preparation of the bill, it was not possible to work out any proper reference in this regard. It could be done, and it would achieve the same purpose; namely, where credit would be guaranteed by the Government, each man could get a lower rate of interest. We would not get into the discriminatory subsidy which is provided under the present bill.

That language is found on page 37 of the committee report and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of that page, beginning with the words "section 202(b)(8)," in the fifth paragraph of that page and the two succeeding paragraphs.

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

The GAO recommended that in section 202(b)(8), a fixed charge (subject to change

with experience) should be added to the interest costs on the business loans to cover operating costs of the program. There was considerable support for the recommendation of a fixed charge in our committee.

Section 202(a)(3) of the bill provides authority for the Secretary to pay to or in behalf of private business entities, amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points, interest paid on loans obtained from non-governmental sources.

If the purpose of this section is to draw capital into areas which have economic possibilities which the administrators of the program are convinced will support long-term employment, a Federal insurance program to insure the loans made by private lending institutions would perform the same function at no cost to the Government. Such insurance could draw capital from central money markets to an area selected for assistance as has been demonstrated in the FHA program.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. It is my expectation to call for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this provision in the bill is designed as an experiment, the objective of which was well described in the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I read his language on page 11 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

In addition, the new interest rate rebate provision would provide a new means of bringing more stable and promising business enterprises, which are able to obtain private financing, into depressed areas.

What is proposed is not a subsidy for a business but an inducement for strong and stable businesses to move into an undeveloped area. It is geared not to any supposition as to what may be the need of business for assistance, but rather to what may be the needs of the area for assistance by strong and viable companies.

On page 15 of the same hearings there is found colloquy which I had with Secretary Connor on this point. I was interested, as I am sure all members of the committee are, in the validity of the device which is included in the bill.

I said this to the Secretary:

The rationale that you gave on page 5 of your testimony for this provision is that some incentive is absolutely essential to attract the sounder and more viable firms into the areas where new industry is most needed.

Now, no one can quarrel with that objective—certainly not I. It isn't going to help an undeveloped economic area to bring in weak economic units and weak industries to try to build it up. So I wonder if you could build up the record with further comment.

Is this one of the incentives which would indeed attract sounder and more viable firms? What are the reasons why sounder and more viable firms are not as likely to go into these undeveloped areas as we would like to see?

I quoted my question, because I believe my question reflects some of the same concern which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has reflected in his comments. Secretary Connor's reply was:

Secretary CONNOR. Senator Muskies, a large national manufacturing organization, for example, in considering its expansion plans, has many alternative choices as to where it can locate one new plant and then another and so forth. And it is usual that as part of its

planning activity it would be taking various sections of the country into consideration and making comparative judgments as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of locating new plants in many different sections.

Now, in one of these, shall we say, underdeveloped parts of the country, there are some obvious economic disadvantages for such a company locating its plant there. And in the competition with other communities or localities that have a greater infrastructure in depth, or better transportation facilities, or are in a physical location that is closer to the market, one of these redevelopment areas might well lose out in the competition unless there is some kind of added incentive.

The experience in several European countries, particularly Belgium and West Germany, is that if there is some public need for assisting and giving incentives for the location of new industries in locations where there are some problems such as higher rate of unemployment, than an incentive of this kind can be instrumental because a company in looking at the competitive advantages and disadvantages can be attracted to an area where there is, say, a labor surplus and some other advantages that would be helpful in the long run, if it can get some incentive that would offset the immediate economic disadvantages of such an area. We think this is a good experiment to try. We, of course, are not sure of its success because it never has been tried, but after looking at the various types of incentives that would bring these stronger, large national corporations into these areas where their help is needed most, we think this has a reasonably good chance of success.

I then asked the Secretary whether there were other kinds of incentives that were considered to achieve the same objective. The Secretary's reply was:

Secretary CONNOR. Well, other kinds have been considered, Senator Muskies, but the ones considered would involve greater financial outlay by the Federal Government. We think that this leverage effect that we obtain from the use of the 2 percentage points with the company putting up its own money will do at least as effective a job as the others and at least cost to the Federal Government.

Senator MUSKIE. Did you test this out as an incentive—the objective I don't quarrel with, the purpose I don't quarrel with, the need I don't quarrel with, but I am wondering whether the incentive will work. Have you tested it in any way?

Secretary CONNOR. We have had discussions. Of course, something like this can be tested only in the facts of a particular situation by a company that is considering its location in one of these redevelopment areas in competition with an area where greater public services and facilities are available.

I have quoted from the hearing record because I think this makes the best case that can be made for this provision of the bill. It is an experiment worth trying.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has raised the alternative, which is included in the supplemental views of the minority, that of an insurance program. This does not meet the need which this device is designed to serve, because the companies we are discussing do not need credit insurance to obtain credit. We are talking about companies that can get credit on their own, because they would not qualify under the industrial loan provisions of the bill. There is no appeal to them under any of the other provisions of the bill, nor under the proposal the Senator from Nebraska has advanced.

The only device we have to deal with this particular problem is the one that is before us. It is the one which was considered with others, as the Secretary said, by the Department in preparing the legislation. This was the one involving the least cost to the Government and which, at the same time, would serve the objective.

The cost to the Government is reflected in the fact that if it works, an expenditure of \$5 million will generate \$250 million in private funds to stimulate their movement into these underdeveloped areas.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the claim that the Federal Government cannot create prosperity. I agree. The Federal Government can help stimulate the private sector to move into those areas.

After considering everything carefully, in the light of the argument presented to us by the Secretary, we also felt that it was an experiment worth trying. That is why we bring it to the Senate and urge its adoption.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true also that Secretary Connor was able to give a specific example of how this idea has worked. I asked him whether it would work with a big corporation such as General Motors, and whether it would be an incentive to General Motors. He said:

Secretary CONNOR. You mentioned General Motors and in the public announcement they made about the location of one of their plants in Antwerp, Belgium, it was noted that one of the factors they took into consideration, although no indication it was the determining factor, nevertheless the location of the plant in Antwerp took into consideration this 2-percent incentive.

That statement by the Secretary is found at page 38 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This is something that has been tried by American corporations, as the Secretary said, in countries overseas.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. In addition, I point out also that the Secretary comes from the field of big business. In our discussions he spoke as a businessman operating a big company, and the question was raised with him whether in that capacity he thought this was a worthwhile incentive to try to attract a viable company. His answer was in the affirmative.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have a comment to make with reference to the Secretary's statement at page 15. I shall not read all of it, because the Senator has read it: "If it can get some incentive that would offset the immediate economic disadvantages of such an area."

I emphasize the word "immediate." That is the word that concerns me. Does this mean that the company will get a 2-percent subsidy for as long as it is operating, or is there a limitation?

Mr. MUSKIE. The limit is 10 years.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry that our good friend from Nebraska has disturbed the happy harmony which has characterized our proceedings up to this moment by striking a body blow at one of the essential features of the bill. The inducement of meeting 2 percent of the interest cost on investments in depressed areas is one of the most vital features of the bill. It would result in a potential maximum investment of private capital with a minimum of Government expenditure. The 2 percent interest inducement means that for an expenditure of \$2 million we can hope to induce \$100 million of private investment. The proposal would be authorized for 5 years at \$5 million a year. We believe \$5 million would induce \$250 million of investment. Carried out over 5 years, it would mean a potential investment of \$1.25 billion in depressed areas. This is really the most economical way to get a large volume of private capital to start producing and to employ people in areas where there is high and persistent unemployment.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BASS. I should like to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill. I should like to find out if there is to be a vote on the pending amendment today, and, if so, at what time.

Mr. MUSKIE. We are pressing for as early a vote as we can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the commitment made yesterday, when we have the vote, it will be the last vote.

Mr. BASS. The commitment was that the Senator would try not to have any votes after 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. There will be a little flexibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the second point I would like to make is that the proposal is designed to encourage investments made by private capital rather than by public expenditure. It would offer inducement for banks and other private lenders to extend loans to private industry which wishes to expand into areas of high and persistent unemployment or low income. This will be done entirely in the private sector.

There is good precedent for this procedure in the program which was carried out in the construction of post offices, originally by the Eisenhower administration, but continued under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations; namely, that instead of appropriating for the construction of post offices, a rental program was carried out which guarantees an income for a stated period of years. As a result, the building of post offices has been greatly speeded up. There may be some incidental disadvantages of the program, but it has certainly speeded up investments.

The next point I should like to make is that these inducements for loans will draw into depressed areas not merely marginal firms but well-established firms—firms with a good production record and a good earnings record. They

will not be fly-by-night concerns in any way. The failure record should, therefore, be very low.

Finally, if we turn down the proposal, we shall be driven to the alternative of having to greatly increase public loans financed out of the Federal budget.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is a sincere defender of private enterprise. I am surprised that he should sponsor an amendment which would throw us more and more into the public sector by requiring Government loans rather than loans from private enterprise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain material on the foreign experience of West Germany and Belgium, which is very favorable, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with such incidental material as I have.

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

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE WITH THE INCENTIVE OF SUBSIDIZED INTEREST ON BANK LOANS TO INDUSTRY EXPANDING IN REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

The interest subsidy to bank loans has been used by Belgium, Luxembourg, and West Germany among European countries as a device to encourage expansion and modernization of industry in redevelopment areas. This incentive to private enterprise has been most intensively used by the Government of Belgium.

It should be noted, however, that interest subsidies in West Germany amount to 3 percent per year toward the normal amount of interest to be paid to the banks, and are extended for 3 years. In West Germany as in other Common Market countries, interest subsidies are part of a whole package of redevelopment measures and policies. Other credit measures also include direct low-interest loans and Federal guarantees for loans. The subsidy to banking institutions in Luxembourg in order that they may offer loans at lower interest rates is patterned after the Belgian act.

As in West Germany, Belgium makes use of variety of measures to achieve its economic growth and redevelopment objectives, but the assistance to private enterprise through a Government contribution to the rate of interest paid on bank loans is given greater emphasis here than in other countries. Belgium is unique in that it applies its incentives to economic expansion and establishment of new industries on a general, countrywide basis as well as for the development of certain designated areas. The 1959 acts had in mind a general toning up and modernization of Belgian and Belgian-located industry to make it more competitive internationally, and particularly in the Common Market. The differences between the general act and the regional act are mainly a matter of degree and restriction, with industry which expands in redevelopment areas receiving more liberal treatment. For example, the general act provides a Government contribution in the rate of interest of 2 percent under most conditions. The regional act, however, provides for a maximum of 4 percent contribution to interest rates on bank loans extended to industries expanding or modernizing in redevelopment areas. On top of this, additional help may be given in times of a national recession, when the minimum rate may be fixed at 1 percent. The interest subsidy may be extended to 8 years in development areas and up to 5 years under the general act.

How effective has the interest subsidy device been in Belgium—particularly in its ef-

fects on strengthening the economies of its redevelopment areas whose designation criteria are generally parallel to ours? Dr. L. C. Klaasen of the Netherlands Economic Institute has attempted an appraisal of the effectiveness of Belgian regional policy, but he points out two difficulties: (1) the additional advantages given by the regional act are not substantially greater than those available countrywide under the general act, and (2) the acts are of such recent date that no major structural changes can be expected from them as yet. However, the available data do indicate worthwhile results.

Certain data measure only the effects of both the general and regional programs in their entirety. Accordingly, the effects of the interest subsidy are inseparable from the other regional measures including Government guarantees of loans, direct Government financing, industrial building program, and tax exemptions. It is interesting to note, however, that the areas of greatest unemployment in Belgium received relatively the greatest additional employment in industries receiving financial support under the general and regional acts.

Under the regional act, a total of 507 applicants were approved for low interest rates between the enactment of the law in July 1959, and October 1962 (an effective period of about 2 years). Of these, three-quarters (382) were located in the Flemish provinces and one-quarter (125) in the Walloon provinces. Capitalwise, of the total involved (\$128 million) 63 percent was invested in the Flemish and 37 percent in the Walloon provinces. The amount of capital per applicant, however, was much larger in Wallonia than in Flanders (\$380,000 against \$210,000). This latter fact is understandable in that Flanders not only has a higher unemployment rate than Wallonia, but is traditionally more agricultural and less industrial.

The conclusions indicated by the rather brief experience of the Belgian Government with subsidized interest rates on bank loans to industries locating in redevelopment areas may be summarized as follows: The incentive has been quite widely employed by Belgian industry. A total of 507 industries have used it to expand in eligible areas over a period of a little more than 2 years. In considering this volume of use, and without suggesting a direct relationship, it is helpful to remember that the United States has over 20 times the population of Belgium.

What other countries have programs with provisions similar to the 2-percent interest return proposed in EDA?

The redevelopment area programs of Western European countries contain a wide variety of incentives to encourage the location of new industry. These range from tax credits and accelerated amortization to outright capital grants. Two countries—Belgium and West Germany—extend interest rate subsidies somewhat similar to the EDA proposal.

The Belgian plan was aimed at both (1) modernizing Belgian industry better to compete in the Common Market, and (2) expanding industrial jobs in redevelopment areas. Accordingly, the government's contribution nationwide is 2 percent, and in distressed areas specific aid is given in the form of an additional contribution of 2 percent. Still further, during a period of recession, industry expansions (new or existing) in distressed areas are eligible for additional interest subsidy to a minimum of 1 percent. (In Belgium, the interest subsidy may be combined with Government guarantees for loans.) The period of interest support varies from 5 to 8 years.

In West Germany also, interest subsidies are extended for loans to industrial investments in redevelopment areas. They amount to 3 percent per year toward the normal amount of interest to be paid to the banks. The interest subsidy is extended for 3 years.

(Beside the interest subsidy, other devices in West Germany include low-interest investment loans, short-term working capital loans, and Federal guarantees for loans.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I presume the committee record is quite long. Perhaps it contains all the items which indicate a favorable experience in Western Europe with this type of program. I do not know that the conditions in Western Europe are parallel to the economic, industrial, and labor conditions here. But I do note the answer of Secretary Connor on page 38. He said:

You mentioned General Motors and in the public announcement they made about the location of one of their plants in Antwerp, Belgium, it was noted that one of the factors they took into consideration, although no indication it was the determining factor, nevertheless the location of the plant in Antwerp took into consideration this 2-percent incentive.

That is a nebulous statement. The 2-percent subsidy was there, but there is no judgment or conclusion that it was that which caused them to locate the plant in Antwerp, Belgium.

Furthermore, try to transform the \$5 million annual authorization for this subsidy into a maximum of what it could produce if all of it were devoted to this 2-percent subsidy and coming out with a multi-billion-dollar figure is wishful thinking in its greatest degree.

There is no showing that that result is likely to be achieved.

What about the man who might already be in the business of making broomsticks in the area? We would say to him, "We are glad you are here. You are furnishing jobs. You operate a regional industry. But we are going to bribe a great big corporation to come in here with new equipment and a new plant. We are going to pay that big corporation to be your competitor."

Mr. President, it is one thing to make new jobs; it is another thing to engage in practices of pirating industry by closing up a factory in one area for the purpose of establishing it in another, as could be done under the bill.

It is still a third thing to have a subsidy which would establish large corporations, plants, and businesses with that subsidy, and would drive out businesses going now in that area and in competition with that big corporation.

I believe that in the absence of a showing that it is something more than an experiment, and in view of the experience we have had under the Area Redevelopment Act—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. The preponderance of the evidence and the record shows that

we would do well to stay away from the practice of subsidizing plants. It is a subject which is discretionary. Undoubtedly, it would result in a great deal of unsatisfaction and unhappiness. We may have a large firm qualify for a subsidy, but a medium-sized firm, a small firm, or one just starting business could not qualify. The smaller firms would not receive help.

I am for private enterprise, but not only for the big operator. There are some who advocate the advancement of the big companies, such as General Motors, but I believe that American industry is composed in larger degree of the sum of many smaller industries which, under these circumstances, would not be favored and, in fact, would be harmed.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER],

the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORRISON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The regular order is called for. On this vote, 25 Senators voted in the affirmative, 39 Senators in the negative. The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair withhold the announcement of the final vote for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result of the vote has already been announced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not hear the announcement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my demand for the regular order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has entered the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the regular order be rescinded. I observe the Senator from Vermont in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is not in order; the vote must stand.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Russell, Ga.
Boggs	Holland	Scott
Carlson	Hruska	Stennis
Case	Javits	Talmadge
Cotton	Kuchel	Tower
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Pearson	Young, Ohio
Dominick	Prouty	
Fannin	Robertson	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Hart	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hartke	Monroney
Bass	Hayden	Morse
Bayh	Inouye	Muskie
Brewster	Jackson	Nelson
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Clark	Long, La.	Randolph
Dodd	Magnuson	Smathers
Douglas	McCarthy	Smith
Ellender	McGee	Sparkman
Gruening	McIntyre	Tydings
Harris	McNamara	Yarborough

NOT VOTING—36

Aiken	Bible	Cannon
Allott	Byrd, Va.	Church

Cooper	Long, Mo.	Neuberger
Eastland	Mansfield	Pell
Ervin	McGovern	Ribicoff
Fong	Miller	Russell, S.C.
Fulbright	Mondale	Saltonstall
Gore	Montoya	Simpson
Hill	Morton	Symington
Jordan, Idaho	Moss	Thurmond
Kennedy, N.Y.	Mundt	Williams, N.J.
Lausche	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. HRUSKA's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a century ago Joshua Chamberlain, military hero of the War between the States, president of Bowdoin College and Governor of Maine expressed his philosophy of government in these words:

A government has something more to do than to govern, and to levy taxes to pay the governors. It is something more than a police to arrest evil and punish wrong. It must also encourage good, point out improvements, open roads of prosperity and infuse life into all right enterprises. It should combine the best minds of the State for all the high ends for which society is established and to which man aspires. That gives us much to do.

These eloquent words could today serve as a fitting preface for the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 which we now consider. This act indeed—encourages good—points out and opens roads for economic improvement and enhanced prosperity—infuses life into right enterprises—and brings together the best minds of the State, at all levels of government and occupation to work together for all the high ends—economic and social to which man aspires.

This act is the logical culmination of the effects of significant economic and social forces which have acted upon our society over the past two decades. These forces, perhaps revolutionary in perspective, have improved the American standard of economic and social living and the pattern of national economic growth. These forces, too, have brought into focus the important truths that all Americans, in all places, throughout our land are entitled to an equality of opportunity—whether that opportunity be for justice, for political representation, for education, for health, for outdoor enjoyment, for the use of resources, or for economic enhancement.

Equality of opportunity for all men, I suggest, is the underlying theme of our major legislative efforts in this decade of the 1960's. For in this land of plenty, in the midst of our affluence, we are confronted with the paradox of unemployment, poverty, and misery—the products of unequal economic opportunity.

For some years, many States have recognized the uneven nature of economic operations and developments as functions of opportunity. In my own State, for example, we organized in 1955 the Department of Economic Development, to coordinate our industrial and recreational development programs. In 1957 this was followed by the Maine Industrial Building Authority, to guarantee indus-

trial building loans. Both of these programs represent efforts by Government to provide the means—the opportunity—the catalyst—by and through which local communities can utilize local initiative and local resources to solve their economic problems. I am proud that both of these measures were enacted while I was Governor of Maine. Progress has been good in these State-oriented programs but a great need has remained. Thus it was both logical and necessary for the Federal Government to become a partner with the States in this search for economic opportunity for all people. This came to pass in the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 which I was pleased to cosponsor.

In its few years of operation, ARA has been of immense assistance to large areas which need help—help, I might add, not forced upon anyone—but requested, in partnership with local endeavor—vially used and still required. The record for Maine in this regard is worthy of brief comment and example.

ARA projects have been active in nine Maine counties. One of these is Aroostook County in the extreme northern tip of Maine. An area as large as Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, with a population of about 100,000, Aroostook is a largely underdeveloped area. It is rich in natural resources, but concentration in a single industry—potato farming—has made the county's economy subject to violent fluctuations of the potato market.

ARA has proven its promise and great potential for economic development by expanding economic opportunity in Aroostook County. ARA has approved \$11.5 million in industrial loans to industries in Aroostook. As a result of this, 3,015 direct jobs have been created or projected for this area. The average cost per job is \$3,900 and the average annual total income resulting from this direct effort is over \$10 million.

Moreover, these loans have helped to diversify Aroostook's industrial base in wood products, potato processing, and the establishment of a broad-based sugarbeet industry of great potential to Maine's future economy.

About 1,200 jobs have been created elsewhere in Maine through ARA-assisted projects and more than 700 people have completed ARA training programs. The total impact in jobs is over 4,000, providing an annual income of more than \$14 million.

One of the more dramatic events in the life of ARA also happened in Maine. As a result of the shutdown of two textile mills in Lisbon Falls, Maine, during the summer-fall of 1964, this community was confronted with a sudden high rise unemployment situation affecting about 80 percent of its total work force of 1,150. To meet this crisis, President Johnson ordered a Federal task force to this community to assist them in their time of need. Out of this force of 10 or more Federal agencies, the main economic thrust, giving greatest relief to this chaotic situation, came from ARA in the form of a loan to a corporation which bought the largest of the two mills and reopened it at about 50 percent of its former work force.

Here indeed was opportunity created.

There are many more promising prospects in a variety of Maine industries. Pending at this time, but unfunded, because of the exhaustion of ARA funds are nearly \$6 million worth of these "opportunity" projects.

The passage of this bill, S. 1648, will assure the continued availability of opportunity to many Maine communities and other areas throughout our land. As we consider its substantive content, I would urge all Members of this body to think of this bill in terms of opportunity—not handouts—of opportunity for the broad economic growth of the underdeveloped communities of our country; and—of opportunity for the impoverished family to hold their heads high and for a man, his wife, and their children to rise in stature among their peers through their own productive capacities.

For opportunity is precisely what this bill offers—just as opportunity is the essential hallmark of our American way of life.

The committee in its consideration of this bill focused considerable attention on those sections pertinent to regional and local planning and development action. Much will yet be said on these points, but briefly let me conclude my remarks with emphasis on the new "economic development district" and "development" center concepts.

We must remember, that in establishing a national regional economic development program we are dealing with different regions of the country. Each of these regions has a different economic and resource base, and each has a different need in terms of development programs. In many ways New England has the most cohesive and coordinated set of States in the Union. But even here there are divisions. The States and their component parts are not all homogeneous in terms of economic and development program need. We forget this division at our peril.

That we have not forgotten this basic fact is evident. Section 403 provides for the encouragement of local area development through multicounty economic development districts by authorizing a 10-percent increase in development facility grants for projects in such districts and by emphasizing the need for coordinated district planning and programming.

In addition the bill also makes eligible for assistance development centers which are not distressed in themselves but where economic investment will contribute to the alleviation of high unemployment and low income in dependent surrounding areas.

These two elements of the bill are excellent commonsense clauses. They recognize the basic fact that you cannot build our national house of economic enhancement and stability from the roof down but from the foundation up—and indeed from the individual grassroots bricks of that foundation.

We have had important experience with this concept in rural Aroostook County, Maine, where loans to community developments in centers such as Presque Isle could not stand alone but

where economic stimulation was provided to surrounding low-income rural areas through the development of agricultural product processing facilities.

The other provisions of this bill are designed to work in harmony with the loan concept.

Title I of the bill, in a way, is an extension of the accelerated public works program which is out of funds. There is an important distinction though between this program and accelerated public works. The Accelerated Public Works Act was designed to help ease a general unemployment problem facing the Nation at the time it was passed. Funds for public works projects were made available to areas suffering the highest rates of unemployment.

Under S. 1648, the principal purpose is to increase the amount of Federal funds being expended both for general improvement of the physical structure of an area for specific improvements related to projected economic development. The idea is to assist the areas of need to improve and strengthen physical facilities, or infrastructure, so that they

may be better able to support long-term economic development.

The criteria for the approval of public facility and development facility projects under S. 1648 are more restrictive than they were under accelerated public works because, as I have just noted, the principal test to be applied in this new bill is the contribution the project will make to the long-term well-being of an area; not as it was under accelerated public works, the temporary relief of unemployment.

Some of the kinds of public facility projects to be financed under titles I and II of this bill—title II provides for loans for these facilities—can be partially financed under existing programs and others cannot. I have a partial listing of these projects with a notation as to whether or not partial financing is available under other programs. Without objection, I would like to place this listing in the RECORD at this point.

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

I. Public works and development facilities "directly" related to economic development

<i>Type of project</i>	<i>Existing grant-in-aid program</i>
Water works and water lines related to industrial and commercial development.	None.
Sanitary and storm sewers related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Industrial parks (land development and utilities).....	Do.
Police and fire stations related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Research centers related to industrial and commercial development.	Do.
Tourism facilities.....	Do.
Streets and roads related to industrial and commercial development.	50 percent from Bureau of Public Roads if on Federal aid highway system.
Waste treatment facilities relating to industrial and commercial development.	Up to 30 percent from PHS.
Area vocational schools.....	50 percent from Office of Education;
Airports.....	50 to 75 percent from FAA.
Watershed protection and flood prevention related to industrial or commercial development.	30 to 100 percent from Soil Conservation Service.

II. Public works and economic development facilities "indirectly" related to economic development (projects improving the "climate" of a community)

<i>Type of project</i>	<i>Existing grant-in-aid program</i>
Water works and water lines related to residential development.	None.
Sanitary and storm sewers primarily related to residential development.	Do.
Streets primarily related to residential development.....	50 percent from Bureau of Public Roads if on Federal aid highway system.
Waste treatment facilities not related to industrial or commercial development.	Up to 30 percent from PHS.
Hospitals related to community or district economic development.	44 to 66 percent from PHS.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, even though some of these projects can be assisted through grants under existing programs the idea behind S. 1648 is to provide additional assistance to projects that are located in areas of economic distress.

In the majority of eligible areas grants of up to 50 percent will be available. In the hardest hit areas, supplemental grants of up to 30 percent will be made. In no case will a project be entitled to more than 80-percent grant assistance under the bill.

The supplemental grants, incidentally, can apply to those projects receiving a grant under this program as well as to projects receiving direct grants under other programs.

Let me give an example of how this works. If a community waste treatment facility were entitled to a 30-percent grant from the Public Health Service, an additional 20-percent direct grant could be made under S. 1648. If that facility were located in a severely dis-

tressed area it could apply for an additional 30 percent under the supplemental grant provision of title I. The total Federal money in that project then would be the maximum 80 percent.

On the other hand if an airport project were entitled to a 75-percent grant from the FAA, only an additional 5 percent could be granted under the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Never can the total be greater than 80 percent and only the hardest hit areas would be entitled to an amount greater than 50 percent.

Under title II of S. 1648 loans can be made for public facility and development facility projects, and loans and working capital guarantees can be made for promising industrial and commercial projects. There is also a provision that enables the Secretary of Commerce to contract to pay to, or on behalf of businesses, a portion of the interest costs which they incur in financing their expansions from private lending sources.

Much of this title reflects an extension of the better features and experiences of the area redevelopment program, which is about to phase out. It is a very important part of this act since it provides the only direct financial assistance for privately financed industrial and commercial enterprises. These are the facilities that provide the permanent employment we are seeking to create under this legislation.

Title III also represents an extension of the Area Redevelopment Act program and incorporates some of the excellent provisions for technical assistance, planning, and research we have in the Appalachian regional program.

Title IV sets forth the eligibility requirements for the designation of redevelopment areas and development districts—groupings of counties and/or a labor market areas wishing to join together in an economic development effort. The criteria for area eligibility under S. 1648 follow quite closely the standards that were established for eligibility under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The provisions and standards for the establishment of multi-State regions are combined in title V. In this title is the recognition that the Appalachian regional experiment, even though just getting started, offers a means to deal with chronic depression problems extending across State lines. This title encourages and assist States in getting together to work jointly on common problems. An authorization of \$15 million annually, which I consider modest relative to the amount of work to be done, as authorized to help economic development regions in planning, in undertaking technical assistance programs, and to help finance their administrative expenses.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. McNAMARA] for the manner in which he has developed and moved this legislation. I also would like to compliment the ranking majority member of the Public Works Committee [Mr. RANDOLPH] and ranking minority member [Mr. COOPER], both of whom have made major contributions to making this a bill that will have great impact on improving our depressed areas.

I have had the unique experience of sitting on both of the committees which handled this bill. I would like to congratulate Senator DOUGLAS, the principal sponsor of S. 1648 and the father of the Area Redevelopment Act, whose work on the Banking and Currency Committee in considering this bill was most important. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. ROBERTSON] also deserves congratulations for making it possible to move this bill so rapidly to the Senate.

Our Nation has evolved greatly from the Jeffersonian concepts of an agrarian social base. Today many of our greatest economic problems center in urban or rural areas. The basic premise of national economic dependence upon strong, viable, and individual local economies is still valid.

As strong as our local foundation is built so will our national economic house

stand, today, tomorrow, and for years in the future. The emphasis provided in S. 1648 on this basic fact convinces me that this is strong, good legislation. I urge its enactment.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of May 23, 1965, entitled "ROBERTSON for Reelection."

This fine editorial refers to our colleague, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I heartily endorse not only the timeliness of the editorial, but also its substance, and wish to add a few words.

From my experience with the Senator from Virginia, observing his record, I do not believe the Nation has a finer or more effective champion of our great free enterprise system in all of its best features, it being one of the foundation mudsills of our great system of Government.

I certainly hope he will offer for reelection. I am confident he will be reelected if he does.

Having served for many years in the House of Representatives, and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and for the last several years and presently as the chairman of that important committee, I believe he knows the economy of this country as well as does any other Member of Congress, and better than most of us. He knows it from the standpoint of his own State, and he knows it from a national viewpoint.

He has been a guardian of the Treasury and a champion of sound fiscal affairs during all those years. We look to him for guidance in that field.

Furthermore, he is full of energy and vigor, turning out an unusual amount of work week after week and year after year.

He has the respect and esteem as well as the dedication of every one of his fellow Members of the Senate. We appreciate him for his fine services, and even more than that, for his staunch character. The editorial not only is a tribute which I feel for him, but I believe it expresses that of all the people and of his colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial 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 Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 23, 1965]

ROBERTSON FOR REELECTION

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON's third full term as U.S. Senator from Virginia expires next year. The Times-Dispatch herewith urges him to offer at that time for another term.

Senator ROBERTSON is vigorous and alert, both physically and mentally. He is one of the most knowledgeable and articulate men in the Senate. His mind is clear and his physique excellent. He is the same crack

shot and expert fly-fisherman that he was 40 years ago.

During his service in the Senate of almost 20 years, he has built up much seniority, and he is one of that body's most influential Members. It would take any successor a long time to acquire the influence and knowledge which he commands. Before going to the Senate, he served in the House for 14 years.

Senator ROBERTSON is chairman of one of the most important Senate standing committees—that on Banking and Currency—and also of one of the most important joint committees of the Senate and House, the Joint Committee on Defense Production. Both committee chairmanships are posts of exceptional influence.

In addition, he is fifth ranking member of the all-important Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office, and a member of the Subcommittees on Defense and Supplementals, Agriculture and Related Agencies, Independent Offices, and Public Works.

All of which places him in a most strategic position to have an impact on pending legislation. In fact, his subcommittees alone give him a voice in passing on about 96 percent of total Federal budget expenditures.

That voice, we are happy to say, is exercised on behalf of conservative principles in the spending of public funds. Senator ROBERTSON, we need hardly point out, is strongly and irrevocably opposed to the Government's continuing in times of peace and record-breaking prosperity to spend far in excess of income, year after year.

He is also against the extreme policies that are being demanded by the Johnson administration and by many in Congress on behalf of "civil rights."

While it might appear that in view of the present lack of fiscal responsibility in Washington, and the absence of sanity in the administration's racial program, Mr. ROBERTSON has not been able significantly to influence the course of events, this is not necessarily true. There is no telling what effect his vigorous and informed expositions on the floor of the Senate have had. On matters of banking and currency, and in discussing constitutional questions, he has been particularly impressive.

And in pushing for the adequate development of the James river, Senator ROBERTSON has been extremely helpful. His support for this project, so essential to Virginia, has been of crucial importance in bringing it to its present promising posture.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I heartily subscribe to all the good things the Senator from Mississippi has said, and said well, about the Senator from Virginia. They are all true. He is one of the bedrocks of conservatism in the Senate, the Congress, and the country. Too much cannot be said along those lines.

I accentuate what the Senator from Mississippi has said about the vigorous energy and the outdoor character of the man. I have had an opportunity to see him in the field. I do not think there is a better quail shot in the country today. So far as being a fisherman is concerned, I have seen him entice mountain trout from overhanging rocks with skill that surpasses my powers of description. I consider him one of the great sportsmen of our country. He is one of the

authors of the Robertson-Pittman Act, under which Americans have been assured enjoyment of the great outdoors and for their children and their grandchildren after them.

He is a real gentleman and a real Chesterfieldian Virginian.

I hope the editorial to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred states that he is going to be a candidate. If he is, I am sure no one will have the temerity to run against him and that we will have him back here with us.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Incidentally, this is the birthday of Senator ROBERTSON, and I know I express the good wishes of every Member of the Senate.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said by the distinguished Senators from Mississippi and Florida about our distinguished colleague, WILLIS ROBERTSON.

It has been my pleasure to have formed a warm friendship with WILLIS ROBERTSON since coming to this body. I have had the honor and pleasure of fishing and hunting with him in many fields and streams. I have never seen a man as rugged as he is for his age.

He still does push-up exercises each morning. I have had him almost walk me down in fields where we hunted quail. It is difficult to keep up with him and match his stamina on fishing expeditions.

In addition to being an avid sportsman, he is one of the great men of America. He is a distinguished lawyer. He has the courage of a lion. He believes that the Constitution says what it means and means what it says. He is the foremost Bible scholar in the Senate, and one of the most learned historians I have ever known.

He is truly an outstanding American, and a great Senator. It would be a great loss to the U.S. Senate if he were not among us, and Virginia would not be nearly so ably represented.

It is my hope, and I believe the hope of millions and millions of Americans, that WILLIS ROBERTSON will be a candidate for reelection. If he is, I believe he will be overwhelmingly reelected.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am honored to be able to join my colleagues in saying what has been said and will be said about the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I have had the pleasure of serving in both the House and the Senate with the distinguished Senator. I know of no one who is more able, no one who is more cooperative, no one who is more understanding. I make that statement without fear of contradiction, because while every chairman of a committee is cooperative, no chairman is more cooperative in speeding legislation to the floor, regardless of his personal views about it, than is the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

It is a point of pride with him that when legislation is referred to his committee, he does his best to see that it is given expeditious, fair, and judicious consideration, and reported to the Senate for debate and disposal, regardless of the personal views he may have with respect to a particular piece of legislation under consideration.

His contributions to his State and to the country have been many, and as majority leader of the U.S. Senate, I thank him for the tolerance, courtesy, and consideration he has shown to me and to every other Member of this body.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to associate myself with what has been said about WILLIS ROBERTSON. I have not had the pleasure of fishing and hunting with him, but I have had the distinct stimulation of being in disagreement with him on many occasions. I believe I have come out the better for it, because his counsel is wise. We act as chairmen of committees that have much to do with the economy of the United States.

Sometimes there is a little overlapping of jurisdiction, but WILLIS is always courteous and gentlemanly, and we sit down and work out what we believe will be in the best interests of the country.

The Senator from Virginia is vigorous. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] mentioned his strong right arm, like that of a heavyweight fighter.

I have not felt his arm lately, but I am sure it is stronger than those of two other heavyweight fighters who performed up in Maine the other day. I would be willing to put him in the ring with either one of them at any time.

But, WILLIS, I wish you a happy birthday and good, long life. I am sure that the people of Virginia are going to reciprocate and give you a resounding vote of approval for the fine work you have done in your many years in the House and the Senate, during many of which I have served along with you.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am very happy to join Senators today in paying tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I have had an opportunity during the past 7 years to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and I assure the Senate that all the glowing words which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has said about him are entirely true.

There is no man in the Senate who has a better awareness of the significance of the various facets of the economy than the Senator from Virginia. He knows the effect of what we are doing. Many times, in a very courageous way, he has invited the attention of the Senate, and particularly of its committees, to the significance

of the actions we were taking in committee. I am sorry to say that in some instances his advice has not been heeded as much as it should have been. At any rate, I am happy to have the opportunity to pay my own tribute to him, and to thank him for his courtesy and his help in the course of the conduct of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and other Senators in paying our respects to the Senator from Virginia on the occasion of his birthday.

Under the leadership of the Senator from Virginia, I have served as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and also as a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations.

First, the Senator from Virginia is a very able and competent man. He is a distinguished Phi Beta Kappa, a real scholar of the economy, as well as of the Bible. He is exceedingly fair. Sometimes we have been in opposition, and sometimes we have been in agreement with him; but whether with him or against him, he has always given every consideration to the views of those who serve with him.

He is also able to lighten some of the tedious moments of debate on complicated and difficult problems with a very delightful and saving sense of humor. The Senator from Virginia possesses a remarkable sense of humor because he never repeats the same joke. I do not understand how he does it. His stories are always delightful to hear.

The Senator from Virginia is also known as a guardian of the Public Treasury. He has done a magnificent job in that respect, both in the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Let me point out that the people of Wisconsin have been deeply impressed with the Senator from Virginia. He visited Wisconsin and spoke before our bankers association in Milwaukee, and he made a deep impression upon them.

I am very happy to have the honor to serve with the Senator from Virginia. I congratulate him on his birthday.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to join in this tribute to the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I know of his skill in the field and in the stream. I have not had the pleasure of fishing or hunting with him, but I have covered the same territory after he has left it, and I know that his success has diminished my potential for success in whatever waters he was fishing—whether in the countryside or in the Senate.

I have enjoyed serving under his chairmanship of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I came to the Senate 5 or 6 years ago and found the Senator from Virginia to be always courteous, thoughtful, and willing to give a young Senator a share of the legislative load to carry, whether his views were consistent with his, or were in disagreement. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the Senator from Virginia for the thoughtfulness and cooperation which he has given me while I have been in the Senate.

I wish him many, many long years of continued, successful public service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I promised to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, and then to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators in paying my respects to a very great Member of Congress. By that I mean the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

It has been my great pleasure, through the years, to serve with him as a Representative, and also as a Senator at the present time. I served with him in the House, where he was an acknowledged leader on matters of taxation by being a member of the most important Ways and Means Committee of that distinguished body.

He came to the Senate a considerable number of years before I did, and when I reached here, he had already become the leader of this august body in taking his part in the role of writing appropriations and banking and currency legislation.

I serve on the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Virginia. I have never seen a man able to go from the price of a postage stamp and the delivery of a first-class letter on to what the cost of a Coast Guard cutter should be. He speaks with great erudition. From there he can go to a discussion of a hotrod automobile for the Secret Service and how much it would cost.

The junior Senator from Virginia is truly a versatile man. No one dares to try to match him in the art of telling a story, or the lore of the ways of hunting and fishing.

I join my colleagues in congratulating the Senator on this very happy occasion of celebrating his birthday.

Mr. STENNIS. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the young man who sits behind me in the Chamber.

No mention has been made of his age. I do not suppose he will mind if I tell the Senate that today he is only 78. I understand that there are only two Senators who are older than he.

Mr. President, I have occasion to visit with him frequently in the baths in the Old Senate Office Building. He keeps in trim by taking his "daily dozen." I hope for him much success. I express the

hope that many of his colleagues will do what he does; namely, go out and take exercise every day. I am sure it would mean a longer life for them.

In addition to his "daily dozen," I know how my colleague dearly loves to spend as much time as possible behind his bird dogs cutting across the beautiful fields of Virginia. I know that he keeps his shooting eye in on both quail and ducks, and only regret that neither he nor I can find the time we were once able to spend out in the open.

I hope my good friend can continue to find time for hunting for many years to come, however, because on occasion I have been so fortunate as to share in the birds knocked down by his sharp eye and steady hand.

I fully agree with the editorial from which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] quoted. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] should be returned to this body with an overwhelming election victory next year.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have been hunting with the Senator from Virginia many times, and he never failed to walk me down. I do not leave until it grows so dark I can see the flash of a gun. I do not know how much longer he stays. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest to Senators that all of us can be nunc pro tunc. I wish to include my happy birthday wish to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I have served under him as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I can attest to his youth, his mettle, and his spirit.

There is no man with whom I would rather disagree than the Senator from Virginia, because he is so very pleasant, kind, and understanding about it. He is also a great sportsman.

Today, I certainly join in paying tribute to him, as one who serves with him, who has observed his sterling qualities, and has come to admire him greatly.

I wish him a happy birthday, as we say in my faith, until 120.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by my colleagues concerning the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, WILLIS ROBERTSON.

To those who have referred to his fishing, and to his hunting of quail, I am happy to say that my State of West Virginia is one of the States in which our colleague most often casts his fishing line and shoots the quail.

I have enjoyed serving in this body with Senator ROBERTSON. I sat with the Committee on Banking and Currency for a period of about 2 years. I marveled at his ability, his fairness, and his courage. I have sat at prayer breakfast with him, and I have marveled at his tremendous knowledge, not only of the Bible, but also of history.

I marvel even more at his ability to quote the Scriptures and the lines and words of great men. I congratulate the people of the State of Virginia on their

good judgment in having elected WILLIS ROBERTSON year after year to serve them in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

If I may be permitted to choose a bit of verse which I believe epitomizes my thoughts on this man and the thoughts which have been expressed by other Senators today, it would be that poem which was written by J. G. Holland some years ago entitled "Wanted":

God, give us men. A time like this demands

Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking.

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog

In public duty and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,

Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo. Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting justice sleeps.

God give us men.

Men who serve not for selfish booty,
But real men, courageous, who flinch not at duty.

Men of dependable character; men of sterling worth.

Then wrongs will be redressed and right will rule the earth.

God, give us men.

I think of WILLIS ROBERTSON as such a man. May this be a happy birthday for him, and may he long serve the people of Virginia and the Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well said indeed. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am very happy to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from West Virginia, and others. It is one of the blessings of the State of Maryland that we are juxtaposed to and border on the great Old Dominion State of Virginia.

I can remember my father telling me of WILLIS ROBERTSON many years ago. Since I came to the Senate he has gone out of his way to be kind to me, a freshman Senator. Even today he took 15 minutes out of his busy schedule to meet with a constituent and me to give us advice.

To me he epitomizes all those things which the great Virginian, Robert E. Lee, stood for in his lifetime. I hope that Senator ROBERTSON will be here for many more years.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this is a very delightful way to celebrate my 78th anniversary, which includes 49 consecutive years in public office.

I must plead guilty to the soft impeachment of age which has been attributed to me by my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Not long ago, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] took me on a fishing trip in Georgia, to a very delightful lodge. Over one of its doors

was a sign which read: "More people die of worry than from overwork, because more people worry."

Mr. President, so long as I can have the friendship of the Members of this body, all of whom—as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said—are younger than I am, except two, and will treat me as though I were their age; so long as I can have the friendship evidenced by my loyal friends in Virginia, who have urged me to be a candidate for reelection next year, I am not going to die of worry.

I thank my friends in the Senate. I shall always cherish their high tributes, although I recognize that they are really exercising the privilege of painting the lily.

Mr. STENNIS. Do not discount our words. We mean every one of them.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with order number 238, and that they be called in sequence.

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

The clerk will proceed to state the items referred to.

MAJ. RAYMOND G. CLARK, JR.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, United States Army, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,285.23, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay which the said Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, received for the period from May 19, 1950, through June 30, 1963, while serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made to the said Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service for certain periods during which he was enrolled as a temporary member of the United States Coast Guard Reserve. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Major Raymond G. Clark, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this Act

shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 248), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would relieve Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., U.S. Army, of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,285.23, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay which he received for the period from May 19, 1950, through June 30, 1963, while serving as a member of the U.S. Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service for certain period during which he was enrolled as a temporary member of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve. Provision is made that in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved; and section 2 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr., the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of the bill.

MRS. GENEVIEVE OLSEN

The bill (S. 69) for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Genevieve Olsen, of Ogden, Utah, the sum of \$3,375, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries resulting in permanent partial disability which were sustained by the said Chester J. Olsen on October 10, 1953, while he was performing duties as an employee of the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 249), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The bill would authorize payment of the sum of \$3,375 to Mrs. Genevieve Olsen, of Ogden, Utah, the widow of Chester J. Olsen, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries resulting in permanent partial disability sustained by Chester J. Olsen on

October 10, 1953, while performing duties as an employee of the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

LT. RAYMOND E. BERUBE, JR.

The bill (S. 97) for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Raymond E. Berube, Junior, United States Navy, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$797.27, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by the said Lieutenant Raymond E. Berube, Junior, for the period July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1964, such overpayments having been made as a result of his having been erroneously credited for pay purposes with military service previously performed as a midshipman in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Raymond E. Berube, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 250), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve the claimant, Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr., U.S. Navy, of liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$797.27, the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1964, which overpayments were made as a result of his having been erroneously credited for pay purposes with military service previously performed as a midshipman in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

LLOYD K. HIROTA

The bill (S. 134) for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lloyd K. Hirota, of Alea, Hawaii, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$782.93, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the United States Army, Office of the Quartermaster, at Honolulu, Hawaii, for the period from October 10, 1954, through June 16, 1962, such overpayments having been made as the result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate when he was erroneously promoted from grade GS-3y to grade GS-4x, effective as of October 10, 1954. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lloyd K. Hirota, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 251), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Lloyd K. Hirota, of Alea, Hawaii, of liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$782.93, the amount of overpayment of salary resulting from an administrative error, and to pay him the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment.

HONORATA A. VDA DE NARRA

The bill (S. 263) for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed (1) to accept any application filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by Honorata A. Vda de Narra of the Republic of the Philippines for the payment of insurance benefits previously authorized under section 602(d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (now repealed), and (2) to pay to the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra any insurance benefits the Administrator determines would have been payable to her under such section had she made application for such benefits within the time period prescribed by section 602(d)(5) of such Act, the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra not having been officially notified by the Department of the Army until January 29, 1958, of the death of her son, Florentino A. Narra, who died on March 1, 1942, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 252), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (1) to accept any application filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Honorata A. Vda de Narra of the Republic of the Philippines for the payment of insurance benefits previously authorized under section 602(d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (now repealed), and (2) to pay to the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra any insurance benefits the Administrator determines would have been payable to her under such section had she made application for such benefits within the time period prescribed by section 602(d)(5) of such act, the said Honorata A. Vda de Narra not having been officially notified by the Department of the Army until January 29, 1958, of the death of her son,

Florentino A. Narra, who died on March 1, 1942, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 304) for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel was announced as next in order.

Mr. FANNIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 321) for the relief of Leo M. Mondry was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT L. WOLVERTON

The bill (S. 572) for the relief of Robert L. Wolverson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Robert L. Wolverson, of Fenton, Missouri, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,260.23, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the United States Army, Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, Missouri, for the period from September 24, 1962, through December 28, 1963, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate at the maximum scheduled rate of the grade to which he was appointed, in violation of section 801 of the Act of October 28, 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), which provides that all new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Robert L. Wolverson, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 255), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Robert L. Wolverson, of Fenton, Mo., of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,260.23, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District, Missouri, for the period from September 24, 1962, through December 28, 1963, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error in establishing his salary rate at the maximum scheduled rate of the grade to which he was appointed, in violation of section 801 of the act of October 28, 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), which provides that all new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of

any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, it is provided that full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster, United States Air Force (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$4,153.83, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by the said Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster (retired), for the period from December 27, 1941, through August 31, 1960, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster (retired), referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 256), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired), of liability to the United States for \$4,153.83. The amount represents overpayments of longevity pay received by Lieutenant Colonel Schuster. Overpayments were received during the period December 27, 1941, through August 31, 1960. They resulted from an administrative error in the computation of his creditable service. The bill allows for credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for the amounts involved. The bill authorizes refund to Lieutenant Colonel Schuster of amounts received or withheld from him because of the overpayments.

OTTILIA BRUEGMANN JAMES

The bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Ottilia Bruegmanna James was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitation on the time within which applications for disability retirement are required to be filed under section 7(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2257(b)) is hereby waived in favor of Ottilia Bruegmanna James, a former employee of the Department of the Army, and her claim for disability retirement under such Act shall be acted upon under the other applicable provisions of such Act, as if her application had been timely filed, if she files application for such dis-

ability retirement within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to waive the limitation on the time within which applications for disability retirement are required to be filed under the Civil Service Retirement Act in favor of the claimant, a former employee of the Department of the Army.

Official records disclose that Mrs. Ottilia Bruegmanna James, a Department of the Army employee with over 29 years of Federal civilian service, resigned from her last permanent position on February 28, 1961, to accompany her husband, an Army warrant officer, to Honolulu, Hawaii. While in Hawaii she held a series of temporary appointments, with several weeks of unemployment between positions, at Headquarters, U.S. Army, Hawaii, from May 22, 1961, to July 27, 1963.

Mrs. James underwent an operation for a brain tumor on January 10, 1964, at the U.S. Army Tripler General Hospital in Hawaii and is considered incapacitated for future employment. On March 4, 1964, she applied to the U.S. Civil Service Commission for disability retirement benefits. Her claim was denied by the Commission on May 21, 1964, on the ground that an applicant for disability retirement must file for these benefits within 1 year following separation from the last period of permanent employment (70 Stat. 750 (1956), 5 U.S.C. 2257(b) (1958)). The temporary appointments held by Mrs. James in Hawaii did not come within the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Enactment of this legislation would waive the 1-year statute of limitations governing the filing of disability retirement claims and permit the U.S. Civil Service Commission to determine whether Mrs. James was entitled to disability retirement benefits at the time of her last period of permanent employment provided she applies for such benefits within 60 days of the enactment of this legislation. As the present bill pertains to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, the Department of the Army defers to the views of that agency.

FRED E. STARR

The bill (S. 1068) for the relief of Fred E. Starr was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to provide for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of Fred E. Starr, a former employee of the Department of the Air Force assigned to Headquarters, Pacific Air Force, Hawaii, from his last overseas duty station, Honolulu, Hawaii, to his permanent residence in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, and to pay, out of any funds available for the payment of transporting household goods, any unpaid storage charges which may be due on such household goods and personal effects at the time of shipment.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Fred E. Starr, the sum of \$1,095.28 in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for expenses incurred by the said Fred E. Starr in storing the household goods and personal effects referred to in section 1 of this Act prior to the shipment thereof authorized by this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1068 is to provide for the shipment at Government expense of the household goods and personal effects of Mr. Fred E. Starr, a former Air Force civilian employee at Headquarters, Pacific Air Forces (PACAF), Hawaii, from Honolulu, Hawaii, to his permanent residence in Menomonee Falls, Wis.; to pay any unpaid storage charges which may be due on such property at the time of shipment; and to reimburse Mr. Starr the sum of \$1,095.28, representing storage charges paid by him.

JACK C. WINN, JR.

The bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jack C. Winn, Junior, of Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$721.25, representing overpayments made on the date of his release from active duty in the United States Army on April 18, 1958, as a result of administrative error in the computation of payments due for accrued leave and excess leave. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Jack C. Winn, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 259), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Jack C. Winn, Jr., of Roswell, N. Mex., of liability to repay the sum of \$721.25, representing overpayments made on the date of his release from active duty in the U.S. Army on April 18, 1958, as a result of administrative error in the computation of payments due for accrued leave and excess leave.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1867) for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT L. YATES, AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 2299) for the relief of Robert L. Yates, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 26), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve 10 individuals who are present or former Air Force civilian employees at Brookley Air Force Base, Ala., of all liability to refund to the United States certain amounts representing overpayments of compensation. The overpayments were the result of administrative error in adjusting the rates of pay at the time of reclassification of the positions from the wage board system to positions under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

VERMONT MAPLE ORCHARDS, INC.,
BURLINGTON, VT.

The bill (H.R. 3051) for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 262), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt., arising out of participation in the St. Eriks Fair, Stockholm, Sweden, during the summer of 1963. An amount not to exceed \$2,671.21 may be allowed in full and final settlement of the claim.

MAXIE L. STEVENS

The bill (H.R. 3074) for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 263), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay to Maxie L. Stevens the sum of \$1,519.54 in full settlement of his claim for medical expenses and transportation associated with medical treatment related to his employment by the U.S. Weather Bureau on Wake Island.

C. R. SHEAFFER & SONS

The bill (H.R. 3899) for the relief of C. R. Sheaffer & Sons was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 264), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation to pay C. R. Sheaffer & Sons the sum of \$3,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses and losses incurred in vacating premises at the municipal fish wharves within the southwest urban renewal area at the direction of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

AMERICAN BANKING—SOUND AND
UNIQUE—ADDRESS DELIVERED BY
SENATOR HARRIS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma spoke at the State convention of the Oklahoma Bankers Association, on May 7, in Tulsa. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is a member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and has taken an active part in the Senate banking inquiry. He speaks with insight and authority on the Banking Industry and on governmental regulation of this industry. I believe the portion of his speech dealing with the banking industry will be of interest to all Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

AMERICAN BANKING—SOUND AND UNIQUE

Everybody agrees that the American system of private banks is sound and unique. No changes should be made in the laws or administration of this system without a great deal of study and serious thought.

On direction of the U.S. Senate, the permanent Senate Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am a member and of which Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, is chairman, is now conducting a banking inquiry.

While the inquiry may be embarrassing and at times painful for those in the industry, I believe the overall effect will be wholesome, because already there are indications of needed improvements in banking laws and procedures.

Our able chairman has made it clear from the very first that we are seeking, not sensationalism, but hard suggestions and indications where proper improvements may be made. Furthermore, he has followed a rigid policy of discussing in public only those banks which have been closed, so as not to cause harm to any bank still in operation.

Hearings were resumed this week, and I think it is possible the inquiry will continue through this session and even into the next one.

And, before it is finished, I look for the inquiry to focus further on so-called money brokers, on attempts by some unsavory characters to enter the banking industry and, also, to inquire into the operations of certain savings and loan associations.

As a result of our hearings thus far, there are obvious areas where improvements are in order. I want to emphasize that these are tentative and no final decisions have, of course, been reached. Many of these points were included in my "Report to Oklahoma Bankers" issued last month.

All of the banks which have failed, or are teetering on the brink of failure, which the committee has examined in detail to date, either were newly chartered banks or banks in which ownership had recently changed hands.

Therefore, it is on these situations my recommendations to date are focused.

Without question there is real room for improvement in the operation of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. I think there has been justified criticism of his rather openhanded chartering of new banks. Our testimony reveals that there has been rather lax examination procedures on applications for new charters, some sad experiences in connection with which have already caused tighter requirements in that office.

There has been a lack of cooperation on the part of the Comptroller of the Currency with the Federal Reserve Board, FDIC, and the Justice Department, although, since our hearings began, improvements have been made in this regard. In one particular case of a now closed bank, for example, the Comptroller possessed evidence of gross and criminal misconduct by a bank official, but did not furnish this information to the Justice Department or to the lending Federal Reserve Board or to the Insuring Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation until 12 months after the violations were committed, 9 months after the examination revealed them and 8 months after the regional comptroller had recommended that the matter be turned over to the Justice Department. This was a case involving a bank newly chartered by the present Comptroller.

It is imperative that the presently vague criteria for establishing a new bank be better defined and stated and that standardized, publicly announced, quasi-judicial hearings and procedures be established so that all parties concerned may testify for or against the granting of a new bank charter.

Testimony before the committee clearly reveals that in another case of a newly chartered bank which failed, such a hearing would probably have revealed evidence which would have caused the charter to be denied.

Tighter examinations and surveillance by the Comptroller's office is definitely indicated for a beginning period after an existing bank has changed hands. Sad experiences in this regard, also, have already caused that office to institute some improvements in this area.

Our hearings already indicate other areas of the banking laws need tightening. False statements to secure a loan from a bank insured by FDIC should be a violation of Federal law, just as it is when the statement is furnished to a federally insured savings and loan institution. False statements in an application for a bank charter should be more easily prosecuted under new criminal laws written and included in the U.S. Banking Code.

Further, there must be some limitation and restriction upon the newly developed practice of so-called money brokers furnishing deposits to a bank under certificates of deposit. This is a questionable, dangerous, and growing practice which has been involved in the recent failure of several banks. In some areas of the country, our evidence reveals, many banks needing deposits or compensating balances, have yielded to the temptation of paying high and sometimes exorbitant fees to money brokers for deposits. The inevitable result of the payment of such fees is the banks making loans, which would normally be classified as unbankable and too risky, in order to get a greater than usual return to keep up with the greater than usual amounts they are having to pay for deposits.

Unless this practice of money brokers is limited and restricted, unless there is some curtailment, licensing, or supervision of those engaged in the practice, the whole thing is

likely to spread to other banks and other areas of the country, as they take up the practice in order to meet the increased competition for deposits.

I think we need laws to prohibit the bulk of beginning capital in a new bank being money borrowed on a pledge of the new bank's stock. We have been investigating a situation where a group of people got control of eight banks with an initial investment of only \$2,000, making all of the acquisitions or getting a new charter on borrowed money, sometimes at 100 percent of the value involved and always by pledging the bank stock as collateral for the loan.

In this instance, as some of the notes became due and couldn't be paid, the whole house of cards fell, taking down with it some of the banks, leaving the others in a precarious position.

One further thing. I feel that we should not yet accept the suggestion some have made for a greater centralization of Federal bank authority in some kind of agency which would combine the powers now reposed in the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

These agencies are doing a better job of working together now than they previously were, and further improvements will be made, I am certain. I think that there is real strength in our system of diverse banking jurisdiction.

But further, and most important, our system of private banking in America is overwhelmingly sound. In 1964 and thus far in 1965, only 11 of the 14,000 private banks have had to close their doors.

We want to make improvements where indicated, but the system, itself, has proved to be sound and strong, developed through long experience and in response to the needs of our people, and ought not to be substantially altered on the evidence now at hand.

The American system of private banking is sound and unique. I want to work with you to help keep it so.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the calendar committee members on the other side of the aisle, and with their approval, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 237, H.R. 3708.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Works with amendments on page 14, after line 24, to strike out:

(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a) (1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a) (1) unless the Secretary has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract.

On page 16, after line 2, to strike out:

(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a) (1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a) (1) unless the Secretary has consulted with such State agency regarding such grant or contract.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 247), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE AND EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill provides for an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under a Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Ten objectives are listed, including income, health, housing, research, and employment. (See sec. 101 of section-by-section analysis.)

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to States for (i) community planning and coordination of programs for older citizens, (ii) demonstration projects, (iii) training of special personnel, and (iv) other programs to carry out the purposes of the act; to make grants and contracts with public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, institutes, or individuals for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and to make grants and contracts with any public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution for specialized training of personnel.

The duties of the Administration are to—

- (1) serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging;
- (2) assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to problems of the aged and aging;
- (3) administer the grants provided by this act;
- (4) develop plans, conduct and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging;
- (5) provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the aged and aging;
- (6) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons;
- (7) gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and
- (8) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

There is established an Advisory Committee on Older Americans consisting of the

Commissioner as Chairman, and 15 persons appointed by the Secretary who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in special problems of the aging.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out one change made by the committee. In my judgment, it is a change which would be very important to the States. It would require consultation in respect to activities carried out under the bill with the State authorities. It would not be a veto, but State authorities would be fully informed and given an opportunity to participate in what studies, et cetera, are being made. I think that is a distinct improvement in the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is a source of great satisfaction to me that the Senate today has given unanimous approval to the Older Americans Act of 1965.

This is a great day for the more than 18 million Americans who are 65 and over.

The bill we have approved today differs only slightly from the version approved March 31 by the House of Representatives. Hopefully, the House will accept the Senate amendments without a conference and the act can go quickly to the White House for the President's approval.

The Senate action today climaxes an effort that dates back to the first National Conference on Aging, convened by President Harry S. Truman in 1950.

Further, it follows through on the recommendation by the 1961 White House Conference on Aging.

Extensive examination has been made of the problems of our senior citizens beginning with the 86th Congress by the Special Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which I was chairman. It was continued by the Special Committee on Aging, which I directed in the 87th Congress and which continues its useful work today.

All of these studies and public hearings pointed to the need for a high-level agency, within the Federal Government, exclusively concerned with the problems of the elderly, and for a program of grants-in-aid for State programs on aging.

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island. His dedicated and skillful handling of this legislation in the House has made final approval possible.

For several years now, Congressman FOGARTY and I have jointly introduced legislation to achieve the purposes of this act.

It is worth noting, I believe, that this bill—a major piece of legislation—is unusual in that it originated within the Congress rather than as a recommendation from the administration.

While it now has administration support, its origin, concept, and development took place entirely within the Congress.

It is worth noting too, that this legislation has attracted widespread, bipartisan support, as the 394-to-1 vote in the

House and the unanimous action of the Senate attests. A total of 23 Senators joined me in cosponsoring the Senate version of this measure.

As I noted earlier, the Senate has made only minor changes in H.R. 3708, the bill approved by the House. These amendments would remove the requirement that State agencies must approve grant programs or contracts with public and nonprofit organizations for research and demonstration projects and specialized training of personnel.

However, the bill stipulates that the Secretary must consult with the State agency before authorizing these grants or contracts.

I believe this will prove to be a satisfactory arrangement.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 has a dual purpose:

First, it will establish an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Second, it will authorize a 5-year program of Federal grants to the State and to public and private nonprofit agencies for research, training, community planning, and demonstration projects relating to aging.

The bill also creates a new position of Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President and subject to confirmation by the Senate, to be head of the Administration on Aging. In addition, the act provides for an Advisory Committee on Older Americans consisting of 15 citizen members who have experience and interest in the special problems of the aging, with the Commissioner on Aging as Chairman.

An important result of this act will be to erase the stigma of welfare from the problems of older people, by removing the function from the Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and giving it co-equal status as a separate Administration.

The functions of the Administration on Aging are defined in the act as follows:

First. Serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging.

Second. Assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to problems of the aged and aging.

Third. Administer the grants provided by this act.

Fourth. Develop plans, conduct and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging.

Fifth. Provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the aged and aging.

Sixth. Prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons.

Seventh. Gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and

Eighth. Stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

The act also encourages the establishment of State agencies on aging by providing grants to the States, the District

of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. Title III authorizes \$5 million in fiscal 1966 and \$8 million in fiscal 1967. In order to qualify for these grants, a State plan must be submitted to the Secretary which includes the following:

First. A single State agency.

Second. Financial participation by the State or communities in the projects and activities under the plan to insure continuation after termination of Federal financial support.

Third. Programs and activities to carry out the purposes of the act, including furnishing services to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations.

Fourth. Methods of administration including personnel standards on a merit basis.

Fifth. Approval of projects of public or nonprofit agencies or organizations.

Sixth. State reports.

The \$5 million authorized for the States will be allocated in the amount of \$50,000 to each State, with the remainder distributed under a formula based on the ratio of the population aged 65 or over in such State bears to the national population aged 65 or over.

These grants to States require State participation for each project in an amount equal to 25 percent of the cost of the project in the first year, 40 percent the second year, and 50 percent the third year.

Under titles IV and V, grants and contracts may be authorized by the Secretary with public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, institutions or individuals for demonstration and evaluation projects and for specialized training of personnel to carry out the purposes of the act. For these purposes, \$1.5 million in fiscal 1966 and \$3 million in fiscal 1967 is authorized.

I believe the Federal Government in cooperation with State and local governments should assist the older people to attain the full and free enjoyment of the objectives contained in the act, as follows:

First. An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

Second. The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.

Third. Suitable housing, independently selected, designed, and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

Fourth. Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

Fifth. Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

Sixth. Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.

Seventh. Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

Eighth. Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

Ninth. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

Tenth. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Senate approval of H.R. 3708 is an impressive step toward achieving these objectives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3708) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and other members of the calendar committee for clearing the bill for consideration this afternoon.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am privileged to receive communications from citizens from all over the United States calling to my attention developments in education and items of interest to education.

Today, I should like to share with the Senate a speech which was delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Connecticut last May 15 to the annual convention of the Massachusetts Vocational Association which is, in my judgment, of interest and importance to all Senators.

Education and juvenile delinquency are interrelated subjects. The quality of the education we offer our young people I believe to be inversely correlated with juvenile delinquency rates. The better the schools do the jobs, the less work our other social agencies will have to do. But until the day arrives when each of our schools can be raised to the standards now set by the best, it will be necessary for us to invest heavily in services to the child in trouble.

Certainly, Senator Dodd points out the services we are beginning to provide under the authorities of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act are very important in this total context. Physical and mental health of children, as he suggests in his stimulating address are areas needing more attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE MASSACHUSETTS VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, NORTH DARTMOUTH, MASS., SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1965

I am pleased and privileged to be here today with those who have made a national

and even an international reputation in the vital field of vocational education—the members of the Massachusetts Vocational Association.

You and I are really in the same field, that of helping our young people to build constructive, decent, fruitful lives.

Your primary task is to prepare them for a productive place in society, and your success in that is widely known and heralded.

My field, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, is to try to find ways of preventing boys and girls from being already warped and destroyed by the time they come to your classroom—and I wish that I could claim the success that you have enjoyed.

But we are making progress in many directions.

A variety of youth programs centered around the school dropout is now underway.

Today I wish to speak about a vitally critical area that has up to now received far less attention—the very young, the preschool and primary school child.

Ten years ago, a group of social scientists made a study and ventured some predictions that should have a stunning impact on contemporary society.

The subject of this inquiry was a large number of 6-year olds who were starting school in a Bronx slum.

Its object was to predict the future for the youngsters.

What kind of people would they have become 10 years hence?

Would they be climbing toward productive lives or on their way to prison?

The factors in this study were the child's family and neighborhood; and for most of the slum first-graders these factors were uniformly bleak—an unknown or absentee father; a delinquent or overly permissive mother; a vice infested neighborhood; grinding poverty on the outskirts of plenty; and the total absence of authority, discipline, and good example, lacking even the elemental germs of culture or worthy endeavor.

On the basis of all measurable influences the sociologists made individual forecasts on the fate of each child and foretold for most a useless and futile life of degeneracy and crime—unless something in the picture changed.

Ten years passed.

The sociologists checked out their tragic prognoses and sadly pronounced them to be incredibly accurate.

By the age of 16 almost every one of the designated innocents of a decade before was well advanced from promiscuity into hardened criminality.

There were 3 deviations; 3 out of 200 were spared.

And when the sociologists inquired as to why, they found that in each case their predictions were upset by the unexpected intervention of an outside influence—a concerned and dedicated grandmother who took over the child's upbringing just in time to cheat the grim pattern of predictability from claiming another foreordained victim.

Surely this episode confronts our people with some jarring questions that do not yield to the comfortable formulations of old.

If these children could be scientifically consigned to prison as infants because of the inheritance they received from society, what light is thus thrown on the theological dogma of free will, or upon the political concept of free choice, or upon the judicial doctrine of due process of law, in its broadest sense?

To say the least, they seem largely inoperative when environmental circumstances sink below certain levels of decency.

And if we are to proceed with our war on crime, against what or whom is it to be mounted?

Against conditions which breed criminals with almost infallible mathematical precision?

Or against the youths whose essential crime is that they are the faithful products of their environment, just as much as is the Irish girl in the convent or the Oxford don who wears tweeds, speaks the King's English and conducts learned inquiries?

The questions answer themselves.

Against this sombre background, the familiar remedies—more dogs, longer nightsticks, stiffer sentences, more foot patrolmen, are revealed as non sequiturs.

They are necessary, to be sure.

But necessary for what?

Not to win a war against what we like to think of as an alien condition called crime, but rather to defend society from the retribution of its own undisownable product.

We can go on multiplying canine corps and radio patrols until the squad cars outnumber the 6 years olds, and still the streets will not be safe nor the prisons sufficient.

Or we can do something else, we can stop reproducing this monstrous byproduct of our civilization with which the police are desperately grappling.

The only practical answer, the only intelligible answer—even leaving aside such considerations as idealism and charity—is for society to perform the role of the intervening grandmother for all those 6 year olds who have no interested grandmother, or anyone else who cares enough about them to introduce love, direction and discipline into their lives.

Social science is able to do far more than to accurately predict the degeneration and imprisonment of infants who have not even reached the age of reason.

If society can diagnose a towheaded boy as an inevitable criminal on the day he enrolls in the first grade, then it can also meet him at the school door with the means of deliverance—whether it be a social worker, or a psychologist, or a "big brother," or a grandmother.

One of the gravest weaknesses of our society is that its redemptive organs, its saving forces, do not begin to function in most places until too late, until the child has already been warped into a chronic rebel or an incipient lawbreaker.

This need not be so; it is preposterous that it is so.

If free will, free choice, and equal justice are to have full meaning the community must take on some overseeing role in the life of every child likely to have been abandoned at birth, so far as life's essentials are concerned.

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Mr. Walter Tobriner, recently requested that the law for Washington be changed to require doctors to report to authorities on gunshot wounds and the physical abuse of children.

That this should have to be proposed in our Nation's Capital in the year 1965 is of itself a dismal commentary on the heedlessness and irresponsibility of adult society.

But, things being as they are, can we not go further than the good Commissioner?

Why cannot we set up machinery for periodic physical and emotional checkups from birth on for children enduring those conditions so neatly categorized by the unerring crime forecasters?

The skilled eye can usually perceive whether there is something physically or mentally wrong.

We are told that a child experiences about half of his mental and emotional growth during his first 5 years of life.

Yet this is the very period when the child is beyond the scope of our civilized institutions and is at the mercy of chance—the chance that he will be granted the blessing of good and enlightened parents.

For many an infant, this supreme gamble of life is lost; far better for them to have

been born orphans and to have had their parents selected and their environment watched over by an adoption agency.

We must lift the veil that shrouds those early years.

Many communities require an annual inspection of automobiles to protect the public safety.

How about children?

Public policy has begun to move in this direction.

This summer the Federal war-on-poverty program, working in cooperation with hundreds of communities, will conduct preschool clinics for 500,000 youngsters, aged 4 and 5.

The children involved will be primarily slum children who are already so far behind their contemporaries in the rudiments of civilization as to be virtually counted out in the race of life at its outset and unable to meet the meager demands of the first grade.

This effort seeks to bridge the cultural gap and the health gap that yawns so incredibly between the underprivileged and the average.

Its directors are prepared to find that a high percentage of these preschool youngsters are suffering from malnutrition and hearing and eyesight failures which can be corrected.

Others will be unable to use or to understand the language sufficiently to know what is going on in a primary school classroom.

Still other tortured little souls will be emotionally unable, for a hundred dark and unknown reasons, to adapt to the classroom atmosphere without extensive remedial training.

I regard this program as one of the most intelligent and promising enterprises of our time, and I hope that every community will give the fullest cooperation.

But it faces great odds.

How much of the crimes against childhood can be undone in a few weeks of summer school?

How many of the children who most need this training will not attend, through parental neglect?

But it is an important step forward toward the assumption by society of its rightful responsibility toward the child and I hope and expect that it will lead toward the more comprehensive approach I have suggested today.

And I suggest further that every school, beginning with primary schools, have a unit concerned solely with the total health of each child in its care, with ready access to whatever mental and medical assistance that is needed.

Would that such concern and care had been available to Lee Harvey Oswald and a million like him who today roam the streets in bitterness and hatred.

What better investment can we make than that which heals the sick and the disturbed child—and prevents the adult invalid or psychopath?

Thankfully, under legislation begun by President Kennedy and carried forward by President Johnson, we have begun to build and to staff mental health clinics in hundreds of cities for the public at large.

But how much more thorough we should be when it comes to children, in their precious, formative years, who do not know enough to go to a clinic, who do not know yet that they are sick, or that they have been robbed in infancy of that which we rightly declare to be the birthright of everyone.

The new clinics could serve hand in hand with the school facilities I have recommended, facilities financed in part through Federal aid, which has at last come to the assistance of our school systems.

There are two predictable objections to reforms of this kind:

One, we don't have the money.

Two, we don't have the right to meddle with a child's upbringing until a total catastrophe has occurred.

To the first objection I say that we must find the money. And if self-preservation remains man's primal instinct, we will find it, either for more and more prisons and police and perhaps even neighborhood pill-boxes, or for remedial programs which fight the variable conditions instead of the constant effects.

And if we are really economy minded, we shall choose the latter, for the cost of curing a child is far less than that of caging a criminal.

We have already found the money for many other worthy programs.

We have already decided as a nation, for instance, that we will finance the medical and mental care of our aged.

Now, in the venerable tradition of first things last, I say again, how about the children?

The second objection, that society has no supervisory role over children until the time they enter reform school, is a foolish sentiment that the people of this country entertained and discarded long ago.

We faced this issue when we were trying to outlaw child labor and establish a minimum age for leaving school.

The self-styled moralists of those days, and the strange spokesmen for the dignity of the family, argued that only the father had the right, a divine and inherent right, to decide the fate of the child and to determine whether his 8-year-old should be schooled, or put to work in mine or factory, or regularly horsewhipped, for that matter.

In time, the American people decided that this was Old World nonsense, that society had a stake in and a responsibility to each child, that freedom was safe only in enlightened hands, and that children had some rights, too.

And besides that, our forefathers had broken with the concept of divine rights as far back as 1776, when they came out for human rights.

That view holds true today—and it must be extended to protect the abused and exploited youngsters of our day.

There must be a way for society to judge whether parents are fulfilling, by any civilized standard, their minimal trust, and a way of intervening, as did the grandmothers, in time to salvage the future of the child.

We all recognize this, of course.

The principle is firmly established in the law.

It is the application of the principle that is wanting.

We must stop waiting until flagrant abuse knocks us over the head, until the child stands in the prisoners dock, or lies in the hospital emergency room, before we assert our interest.

We must perfect our ways of uncovering these tragic miscarriages of trust, so easy to perceive.

I have described one approach, which I hope will receive consideration.

The concept that society must find effective methods of intervening to reverse the tide of disintegration that is engulfing large segments of our people is really at the heart of the practical and unpretentious social revolution of our time. This revolution finds its most ambitious and hopeful expression in the great programs of reform, rehabilitation and education proposed by President Lyndon Johnson.

But its guiding thought has for many years been the motivation of groups such as the Massachusetts Vocational Association—helping young people to help themselves through education.

Vocational education, in particular, is one of the keystones of our national effort to fight poverty, unemployment and crime.

Few satisfactions can equal that of teaching boys and girls the skills that will sustain them throughout life and enable them to

be productive citizens, contributing greatly to the life of their communities.

And few endeavors reap such a harvest of public good.

So many things go hand in hand in our attempt to redeem our American civilization from the demoralization that threatens it.

Building up our schools.

Cleaning up our slums.

Curing our emotionally disturbed.

Ending discrimination.

Opening up opportunity.

Curbing the filth in our movie theaters and on our newsstands.

Controlling the insane traffic in guns and drugs.

Elevating the level of our popular art—television.

Improving the administration of justice.

Caring for neglected children—so many good things to be done.

And we are doing them.

And none is more important than the calling to which you have dedicated your lives.

Teach a boy a trade and you have given him something upon which he can fashion the building of his life.

And so it has been an honor for me to be with you today and to discuss these good causes with pioneers who have for many years been blazing the trail to that greater America for which we all hope and work and pray.

Thank you.

THE UNDECLARED WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleague in the House, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, has made a penetrating and eloquent statement in a discussion in explanation of a recent vote, on which she voted against the President's bill providing for a \$700 million military appropriation to conduct his undeclared war in South Vietnam.

Of course, the bill was but a vehicle that the President used, by his own admission, to obtain a vote of confidence from the Congress of the United States in support of his unconstitutional war. Representative GREEN has made a statement as to why she voted against the appropriation. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH GREEN REGARDING ADDITIONAL \$700 MILLION MILITARY APPROPRIATION REQUEST MAY 1965

Cloaked in the disguise of a military appropriation bill—this House was asked to approve—and did approve—this Government's policy of escalating the war in southeast Asia. Six of my colleagues and I dissented.

Since it is conceded by everyone, including the President, that the \$700 million was not the issue at hand, then at a minimum, surely, in this body which the Speaker refers to as the greatest deliberative body in the world, there should be full discussion of what this resolution does mean while there is still time, hopefully, to resolve these tragic affairs before we bring down upon our heads the wrath of the world and shatter the frail edifice of world peace.

To my colleagues and my constituents I want to say that for many, many months now I have searched for every possible excuse to support my Government in the policies it is pursuing in Vietnam—and I have supported it. In spite of the shaky logic of the

domino theory, I have done my very best to believe in it; in spite of the fact that the people of South Vietnam have been subjected to one unpopular and unstable dictatorship after another, I have done my best to believe we are defending their freedom; in spite of the fact that we have violated the Geneva accords, I have done my best to believe this was justified because the North Vietnamese did also; even though I know that two wrongs do not make a right; in spite of one humiliating military defeat after another, I have done my best to believe all the optimistic reports about our really winning the war over there; in spite of all the evidence of internal discord and revolt against the governments we maintain in power, I have done my best to believe this is what the Vietnamese people really want us to do—but my fellow Americans, there is a point beyond which credibility simply will not stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war—we pursue a policy of peace.

This vote represented—in my opinion—a vote for that delusion. It could not have been a vote for \$700 million, for the President himself said this was available in any case. It could not have been a vote to show our united determination to halt Communist aggression, for if more than a decade of effort, more than 400 American lives, more than \$3 billion expended does not show this, then how can \$700 million demonstrate it?

One of the things the vote could mean, though, is what in fact everyone knows it will be interpreted to mean and that is congressional approval for the continued bombings of North Vietnam and commitment of thousands and thousands of American troops to a war the justice and wisdom of which has been questioned inside and outside this Nation by citizens and friends of unimpeachable loyalty. I think it also clearly means the relinquishment by Congress of its constitutional authority to declare war, for if the President can direct bombing raids on North Vietnam by simple Executive fiat, why can he not direct similar action against any other nation at any other time?

Why bother to ask? Once the bomb is dropped, it can always be pointed out that rightly or wrongly—legally or illegally—we are in a war and that American lives are at stake and that it would be disloyal to not approve funds for the war.

I cannot in good conscience lend myself to that kind of devious usurpation of congressional power—and for the purpose of continuing a course of action which I believe will only reap at best, decades of hostility, enmity and distrust of my countrymen by the peoples of Asia or, at worst, utter catastrophe for my Nation and the world.

Yet but an hour and a half debate was allotted for discussion of a measure which profoundly affects the future of our country—and the world, and less than 15 minutes of that time was given to those who might have reservations—who might have questions—who might disagree. I find it impossible to understand why an admittedly unnecessary appropriation request need be manted in a cloak of urgency and secret meaning with full, free and frank discussion of its merits denied.

The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who, in one breath, demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project, because some of the participants criticized administration policy in Vietnam and then—in the next breath—he admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that "every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs," and this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority party a voice in foreign policy decisions. His exact quote is: "These teach-ins are a protest against the national policy of our country.

It seems to me that when we have individuals conducting these teach-ins and acting as leaders in these groups, that it is not in the best interests of the national security of our country for our Government to subsidize this kind of operation by financing projects in which these same people play a prominent role." I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow the advice of the gentleman from Wisconsin—making certain we don't subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

And yet, I wonder if any policy, domestic or foreign, which its supporters here in this House are unwilling to risk to the judgment of free and inquiring minds can prove anything except on the part of its advocates, an abysmal lack of confidence in its strength. Surely a policy in which one believes deeply can stand examination and discussion.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Representative from my State. I agree with every observation that she has made. In my judgment, in due course of time, history will sustain her. In due course of time, American historians will write about this major mistake that the President of the United States made when he asked for support of the bill and sought this vehicle for obtaining a vote of confidence of the Congress that should never have been extended to him. I am proud to be associated in the Congress with the Representative from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from a committee group of Wayne University in Michigan signed by David Wineman, chairman, professor of political science, Wayne University, in support of the position which the senior Senator from Oregon has taken in opposition to America's undeclared war in Asia.

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

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following declaration was adopted by the Detroit teach-in of May 15 attended by approximately 300 persons:

1. Power should not be America's way of dealing with small nations.
2. Our Government must adopt a policy of self-determination of nations without qualification.
3. We demand the \$50 billion now spent by the United States on armaments be used to eradicate poverty at home and abroad with no strings attached.
4. We specifically recommended that the suspension of bombings of North Vietnam be permanent and that the United States immediately seek negotiations to end the war in Vietnam without qualifications as to time, place, or participants, including the national liberation front and withdraw all foreign troops from that nation in accord with the Geneva agreement.
5. We deplore the administration's failure to send a representative to the national teach-in.

DAVID WINEMAN,
Chairman, Detroit Teach-in, Cosponsored
by the Wayne Chapter, University's
Committee on Problems of War and
Peace, and Wayne Student Committee
To End the War in Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. While I am commenting on this subject, I wish to say that it still is not too late for the President to

recommend a declaration of war. It is not too late for the President to get back within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. It is not too late for the President of the United States to suggest that we keep our commitments under the United Nations Charter and lay this whole threat to the peace of the world before the United Nations for his jurisdiction.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Dallas Morning News, a Texas newspaper, entitled "Brinkmanship" be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News,
Apr. 29, 1965]
BRINKMANSHIP

President Johnson is understandably annoyed with the critics of his Vietnam policy—primarily because he is right and they are wrong. Liberal isolationists at home and myopic defeatists abroad—from Walter Lippmann to Charles de Gaulle—have been urging the President to back down, to negotiate with the enemy at almost any price. On Monday Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, called the President's policy "immoral and godless."

What these people object to is the policy of brinkmanship, honed to a fine art by Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, but practiced to some extent by four presidents, both Republican and Democrat, since World War II. Dulles, defining brinkmanship, once said: "You have to take chances for peace just as you must take chances in war."

The President's statement, "From Munich until today we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings more destructive war," is a variation on the same theme.

Former President Truman followed this advice by going to the brink with success to stop Stalin in Libya, Turkey, the Dardanelles and Greece, to break the Berlin blockade, to save at least half of Korea. The major foreign-policy disaster during his term of office was the loss of China, which might have been prevented if Truman had not avoided brinkmanship. In fact, if we had been willing to take the risk then, there might have been no Korean war and no problem today in Vietnam.

Ike obtained an armistice in Korea by going to the brink, by threatening to bomb Red China beyond the Yalu. He saved half of Indochina by coming to the aid of the beleaguered French with an airstrike, risking 7th Fleet brinkmanship in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu and saved Lebanon by sending in the Marines.

There were foreign-policy losses, too, under Eisenhower. But they resulted from a refusal to go to the brink, a decision to remain passive during the East German revolt in 1953, the Hungarian uprising of 1956, Red China's seizure of Tibet in 1959 and Castro's take-over of Cuba the same year.

Perhaps the best example of brinkmanship and the resulting coldwar victory for the United States was the show of force by the late President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962—a risky eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation which might have led to World War III, but instead sent the Russians home with their tails (and missiles) between their legs.

Surely these numerous tests of the brinkmanship policy should have taught us a few lessons. Among them are these: (1) The Communists have been successful in expanding their empire only by the use or threat of force, when we have been passive;

(2) they have been repelled only by our use or threat of force; (3) protest without action has got us nowhere, and (4) the alternative to brinkmanship is slow surrender.

The liberal isolationists and defeatists were wrong when they attacked brinkmanship under Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, and they are wrong today. They have failed to learn the lessons of history which teach, as the President put it so well Tuesday: "To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace." What they cannot seem to realize is that defeat in South Vietnam or anywhere else, as the President warned, "would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression. It would encourage and spur on those who seek to conquer all free nations that are within their reach."

Mr. MORSE. That editorial from Texas raises a serious question as to the wisdom of our course of action in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Talk," from my hometown newspaper in Eugene, Oreg., the Eugene Register-Guard, which I assure the Senate is not considered a Morse newspaper.

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

LET'S TALK

Apparently the United States will join other nations in a conference, probably at Geneva, to talk about the integrity of the borders of Cambodia. Cambodia is worried about this matter and wants the conference. But since Cambodia has kicked the United States out of its country, and since the United States left without protest, it's a little hard to see what this Nation can contribute to any discussion of a place where it isn't wanted.

Nonetheless, the United States definitely should take part. For Cambodia is far from the burning issue in southeast Asia. A conference of the nations that met at Geneva in 1954 to reorganize the former French territories in southeast Asia would not talk long about Cambodia. Sooner or later, and probably sooner, the talk would shift to Vietnam. Thus, a meeting called ostensibly to talk about a minor problem could be a device for backing into discussions of Vietnam, where the controversy carries the seeds of world war.

Since April 7, President Johnson has had the country on the record as willing to talk—anyplace, anytime, with anybody—about ways to end the killing. And talk we must. It is no sign of weakness to seek an honorable peace.

The alternative to talk is total war, not just against North Vietnam but against the real power, Red China. That we do not want. But neither do we want all southeast Asia to be swallowed up by a nation that boasts it is bent on conquest.

Negotiation is not the same as surrender. This is a point that was overlooked last weekend at the all-night rally at the University of Oregon. One group there appeared to advocate turning all Vietnam over to the Red Chinese. Period. Another, more realistic, urged that we explore ways to stop the killing.

Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator Morse said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone.

The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to throw some of the responsibility to its critics.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial went so far as to say:

Also, it is perfectly reasonable, as Senator Morse said at the rally, that we try to interest other nations, also, in this major threat to world peace. The trouble has been thus far that other nations have been disinclined to help in stemming Communist aggression while Uncle Sam was willing to do it alone. The meeting at Geneva might be this Nation's chance to throw some of the responsibility to its critics.

I highly commend the Eugene Register-Guard for at least lifting its journalistic blinders slightly and letting a few rays of light and truth creep into its journalistic policy. It is very encouraging, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Curry Democratic Central Committee Backs Morse's Views on Viet," written by Ruth Brewer, and published in the Coos Bay, Oreg., World of April 28, 1965.

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

CURRY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE BACKS MORSE'S VIEWS ON VIET (By Ruth Brewer)

GOLD BEACH.—An apparent grassroots movement supporting Senator WAYNE MORSE on his stand against the war in Vietnam gained strength this week when the Curry County Democratic Central Committee unanimously agreed to go on record as approving the Senator's views.

To his knowledge, this is the first such action taken by a county central committee, according to Charles Brooks, Morse's administrative assistant in Oregon, who was reached by telephone this week.

Prior to agreeing to notify MORSE of the committee's stand, members held a lengthy discussion on the Vietnam war, the dangers involved and damage to prestige of the United States as the results of actions in Asia.

The full text of a speech delivered last Friday, April 23, in Eugene by MORSE was read to the committee by chairman Bruce Manley.

On the basis of past knowledge, MORSE's fight to get the United States out of the situation, helped by such Senators as GRUENING, of Alaska; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; CHURCH of Idaho, and others, and contents of the Eugene talk, the committee appeared unanimously in agreement from the beginning of the discussion.

"Senator MORSE has been carrying this almost alone * * * he needs all the support he can get, and it's time he realizes that he has it," was one comment.

While it was generally thought that many persons in the country do not keep up with the situation in Asia through the news, and actually avoid trying to understand the complicated matter, "the man on the street is changing his views," another stated.

"If we are trying to impress Asiatics, we aren't doing it * * * they will resent a police state administered by the United States as much as if it were administered by one of the Red countries. (Asiatics) are just interested in putting rice in their bellies and don't care who runs the shoestore down the street," was the opinion of another member of the committee.

It was felt that public opinion is going toward the Senator's views, though few of the news media had given their support. One of those mentioned as having come out in favor of MORSE's opinions was the World, which has supported him editorially.

Though, in the opinion of one, Democrats taking an open stand "might split the party,"

it was felt that after such action, others who share the same sentiments would soon make themselves heard, and regardless of any repercussions, the seriousness of the issue warranted the action.

Though the cry of "communism" might soon be raised in speaking out, "let them cry," declared one member. "If there is one thing I abhor, it is communism. I stand for this country and freedom, and it is my duty and privilege to speak out * * * we are not containing communism, we are helping it (by loss of friendship among the nations of the world due to the Viet situation)," he concluded.

Senator MORSE is to be notified of the committee action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received from one Karl S. Landstrom a letter dated May 10, 1965, expressing his disagreement with my position on the undeclared war in Asia, and also commenting, by way of criticism, that he did not think I had called enough attention to communications of criticism that I have received. Perhaps Mr. Landstrom has not been diligent in reading the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon; but I would not want him to feel slighted. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Landstrom's letter of criticism of the senior Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ARLINGTON, VA.,
May 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I believe your position in regard to the South Vietnam problem is entirely wrong.

It is disturbing to me, as a graduate of the University of Oregon, and at one time a student in commercial law under your own tutelage, and as one who remembers your service at the university as dean of the law school, to note that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 you inserted, with apparent approbation, a letter from a University of Oregon professor who threatens nonpayment of her Federal income tax as a means of producing a change in the administration's policy in Vietnam. Surely you do not endorse so-called peaceful civil resistance to the point of violation of the law.

It would be interesting, I think, if you would insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the communications that you must be receiving which disagree with your views and support the views of the administration and the vast majority of Members of Congress in the handling of the matters in South Vietnam.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

KARL S. LANDSTROM.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Landstrom says, in part:

It is disturbing to me, as a graduate of the University of Oregon, and at one time a student in commercial law under your own tutelage, and as one who remembers your service at the University as dean of the law school, to note that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 you inserted, with apparent approbation, a letter from the University of Oregon professor who threatens nonpayment of her Federal income tax as a means of producing a change in the administration's policy in Vietnam. Surely you do not endorse so-called peaceful civil resistance to the point of violation of the law.

I am surprised that Mr. Landstrom should think that because I respect the

right of citizens to petition their Government, I agree with all phases of their petition. So I replied to him, saying:

Inserting letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approbation on my part of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a cross section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to the administration's policy are entitled to petition their Government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Vietnam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you will check my insertions in the RECORD, you will find some of them do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Vietnam. My mail for months has run around 200 to 1 in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

I am inserting in the RECORD, your letter and my reply so that you will not feel slighted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my complete reply to Mr. Landstrom be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 14, 1965.

MR. KARL S. LANDSTROM,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. LANDSTROM: You certainly are welcome to disagree with my viewpoint on the undeclared war and thereby the unconstitutional war which the Johnson administration is fighting in South Vietnam.

I am enclosing tearsheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering my two speeches in opposition to the President's recent request for a vote of confidence on his course of action in South Vietnam.

Inserting letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, contrary to your false implication, does not carry any approbation on my part of any point of view expressed by the writer. The letters do show the great concern of a cross section of the American people in regard to the warmaking aspects of American policy. I insert the letters because I think people who are opposed to the administration's policy are entitled to petition their government and make known their disagreement with our foreign policy in Vietnam. I intend to continue to insert letters of protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you will check my insertions in the RECORD, you will find some of them do not disapprove of the United States conducting an undeclared war in South Vietnam. My mail for months has run around 200 to 1 in support of my opposition to our undeclared war in Asia.

I am inserting in the RECORD your letter and my reply so that you will not feel slighted.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other letters, articles, and editorials, which I have received, dealing with Vietnam, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch,
Apr. 26-May 2, 1965]

A SOUND INSTINCT AGAINST ASIAN WAR

A massive public discontent with American policy in Vietnam, uncrystallized but none-

theless real and persistent, has made it necessary for President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara to explain themselves once again.

The President at his news conference Tuesday was aware that millions of Americans are haunted by an instinctive if often inarticulate sentiment that our country has taken the wrong course in Asia. Their instinct, we think, is far sounder than his rationalizations. We hope it will continue to make itself felt until the course is changed. The President wisely refused to join some of his subordinates in smearing his critics as appeasers. He appears to invite honest debate, and should be taken at his word.

The rationalization of his policy rests upon a distortion of history and an obscurity of purpose. It demonstrates confusion as to where we have been, and a hazy ambiguity as to where we are going.

Like the Secretaries of State and Defense, President Johnson describes the situation in Vietnam as a simple one of armed aggression by one nation against another, which we have a duty to resist. It is in fact an infinitely complicated case of civil war, growing out of the determination of Asians to throw off the chains of white colonialism, a civil war in which we are involved on one side and the Communist powers on another.

The indigenous Communist-led nationalist movement which now governs North Vietnam began its revolution over 20 years ago, while Indochina was under Japanese rule during World War II, and continued it against the returned forces of France, finally defeating the French decisively in 1954. It called off the war under the terms of an international agreement which provided for military neutralization, independence, and self-determination.

Under the Geneva accords, North and South Vietnam were set up as temporary political zones, each to be cleared of foreign military forces and then to decide its own future in supervised free elections. The elections were never held because the United States promptly established an anti-Communist government in Saigon and started building it up with military and economic aid as an outpost of American influence. Thereafter, the Hanoi regime began organizing and helping to supply Communist-led insurgents in the South.

Despite 10 years of massive American aid, successive governments in Saigon were unable to gain the loyalty of their people; today the Communists control more than half, perhaps 70 percent, of South Vietnam. They collect taxes, they export rice, they govern, they wage guerrilla war. The United States, having done everything possible to help South Vietnam win its own war, is now in process of taking over and fighting the war itself, at the risk of world war with China and Russia.

To say that all this is identical with the situation in Hitler's Europe, and that any reluctance to deepen our military involvement amounts to appeasement, is to misunderstand both history and the nature of revolutionary forces in ex-colonial lands. The United States has no strategic interest that requires it to hold a land base in Asia; the President has repeatedly disavowed any territorial ambitions in Vietnam. Neither have we any responsibility to act as a global policeman, putting down revolution wherever it occurs, getting into every war that comes along. We can help free nations build the economic and social conditions which immunize them against Communist revolution, but if they do not do the job themselves we cannot do it for them by waging war.

Admittedly changing our course in Vietnam presents enormous difficulties at this late date, but it must be done if sanity is to prevail. We cannot get out tomorrow, we cannot cut and run in precipitate retreat.

We can and should, however, make peace and disengagement our long-range objective instead of simply accepting the drift to ever-widening war.

The President's reaffirmation of willingness to enter unconditional discussions is welcome, along with his assurance that active diplomatic efforts are being made "every day" to get talks going. Regrettably missing is any hint of ultimate objectives or terms of a peaceful settlement that would show we are ready to accept something else than total surrender of the other side. Talks about what? They are not likely to occur if, in addition to rejecting even a pause in the air bombardment, we give reason to believe that all we want to talk about is the end of North Vietnamese intervention but not an end of our own intervention.

The essential principles of the 1954 Geneva accords, adapted with due recognition of what has happened in the interval, offer a basis for a fair and reasonable settlement. If the President made them the clear objective of his policy, instead of inventing twisted rationalizations for a war policy, he would have the American people overwhelmingly on his side.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 9, 1965]

ADVERTISEMENT SPONSORING END OF WAR IN VIETNAM

The sponsors of this advertisement: Rev. Milton Andrews, Rev. Charles Asplin, Rev. Harold Bass, Rev. Herbert Dimock, Rev. John Gill, Rev. Blaine Hammond, Rev. Herbert Lazenby, Rev. George McCleave, Rev. Chadbourne Spring, Rev. Bernard Turner, Rev. Peter Weller, the American Friends Service Committee, Pacific Northwest Region, and the concerned citizens whose names are listed below join 16,916 Protestant clergymen (New York Times ad, Apr. 18); 2,700 clergymen of all faiths (New York Times ad, Apr. 4); 800 faculty members of colleges and universities in the New York City area (New York Times ad, Feb. 28); U.S. Senators MORSE, GRUENING, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, AIKEN, CLARK, and others; U.N. Secretary General U Thant; the leaders of 17 nonaligned nations; and the many thousands of individuals and leaders around the world who have already spoken out in calling on President Johnson to end the war in Vietnam by peaceful negotiations now.

We believe the only conditions under which such negotiations are possible are (1) cessation of bombing raids on North Vietnam, and (2) a cease-fire with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

We believe the people of Vietnam are as entitled to peace and the opportunity to secure and better their lives economically and socially as are people everywhere, so that the United States must take the lead in bringing peace as quickly as possible to that land, which has known no rest from war for over 25 years.

We, therefore, call on the President to seek an end to the fighting through immediate peaceful action rather than through rhetoric or show of force.

(If you agree with the views stated above, one direct action you can take is to add your name to this advertisement and mail the page to: President Lyndon Johnson, the White House, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. and Mrs. Lester Achenbach, Norm Ackley, Jeff Acorn, Joseph Airo-Farulla, Jeff Acorn, Mr. and Mrs. John Affolter, Holly Adiele, Selma Waldman Adkins, Joelynn Airo-Farulla, Blair Allen, Gerald Allen, M. J. Allen, Ray Allen, Mrs. W. B. Allen, Bill Allison, Mark H. Anderson, Ruth Anderson, Chuck Angell, Alfred S. Arkley, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Arkley, Mr. and Mrs. T. R. Astley, P. J. Ater, Gilbert Allen Atkinson.

Eliot Backup, Elizabeth Bagshaw, Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bailey, Jackie Barish, Arthur Barnett, Virginia Barnett, Harvie Barnard, Hermine Basnight, William Basnight, Ethel Bass, B. C. Baxter, Rozette Baxter, D. H. Beach, Margie Bell, James R. Bennett, Mrs. Jean Bennett, Mable Bennett, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Bennett, Fred Berg, J. Lennart Berggren, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Bernstein, Richard Beyer, Audrey Bickford, Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bierley Jr., Marilyn Bierman, Mrs. L. D. Bishop, Jacqueline Blanchard, B. Blasko, Lorne Blucher, Walter Boggess, Ruth Bonnevie, S. V. Bonnevie, Edward Bostetter, David C. Botting, Diana Bower, Ted Bower, David Box, David Boxer, Julie Boxer, Helen Bradley, Charles F. Brady, Franz A. Brodine, Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Brotman, John Broussard, Emmy Buck, Mrs. Stimson Bullitt, John Bundy, Mr. and Mrs. John Burdick, Pat Burks, Stephanie Born, Lillian W. Burns, Joost A. Businger.

David H. Campbell, Caroline Canafax, Leo Canafax, V. E. Carol, Harold Carson, Beth F. Carter, Victor Case, Delbert E. Castle, Pearl Castle, Jeremy Caughlin, Pat Cawthon, William C. Chambers, Carla Chotzen, Walter Chotzen, Mrs. W. G. Christen, William B. Christie, Mrs. Annabelle B. Christie, Mrs. W. T. Clark, Henry Leland Clarke, Julia Newbold Clarke, Charles Coe, John Collins, Victor Cook, Cecelia Corr, William Corr, Lida Coryell, Prof. Giovanni Costigan, Andrew J. Crane, James Carlisle Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth G. Crane, Mr. and Mrs. Michael B. Crane, Beatrice S. Crouse, Paton B. Crouse, John Crow, Ruth Crow, Virginia Crow, William Crow, Mrs. C. E. Cunningham, Juliet Cunningham.

Michael Dailey, Robert Dale, Mrs. A. R. Dannhauer, J. Robert von Dassow, Elaine Davenport, John Davies, Mary Davies, W. J. Davis, Anne Dawson, Jeffrey Dawson, B. W. De Vault, W. A. Dickinson, Altura A. Dodd, Donald A. Dodd, Lorraine Donegan, Ann A. Drury, Roy Dubisch, David Dunham, Jackie Dunham.

Steven Easterson, Al Edelman, Carol Edelman, Roger Cushman Edwards, Mr. and Mrs. N. Ekroth, Lois B. Elkinton, Richard J. Elkinton, Dr. Frederick E. Ellis, Robert J. Ellrich, Ruth Emerson, Jo Erickson, Ray Erickson.

J. Kaye Faulkner, Mrs. John E. Fawcett, Mr. and Mrs. John Fiedler, Mel Fielding, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Fiege, Lillian Fiest, Laurie Fish, Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Fisher, Edison S. Fisk, Evelyn M. Fiske, Robert G. Fleagle, A. C. Fleishman, Denis Flood, M. Fogelstedt, Mr. and Mrs. David Fogerty, Jane, Forste Robert Forste, David C. Fowler, Sol Frankel, Richard Frazer, Barbara Frazier, John Frazier, Hazel Fritz.

Vivian F. Gaboury, Barbara Gamble, Robert Garfias, Francis M. Garton, Sidney Gerber, Mary T. Gibson, Evalyn P. Gill, Louise Blue Givens, James Gladfelter, Harry Glickman, Josephine Godsey, Dr. and Mrs. Morris Gold, Dr. Samuel Goldenberg, Henry Goodman, Ruth Goodman, Mrs. Carol Goodrich, J. Goodrich, Diana Gordon, Louise Gosho, Alex Gottfried, Sue Gottfried, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Granby, Norman Grant, Genevieve Grant, Gordon Griffiths, Mary Griffiths, Eva Gruber, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Gwinn.

Claus Halberstaedter, Oliva Halonen, Taimi Halonen, Roberta Hammer, Ellen Hanly, John Hanly, Orvel Hansen, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley M. Hansen, Isabel Harlock, Ray Harlock, Marita Harris,

John Hart, Ben Harwood, Sylvia Havlich, Mary O'Neill Hayes, John Healy, Lonnie Healy, Ralph Heino, Mrs. E. W. Helander, Martha Hennen, Marjorie Herford, Ernestine Herr, Dr. George B. Hill, Theodore M. Hiltner, Mrs. Francis Hoague, Irwin Hogenauer, Mary Hopkinson, Hazel Horder, Florence Hornig, Grace Howard, Eric W. Hoyte, Virginia B. Hoyte, Wanda Hubbard, Hildur Josephine Hughes, Mr. and Mrs. William R. Hughes, Irene Hull, Walter Hundley, Katherine Hunter, Mr. and Mrs. George Hurley, Raymond Immerwahr.

Dorothy Jackins, Robert L. Jackson, Roger Jackson, Sue Jackson, Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Jackson, Ann Jacobson, Charles James, Etta Marie James, Larry James, Dr. and Mrs. Charles M. Janeway, David Javorsky, Karen Johansen, Alice Johnson, Leif Johnson, Michael R. Johnson, Sharon M. Johnson, Robert S. Johnson, Robert S. Johnson, Ruth Johnson, Mrs. Robert B. Jones, Sheila Jones, Mildred Joyce.

Howard Kaminsky, Annette Kaplan, Helen Karr, Milton Karr, Prof. and Mrs. Max Katz, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Kauffman, Dr. Abraham Keller, Mignonne Keller, Dr. and Mrs. Ward Kennedy, Martha Kennen, Harold Kerney, Robert H. Kerr, Robert W. Kessel, Rev. Eugene Kidder, Dorothy M. Kistler, Elmer C. Kistler, Joan Klyn, Mark S. Klyn, Camille Knatvold, Arthur Kobler, Virginia Kobler, Rev. J. C. Kone, Anci Koppel, Carol Ann Koppel, Jane Krah, Robert Krah, Frank Krasnowsky, Aki Kurose.

Kathy Ladd, Dr. Arthur Lagawier, Lee Landrud, Margery D. Lang, Guy Lares, Lillie Larsen, Mrs. Harold Laughlin, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Levine, Helen Levin, Arthur N. Lewis, Charline Lewis, Paul Lichter, Don Little, Marian Lobasc, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Lobl, Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Lockwood, Dr. and Mrs. Ernest Loeb, Patricia Loken, Eugene V. Lux, Lillian C. Lux, Timothy Lynch.

Dr. Sylvia Maccoll, Dr. W. A. Maccoll, Dr. Donald F. Magee, Mrs. S. Manarolia, Mr. and Mrs. David A. Manning, Betty Jean Martinson, Mr. and Mrs. Christ Martinson, Judith W. Matchett, Robert S. Maynard, Deta McEvoy, Mr. and Mrs. E. C. McIntosh, Marguerita McIntosh, Irene McMahon, David C. Meekhof, Mrs. Sophie K. Meld, Ramona Memmer, Barbara Mercer, Lyle Mercer, Flora Merrill, Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Metcalf, Stephen L. Michael, Mrs. Alida J. Michael, Dr. and Mrs. Ward C. Miles, Ronald Moe, Mrs. J. B. Mohler, Sally Moore, Wallace Moore, Mr. and Mrs. James Morland, Arval Morris, Rosemarie Morris, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar A. Morrison, Mrs. James B. Morrison, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Mottelson, Mrs. Grace B. Moulton, Bill Murphy.

John Neal, Mr. and Mrs. David Nicholson, Mr. and Mrs. Ray C. Nicholson, Anna E. Nilsen, John R. Norton, Kae Norton, Ted Norton, L. K. Northwood, Olga Northwood, Elizabeth P. Nunn.

Eugene Oliver, Jo Ann Oliver, Marian C. Olson, Robert S. Olsen, Gerald Oppenheimer, Mildred Oppenheimer, Elizabeth Orians, Gordon Orians, Simon Ottenberg, Eleanor Owen, Charles Ozure.

Douglas Palmer, Ida Palmer, Jo Patrick, Mrs. Edith Patten, Fred Van Patten, Dorothy Patterson, Rev. John Paulson, Mr. and Mrs. Clayton A. Paulson, H. Pedersen, Mrs. Ruth Peoples, Rodney J. Peterson, Ruth Peterson, Mrs. A. H. Phillips, Sanford Pisker, Mr. and Mrs. Carl O. Pisk, Bernard Poll, Orobelle Poll, Ruth Pool, Mr. and Mrs. Viggo Povlsen, Mrs. J. C. Price, V. Price, Garth Putnam, Kay Quinn.

Marjorie Rabbit, Miriam Rader, Sylvia Ragan, Dee Wardall Raible, Jarold W. Ramsey, Constance Raphael, Dan Raphael, Conner Reed, Mary T. Reed, Richard J. Reed, Robert Reed, D. E. Reinhardt, Margo Reinsch, Robert E. Renk, Clint Reynolds, Isabelle Reynolds, Mr. and Mrs. Paul M. Rice, James G. Richard, Lorna Richards, Edith Rigg, Ron Ringdahl, Eugene F. Robel, Thorun Robel, Mr. and Mrs. R. A. Rocz, Kathleen Rollefson, Violet Roraback, Mike Rubicz, Steve Rubicz, Mrs. Rose Rudnick, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Runnings.

Selma Sachs, Roger Sale, Richard Saling, Brian M. Scheffer, Linda Scheffer, Victor B. Scheffer, Beth Scheffer, Agnus Schmoee, Ken Schmoee, Dorothy Schroeter, Mrs. Alice E. Schwartz, Dr. and Mrs. Lawrence Schwartz, Mr. and Mrs. William Schwartz, Rose Scott, Alan Selker, Lisa Selker, Lule D. Sellards, Mrs. Louise Shaffrath, Mrs. Joanne Shaw, Stanley T. Shaw, Clara Shaw, Eleanor Siegl, Henry Siegl, Edward Singler, Joan Singler, Edith R. Smith, Edward Smith, Edward A. Smith, Ellen McComb Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Norman C. Smith, Mrs. Watson Smith, Martha M. Smyser, Howard B. Snyder, Margaret Snyder, Edith Soden, Joseph Sommers, Soren Sorenson, Thaddeus H. Spratten, Eleanor Springer, Claire Stafford, Marietta Stark, Roger B. Stein, Edward H. Steinberg, Elva Steinborn, Elaine Steinbrueck, Mr. and Mrs. John Stenhouse, Robert G. Stephens, Joseph Stevens, Mr. and Mrs. John Stanhouse, Robert G. Stephens, Josephine Stevens, Mr. and Mrs. John R. Strickland, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Strittmatter, Lucy M. Stoy, Lucy N. Stoy, Robert F. Stoy, Mr. & Mrs. Jack I. Sussman, Grace Suzuki, Mrs. Ruth Swanson, Tom Sykes.

Ronald Tierandsen, Tacoma Friends Meeting, Calvin Y. Takagi, Ken Takashima, Helen Talbott, Mary G. Tally, Dr. Souren Tashian, Margaret Terrell, Donald W. Thayer, Sarah Thiel, Mr. & Mrs. Robert Thode, Jack P. Tingstad, Dr. Richard Tinker, A. W. Tinsley, Hazel Tinsley, Barbara Tomlinson, Ralph Toporoff, Imogene Truman, George T. Tsutakawa, Dean M. Tuell, Jane Turner, Maurine Tuttle.

Betty Lou Valentine, Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Van Ermen, Mr. and Mrs. John Van Horne, J. M. Van Houten, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Viggo.

Jean Wilson Wagner, Ella Wald, Fern Wales, Mary Frances Wallace, Rev. Robert Waller, Vera Waller, Mr. and Mrs. John Ware, Colleen M. Waterhouse, Leslie Warner, Tom Warner, Lars Watson, Lucille Watson, Carol R. Weller, Leonard Wessels, Carl West, Helen West, Frances Wester, Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Westman, Doris G. Westman, Winifred E. Weter, John H. Whittenbaugh, Dorothy Wittington, Michael Wiater, Karen Wilkie, Dorothy R. Willard, John W. Willard, Ford Williams, Ida Williams, Mrs. Margaret Williams, Philip Williams, Vivian Williams, Mr. and Mrs. Russell L. Willman, Marjorie M. Wilson, Patricia Wilson, Dr. William S. Wilson, Mrs. Lawrence Windoffer, Alice Woodmansie, Edward Woodmansie, William Wooten.

Dr. and Mrs. S. R. Yarnell, Marion Yurman, Richard Yurman, Barbara Zepeda, Julian Zepeda, Dean F. Zuck, Joyce Bennett, Dr. Thomas A. Billings, Clara Fraser, Ruth Fawcett, Margaret Kelly, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth A. Kirkpatrick, Walter B. Laffer II, Ruth Little, Dorothy W. Melland, Marie Severtson, Charles Valentine, Richard

W. Wilkie, Patricia L. Woll, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Yellin, William C. Berleman, Bud Havilisch, Donald A. Fox, David McClary.

(This ad paid for by the above signers.)

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 9, 1965]

A REPLY TO SECRETARY RUSK ON VIETNAM

In his address on April 23 before the American Society of International Law, Secretary of State Dean Rusk attacked academic critics of the administration for talking "nonsense about the nature of the struggle" in Vietnam. He continued: "I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think." This abusive language suggests that the administration wants to silence its critics.

This suggestion is confirmed by insinuations from other administration spokesmen about the loyalty of such critics. Precisely in this time of crisis, however, the academic community has both a right and an obligation to point out hazards and inconsistencies in our military and diplomatic policy.

It is easy to see why the Secretary of State is angry. The reasons have nothing to do with "gullibility" in the academic community. He is angry because the facts and wider considerations brought up by these critics have contradicted so many official pronouncements. It is not the scholars but the leaders of the administration who have shown a "stubborn disregard of plain facts."

"PLAIN FACTS?"

For example, on March 25, 1965, President Johnson said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in south-east Asia." But the "plain fact" is that the Geneva agreement did not provide for a division of Vietnam into two nations. On the contrary, the agreement spoke of the two parts of Vietnam as "regrouping zones" and said that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." It provided that "general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission." No such unifying elections have been held. The Saigon regime, with U.S. approval, refused. Ever since, the United States has insisted that Vietnam remain divided.

On April 7, 1965, the President gave another description of the administration's goals. He said, "Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change," and further on: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." The "plain fact" is that the scale of American intervention is incompatible with the goal of self-determination. North Vietnam has, to be sure, intervened by helping the Vietcong. But at every stage of the war the scale of American intervention has been far greater. The manner of combat shows that we have saturated South Vietnam with every kind of military equipment the terrain allows. We airlift troops and supplies continually. We drop napalm on civilian populations intermingled with guerrillas. We burn and defoliate crops and forests. We have resorted to incapacitating gas. An intervention as massive as this does not furnish a choice to the people. It deprives them of one.

"STUBBORN DISREGARD OF PLAIN FACTS?"

If American actions in Vietnam are defensible, administration attempts to defend them should square with the "plain facts." Self-deception about American intervention can

be a greater peril than discriminating protest. Only by recognizing the ambiguities of the situation can we reach accord with the deepest levels of the American conscience and with the common conscience of mankind. The administration may have contrived the discreet silence or the grudging lipservice of some foreign governments and of some U.S. Senators, but the hazards and inconsistencies of the present policy are widely recognized both at home and abroad.

The situation in Vietnam raises serious moral questions, not merely diplomatic and tactical ones. As a nation we hold immense power. To permit it to be used in reckless and barbarous ways is to imperil the entire basis of American leadership.

Let us make known to the Government and to our compatriots that we oppose the disastrous policy of continued bombardment of North Vietnam. Continuation of the present policy makes it impossible for Americans and Russians to talk further about peaceful coexistence and encourages all Communist nations to close ranks in opposition to the United States.

World opinion does not support U.S. military operations in Vietnam. Throughout the world these operations appear increasingly to be a campaign in the self-interest of a Western power rather than in the interest of that stricken Asian nation. Indochina has been macerated by 20 years of anti-colonial, nationalist and Communist warfare. The United States has the military might to defeat the Vietcong. But unless we show immediate restraint, and show humane imagination in bringing interested parties to the peace table, we risk the loss of the respect and sympathy of men and nations far beyond the present theater of war.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Citizens must speak out on issues of national policy. We will not be intimidated by charges of gullibility or disloyalty.

We demand that the administration return to the "plain facts" and make an earnest attempt to obtain a negotiated peace. Reiteration of the phrase "unconditional discussions" is not enough, especially because the condition is attached to it that the rebel forces in the civil war are not to appear at the conference table. Peaceful intentions can be made plainer than this. We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal combatants, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we should use the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends and; we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the "pursuit of peace."

ANDOVER NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Walter H. Clark, psychology of religion.
Harvey G. Cox, theology and culture.
Vincent deGregoris, religious drama.
J. Leslie Dunstan, missions.
Frances W. Eastman, religious education.
Wesner Fallaw, religious education.
Nels F. S. Ferre, theology.
S. Maclean Gilmour, New Testament.
Norman K. Gottwald, Old Testament.
John H. Scammon, Old Testament and Hebrew.
Earl J. Thompson, Jr., church history.
Joseph C. Williamson, theology.

BOSTON COLLEGE

Eugene Bushala, classics.
Edward J. Collins, history.
Sister Terese Anne Donovan, history.
John M. Von Felsinger, psychology.
John L. Heineman, history.
Edgar Litt, political science.
Raymond T. McNally, history.
Allen Wakstein, history.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

William J. Alston III, physics.
Saul Bernstein, social work.

William P. Bryan, chemistry.
Amiya Chakravarty, physics.
Bernard Chasan, physics.
Robert S. Cohen, physics.
Paul Deats, Jr., theology.
Alvin L. Denman, human relations center.
Anthony J. DeVito, modern languages.
L. Harold DeWolf, theology.
John Endicott, chemistry.
Frank Giese, modern languages.
Sonja K. Gross, chemistry.
Robert H. Hamill, chaplain.
Kenneth Haygood, education.
George E. Hein, chemistry.
Walter L. Holcomb, theology.
Wayne B. Jones, theology (registrar).
Frederick Koss, social science.
John H. Lavelly, philosophy.
Jean Lennox, biochemistry.
Paul Liacos, law.
Robert E. Luccock, theology.
John L. Maes, theology.
Dorothy Meckel, modern languages.
Banks McDowell, law.
Ronald M. Milburn, chemistry.
William Clifton Moore, theology.
Walter G. Mueller, theology.
Paul Nash, education.
Freda G. Reblsky, psychology.
Miriam M. Ritvo, human relations center.
Eugene C. Roemele, law.
Julius A. Roth, sociology and anthropology.

Donald T. Rowlingson, theology.

S. Paul Schilling, theology.
Armand Siegel, physics.
Peter E. Siegle, education.
John F. Smith, chaplain.
Robert H. Sprout, English.
John Stachel, physics.
Robert L. Treese, theology.
Marx W. Wartofsky, philosophy.
James B. Whipple, education.
Charles R. Willis, physics.
Alvin D. Zalinger, sociology.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Herbert H. Aptekar, social work.
Joseph S. Berliner, economics.
Leo Bronstein, fine arts.
David Buchsbaum, mathematics.
Oscar P. Chilson, biochemistry.
J. Cobb, psychology.
Helen Codere, anthropology.
Joseph L. Cohen, biochemistry.
Lewis A. Coser, sociology.
George Cowgill, anthropology.
Jean Danner, biochemistry.
Betty Davidson, biochemistry.
Samuel James Davidson, biochemistry.
P. Diamandopoulos, philosophy.
Robert O. Doyle, physics.
James Duffey, European languages.
Kenneth Feigenbaum, psychology.
Gordon Fellman, sociology.
Joachim Gaehde, fine arts.
David S. Gil, social work.
Ray Ginger, history.
Eugene P. Gross, physics.
Allen Grossman, English.
Thomas C. Hollocher, biochemistry.
Joseph W. Infelburg, biology.
David Kaplan, anthropology.
Nathan O. Kaplan, biochemistry.
Jacob Lauren, fine arts.
Harris I. Lehrer, biochemistry.
S. S. Lehrer, biochemistry.
Lawrence Levine, biochemistry.
Denah Lida, European languages.
Farnsworth Loomis, biochemistry.
Heinz Lubasz, history.
Robert A. Manners, anthropology.
Stephen Miller, social work.
Robert Morris, social work.
William T. Murakami, biochemistry.
Joseph S. Murphy, political science.
Richard Onorato, English.
Robert Perlman, social work.
Arthur Polansky, fine arts.
Thomas E. Ragland, biochemistry.
Jessica E. Reimann, biochemistry.
Karl Reisman, anthropology.

Benson Saler, anthropology.
 Stanley N. Salthe, biochemistry.
 Gordon Sato, biochemistry.
 Morris S. Schwartz, sociology.
 John Scott, social work.
 Violet M. Sieder, social work.
 Richard Silverstein, biochemistry.
 Mitchell Siporin, fine arts.
 Philip E. Slater, sociology.
 Morris Soodak, biochemistry.
 Mark Spivak, sociology.
 Maurice R. Stein, sociology.
 Arnold Strickon, anthropology.
 Sahl Swarz, fine arts.
 Norbert I. Swislocki, biochemistry.
 Marie Syrkin, English.
 Jerome H. Targovnik, biochemistry.
 Helen Van Vunakis, biochemistry.
 Eugene Walter, sociology.
 Rolad C. Warren, social work.
 Alex Weingrod, anthropology.
 Robert S. Weiss, sociology.
 Kurt H. Wolff, sociology.
 Irving Kenneth Zola.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Allan Clark, mathematics.
 William Crossgrove, German.
 Alan Howard, mathematics.
 Michael Rosen, mathematics.

CLARK UNIVERSITY

Charles Blinderman, English.
 Abraham Blum, psychology.
 Walker Crockett, psychology.
 Gerald N. Grob, American history.
 J. Fannin King, romance languages.
 J. Richard Reid, romance languages.
 Mordecai S. Rubin, romance languages.
 Morton Weiner, psychology.

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS

Charles A. Baker, French.
 William Van Etten Casey, S.J., theology.
 Thomas M. Coffee, sociology.
 Joseph F. Donahue, S.J., theology.
 John H. Dorenkamp, English.
 Joseph M. Fallon, S.J., sociology.
 Aldo Fortuna, English.
 James A. Gross, economics.
 Leon E. Lewis, English.
 Frank Petrella, Jr., economics.
 Paul Rosenkrantz, psychology.
 Donald F. Traub, philosophy.
 John H. Wilson, English.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

L. H. Noda, biochemistry.
 Donald E. Olins, biochemistry.
 Milton J. Rosenberg, psychology.
 Melvin V. Simpson, biochemistry.
 Andrew Szent-Gyorgyi, cytology.
 Arnold Wisniala, biochemistry.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Carl Edwards.
 Hubert L. Flesher.
 Joseph Fletcher.
 L. G. Patterson.
 Charles Smith.
 Owen Thomas.
 William Wolf.

GODDARD COLLEGE

Frank T. Adams, Jr.
 Donald M. Barnes, history.
 George Beecher, education.
 Corinne Elliot.
 Vincent Erikson, anthropology.
 Francis Fay.
 Wilfred G. Hamlin.
 Jerome Himeloch, sociology.
 Erland Jacobsen, literature.
 W. Allen Last, chemistry.
 Laurent LaVallee, economics.
 Corinne W. Mattuck.
 Robert Mattuck, literature.
 Arthur Mitzman, history.
 Steven J. Noren, philosophy.
 William E. Osgood, librarian.
 Buryl Payne, psychology.
 Thomas R. Whittaker, literature.
 Thomas Yamamoto, art.
 David York.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

James Luther Adams, divinity.
 Stephen L. Adler, physics.
 Henry D. Aiken, philosophy.
 Charles M. Allen, Jr., chemistry.
 William L. Alworth, chemistry.
 Harold Amos, bacteriology.
 W. French Anderson, bacteriology.
 John S. Ansow, English.
 Joan Argetsinger, biology.
 Ralph Baerlein, physics.
 Gerald Barnes, philosophy.
 G. Octo Barnett, medicine.
 Jonathan Beecher, history.
 Ursula Belugi, social relations.
 Marshall Berman, government.
 A. Bienenstock, engineering.
 Richard Biennenn, history.
 A. Blumenthal, cognitive studies.
 Dwight Bolinger, romance languages.
 Raoul Bott, mathematics.
 Boyce W. Burge, medicine.
 Mary E. Burge, American civilization.
 Frank P. Casa, romance languages.
 David F. Cavers, law.
 David Wade Chambers, history of science.
 Jon Clardy, chemistry.
 Richard A. Cone, biology.
 Ian Cooke, biology.
 Stephen Coutts, chemistry.
 Frank Cross, Near Eastern languages.
 Richard D'Ari, biology.
 P. J. Dart, biology.
 Bernard D. Davis, bacteriology.
 Julian Davies, bacteriology.
 David Denhardt, biology.
 Howard Doldfine, bacteriology.
 Donald Dubin, bacteriology.
 Leonard M. Faltz, bacteriology.
 Ann E. Farnham, bacteriology.
 Ned Feder, biology.
 Robert R. Fenichel, applied physics.
 Sam Fillenbaum, cognitive studies.
 Gordon Finley, social relations.
 Stephen J. Fischer, education.
 Michael Fried, fine arts.
 W. H. Furry, physics.
 E. Furshpan, medical school.
 George Gaylord Simpson, archeology.
 F. W. Gehring, mathematics.
 Barry Gewen, American civilization.
 Stephen J. Gewirtz, mathematics.
 Walter Gilbert, physics.
 Stephen Gilman, romance languages.
 Owen Gingerich, astronomy.
 David M. Gitlitz, romance languages.
 Harvey R. Glasser, Russian research center.
 Eugene Godfredsen, astronomy.
 Rabbi Ben-Zion Gold, Hillel adviser.
 Howard Goldfine, bacteriology.
 James Gordon, general education.
 Luigi Gorini, bacteriology.
 Martin Gouterman, chemistry.
 Joseph C. Grannis, education.
 Ann Graybiel, biology.
 Walter Grossman, history.
 Jean Harrison, biology.
 Chester W. Hartman, psychiatry.
 Jay Hauben, physics.
 Nicholas L. Heer, Middle Eastern studies.
 Stephen Heinemann, biology.
 D. Heller, medical school.
 Kenneth J. Hertz, mathematics.
 Steven Hess, romance languages.
 Mahlon B. Hoagland, bacteriology.
 K. Hoffman, mathematics.
 Charlotte Hogsett, romance languages.
 Richard A. Holt, physics.
 Mathilda Holzman, psychiatry.
 Donald Hubbard, education.
 H. Stuart Hughes, history.
 Garrett M. Ihler, biology.
 William Irvine, astronomy.
 Kurt Isselbacher, gastroenterology.
 Robert M. Jackson, romance languages.
 R. V. James, engineering.
 R. V. Jones, engineering.
 Wolfgang Kalhofen, astronomy.
 Leon R. Kass, chemistry.
 Stanley N. Katz, history.
 Gordon D. Kaufman, divinity.

Myron Kaufman, chemistry.
 Jerry L. Kazdan, mathematics.
 Roger Kelleher, medical school.
 Steven L. Kleinman, mathematics.
 Jerome H. Klotz, statistics.
 Mike Konrad, biology.
 E. Kravitz, medical school.
 Lawrence B. Lapson, astronomy.
 John H. Law, chemistry.
 David Layzer, astronomy.
 Jeana D. Leventhal, bacteriology.
 David H. Levey, economics.
 Pavel Machotka, social relations.
 Martin Micheren, pharmacology.
 Michael Manove, mathematics.
 Gerald Marsden, education.
 Paul Martin, physics.
 Ann Matthyse, biology.
 Jo Ann D. Medalle, psychiatry.
 Jacques Mehler, cognitive studies.
 Everett Mendelsohn, history of science.
 Martin Micheren, biology.
 Stanley Milgram, social relations.
 Henri E. Mitler, astronomy.
 Edwin E. Moise, education.
 Clarence L. Morgan, medical school.
 Barrington Moore, Jr., Russian research center.
 David Morrison, astronomy.
 W. H. Morse, medical school.
 David Mumford, mathematics.
 Leonard Nash, chemistry.
 Franz Nauen, history.
 Peter Neumeyer, school of education.
 Pearn P. Niller, applied physics.
 Frederick A. Olafson, education.
 William E. Palke, chemistry and physics.
 Philip Pearle, physics.
 Martin Peretz, government.
 Edward Pincus, visual arts center.
 Gerald Platt, social relations.
 Mordeai Jane Pollock, romance languages.
 Mary C. Potter, cognitive studies.
 W. M. Preston, physics.
 Charles Price, university preacher.
 Mark Ptashne, biology.
 L. F. Quigley, Jr., school of public health.
 David L. Ragozin, mathematics.
 Benito Rakower, school of education.
 Lillian Randall, rad. grad. ctr.
 Jonathan F. Reichart, physics.
 Edward Rendall, medicine.
 James L. Rice, Slavic languages.
 Herbert Richardson, divinity.
 Anne Roe, education.
 Constance H. Rose, romance languages.
 Larry Rosenberg, psychiatry.
 Judy F. Rosenblith, psychiatry.
 Robert A. Rosenthal, cent. res. & devel.
 Robert A. Rothstein, Slavic languages.
 Susan Rubin, romance languages.
 Jon Rubinstein, history.
 Rose Sabaroff, education.
 Carl Sagan, astronomy.
 Israel Scheffler, education.
 Bartholomew P. Schiavo, history.
 L. H. Scott, history and literature.
 Richard Sennett, American studies.
 Victor W. Siedel, medicine.
 Raymond Siever, geology.
 David S. Sigman, chemistry.
 B. F. Skinner, psychology.
 Rev. Reginald Smart, chaplain.
 Frank Smith, cognitive studies.
 H. Warren Smith, chemistry.
 Joseph L. Snider, physics.
 Sergei P. Sorokin, anatomy.
 P. A. Sorokin, sociology.
 Bessie Sperry, education.
 John Spiegel, social relations.
 Max L. Stackhouse, divinity.
 Peter Stansky, history.
 Jeffrey Steinfeld, chemistry.
 W. Stolz, mathematics.
 Stephen Strom, astronomy.
 Marsha H. Swislocki, romance languages.
 Kenneth Taylor, history of science.
 Karl Teeter, linguistics.
 Ruth D. Terzaghi, applied physics.
 Abigail Thernstrom, government.
 Stephen Thernstrom, history.

Allan Tobin, biology.
 Stephen V. Ullman, mathematics.
 Dorothy V. Vivian, romance languages.
 Lise Vogel, fine arts.
 Thomas von Foerster, physics.
 Ruth Wald, biology.
 George Wald, biology.
 Donald Wallach, biological chemistry.
 William P. Weber, chemistry.
 Charles A. Whitney, astronomy.
 D. V. Widder, mathematics.
 George Williams, divinity.
 Thomas H. Wilson, physiology.
 David E. Wolfe, anatomy.
 Peter N. Wolff, medicine.
 James P. Wright, astronomy.
 Danny Wulff, biology.
 Lawrence Wylie, social relations.
 Linda Zak, romance languages.
 Robert Zevin, economics.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Marcia K. Allen, biology.
 Joseph Altman, psychology.
 Warren Ambrose, mathematics.
 Donald Appleyard, city planning.
 Michael Artin, mathematics.
 Elliot Auerbach, laboratory nuclear science.
 Maria L. Bade, biology.
 Alan H. Barrett, electrical engineering.
 Eugene Bell, biology.
 Aron Bernstein, physics.
 T. Bever, modern languages.
 Carl J. Black, humanities.
 Stephen L. Bloom, mathematics.
 Rev. Myron Bloy, chaplain.
 Frank Bonilla, economics.
 George S. Boelos, philosophy.
 David Botstein, biology.
 Richard N. Boyd, philosophy.
 Joseph Brenner, medical department.
 Gene M. Brown, biology.
 Manuel Blum, electrical engineering.
 Harold H. Carter, chemical engineering.
 Jule G. Charney, meteorology.
 M. Chessman, meteorology.
 Noam Chomsky, modern languages.
 Stephan L. Chorover, psychology.
 Jared L. Darlington, res. lab. electronics.
 John M. Dolan, res. lab. electronics.
 J. R. Dennett, mathematics.
 Robert M. Dowben, biology.
 Murray Eden, electrical engineering.
 Robert Fabry, res. lab. electronics.
 Franklin M. Fisher, economics.
 Maurice S. Fox, biology.
 Harold Freeman, economics.
 Bernard Frieden, city planning.
 Theodore W. Gamelin, mathematics.
 Vincent Giambalvo, mathematics.
 Steven N. Gilborn, humanities.
 Marcus C. Goodall, res. lab. electronics.
 Roe Goodman, mathematics.
 Glen E. Gordon, chemistry.
 David Gordon, physics.
 Annamaria T. Gorini, biology.
 Bernard S. Gould, biology.
 R. Graham, mathematics.
 John C. Graves, humanities.
 Richard Greene, biology.
 Charles G. Gross, psychology.
 Leon Gunther, physics.
 A. R. Gurney, Jr., humanities.
 Theodore Gurney, Jr., biology.
 Morris Halle, modern languages.
 Alfred E. Harper, nutrition.
 Hyman Hartman, biology.
 Alan Hein, psychology.
 Richard Held, psychology.
 Rev. Robert C. Holtzapfel, chaplain.
 Thomas H. Jackson, humanities.
 William D. Jackson, electrical engineering.
 Elizabeth W. Jones, biology.
 J. Katz, philosophy.
 S. J. Kayser, modern languages.
 Georgy Kepes, architecture.
 R. Kirk, modern languages.
 M. Kudlick, mathematics.
 K. Kushner, mathematics.
 G. Lakoff, modern languages.

Elizabeth Landers, modern languages.
 Emmet Larkin, humanities.
 Paul Lee, humanities.
 Thomas A. Lehrer, economics and political science.
 Mark Levensky, humanities.
 Cyrus Levinthal, biology.
 Klaus Liepmann, humanities.
 Francis E. Low, physics.
 Salvador E. Luria, biology.
 Kevin Lynch, city planning.
 Boris Magasanik, biology.
 Kenneth Manly, biology.
 Michael B. Marcus, mathematics.
 Stephen Marglin, economics.
 Paula Menyuk, research laboratory electronics.
 Travis R. Merritt, humanities.
 Franco Modigliani, economics and management.

Philip Morrison, physics.
 Philip M. Morse, physics.
 Walle J. H. Nauta, psychology.
 A. C. Newell, mathematics.
 W. O'Neill, modern languages.
 Robert Pendelton, mathematics.
 Norman Pettit, humanities.
 Louise Pfeiffer, psychology.
 Norman A. Phillips, meteorology.
 Rabbi Herman Pollack, chaplain.
 P. M. Postal, modern languages.
 Hilary Putnam, humanities.
 H. Putz, mathematics.
 J. Ravin, mathematics.
 Daniel B. Ray, mathematics.
 Harold Reiche, humanities.
 Helen R. Revel, biology.
 Phillip W. Robbins, biology.
 J. Robinson, mathematics.
 Ronald Rolfe, biology.
 Steven Rosencrans, mathematics.
 Bruno Rossi, physics.
 A. K. Roy, mathematics.
 Rev. John Russell, Jr., chaplain.
 Herbert D. Saltzstein, psychology.
 Leo Sartori, physics.
 David L. Schalk, humanities.
 R. W. Sekuler, psychology.
 Karl Shell, economics.
 Abner Shimony, humanities.
 Irving Singer, humanities.
 I. M. Singer, mathematics.
 Marc J. Shulman, biology.
 Malcolm Skolnick, physics.
 Huston Smith, humanities.
 Norton Starr, mathematics.
 Arthur Steinberg, humanities.
 Marvin Stodolsky, biology.
 Benjamin K. T'sou, research laboratory electronics.
 John James Ucci, mathematics.
 John Vierter, research laboratory electronics.
 Patrick D. Wall, biology.
 William B. Watson, humanities.
 Burton White, psychology.
 George W. Whitehead, mathematics.
 Hurd C. Willett, meteorology.
 John W. Winchester, geology and geophysics.
 George Wolf, nutrition.
 Victor Yngve, electrical engineering.
 William H. Youngren, humanities.
 Richard Zatorski, research laboratory electronics.

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

Richard Arnowitt, physics.
 Perry A. Bialor, sociology-anthropology.
 Roger Brightbill, psychology.
 Wendell R. Brown, education.
 Henry H. Crapo, mathematics.
 Alan N. Cromer, physics.
 Ellen N. Dunlap, mathematics.
 Theodore N. Ferdinand, sociology-anthropology.
 Mitzi Filson, library.
 Walter F. Fogg, philosophy.
 Marvin H. Friedman, physics.
 Norbert L. Fullington, history.
 Michael J. Glaubman, physics.
 Stephen J. Golburgh, education.

Roberta Gordon, modern languages.
 Joseph D. Gresser, chemistry.
 Edward A. Hacker, philosophy.
 Ruth Harmon, education.
 Walter Hauser, physics.
 Masanori Higa, education.
 John Kazantz, English.
 Frank F. Lee, sociology-anthropology.
 Lila Leibowitz, sociology-anthropology.
 Milton Leitenberg, biology.
 William F. Luder, chemistry.
 Antonio L. Mezzacappa, modern languages.
 Harold Naidus, chemistry.
 Irene A. Nichols, education.
 John D. Oberholtzer, physics.
 Saul Rogolsky, education.
 Norman Rosenblatt, history.
 James Ryan, modern languages.
 Eugene J. Saletan, physics.
 Freda Salzman, physics.
 George Salzman, physics.
 Ina Samuels, psychology.
 Bertram Sharf, psychology.
 Gilbert A. Schloss, English.
 Donald Shelby, economics.
 Robert L. Stern, chemistry.
 Harold L. Stubbs, mathematics.
 H. Ti Tien, chemistry.
 Michael T. Vaughn, physics.

SIMMONS COLLEGE

Donald S. Dunbar, psychology.
 Tilden G. Edelstein, history.
 David Emerson, physics.
 Richard Freedman, English.
 Henry J. Halko, history.
 Ruth C. Hawthorne, history.
 Manfred Klein, German.
 Lawrence L. Langer, English.
 Ruth S. Leonard, library science.
 Joseph T. Leverich, mathematics.
 William M. Manly, English.
 Josephine F. Milburn, government.
 Carroll F. Miles, government.
 Margaret B. Milliken, English.
 George W. Mitchie, English.
 Mary K. O'Brien, nursing.
 Sumner M. Rosen, economics.
 Richard C. Sterne, English.
 Wylie Syther, English.
 Roy M. Tollefson, government.

SMITH COLLEGE

Louis Cohn-Haft, history.
 Robert J. Fabian, mathematics.
 Philip Green, government.
 Bruce Hawkins, physics.
 Murray Kiteley, philosophy.
 Paul Lauter, English.
 Alice Lazerovitz, philosophy.
 Bert Mendelson, mathematics.
 Michael Rice, physics.
 Peter Rowe, government.
 Ramon Eduardo Ruiz, history.
 J. Diedrick Snoek, psychology.
 A. H. Spees, physics.
 Melvin Steinberg, physics.
 Francis Stienon, astronomy.
 Donald Trumpler, mathematics.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Reilly Atkinson III, physics.
 Marston Balch, drama and speech.
 Ernest Cassara, religion.
 Carl Cohen, mathematics.
 John Cornwall, economics.
 Mary Jane Cramer, sociology.
 Dorothea J. Crook, psychology.
 Morris A. Cynkin, medical school.
 William Dameshek, medical school.
 Allen E. Everett, physics.
 Sanford Freedman, psychology.
 Morris Friedkin, pharmacology.
 Sol Gittleman, German.
 Hilde Hein, philosophy.
 Roslyn B. Henning, classics.
 Dennis V. Higgins, English.
 Franklyn D. Holzman, economics.
 David Isles, mathematics.
 Leonard Kirsch, economics.
 Madeline Kovach, German.
 Melvin J. Krant, medical school.

Norman Krinsky, pharmacology.
George F. Leger, mathematics.
Zella Luria, psychology.
Lewis F. Manly, economics.
Bernard McCabe, English.
Nancy Milburn, biology.
Robert L. H. Miller, religion.
Kivie Moldave, medicine.
Thornton B. Ratz, psychology.
Gene Reeves, theology.
Douglas W. Reynolds, art.
H. Ronald Rouse, mathematics.
Gerhard Schmidt, biochemistry.
Edwin Schur, sociology.
Robert Schwartz, medical school.
Newlin R. Smith, economics.
Gary M. Spackey, French.
Manfred Steiner, medical school.
Walter J. K. Tannenber, medical school.
Jack Tessman, physics.
Robert H. Webb, physics.
John C. Wells, German.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Max M. Allen, psychology.
Curt F. Beck, political science.
J. David Colfax, sociology.
Douglas P. Crowne, psychology.
Maurice L. Farber, psychology.
Amerigo Farina, psychology.
R. C. Gosselin, mathematics.
Jerrold Heiss, sociology.
David A. Ivry, finance.
Seth Leacock, sociology.
Charles H. McCaghy, sociology.
Dennison Nash, sociology.
Charles A. Owen, Jr., English.
G. N. Raney, mathematics.
H. Reschovsky, mathematics.
Kenneth Ring, psychology.
A. Robert Rollin, psychology.
Joy S. Roth, zoology.
Julian B. Rotter, psychology.
William A. Wilson, Jr., psychology.
Elliott S. Wolk, mathematics.
David Zeaman, psychology.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Horace W. Briggs, political science.
Robert V. Daniels, history.
Denez Gulyas, sociology.
Samuel B. Hand, history.
Robert L. Hoffman, history.
Richard E. Leidberg, chaplain.
William Metcalfe, history.
Anthony Molho, history.
Edward Rossman, Romance languages.
Daniel Scheans, anthropology.
Thomas J. Spinner, Jr., history.

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE

Bernard Howard, mathematics.
Bruce C. McQuarrie, mathematics.
Romeo L. Moruzzi, electrical engineering.
Philip Shakir, mathematics.
David Todd, chemistry.

YALE UNIVERSITY

Robert P. Abelson, psychology.
Layman E. Allen, law.
James Appel, psychology.
Richard J. Andrew, biology.
James Appel, psychology.
Wendell Bell, sociology.
Bernard J. Bergen, sociology.
Merton C. Bernstein, law.
Harry J. Benda, history.
John M. Blum, history.
George Braverman, biochemistry.
Abram Chipman, psychiatry.
Dorothy D. Clario, psychology.
Michael Cole, psychology.
Barry E. Collins, psychology.
Robert M. Cook, sociology.
Alice Cornelson, psychiatry.
Sheila Counce-Nicklas, biology.
Robert S. Crowder, psychology.
Robert A. Dahl, political science.
David J. Daniels, political science.
Gaylord D. Ellison, psychiatry.
Thomas I. Emerson, law.
Edmund Fantino, psychology.
Harry Fein, psychology.

Yasuko Filby, psychology.
John P. Flynn, psychology.
J. G. Gall, biology.
Arthur W. Galston, biology.
Frank T. Gardner, psychiatry.
Fred Gault, psychology.
Joseph Glick, psychology.
David Goldberg, psychiatry.
Harry Gollub, psychology.
Laurence Gould, psychology.
Leroy C. Gould, sociology.
M. M. Haith, psychology.
George A. Huaco, sociology.
Michael Kahn, psychology.
Kenneth Keniston, psychology.
Bill Kessen, psychology.
Charles A. Klesler, psychology.
Daniel L. Kline, psychology.
E. E. Kriekhaus, psychology.
Theodore Lidz, psychiatry.
Robert J. Liston, psychiatry.
Staughton Lynd, history.
James A. Mau, sociology.
James D. Millikan, philosophy.
Ronald N. Morris, pharmacy.
George D. Mostow, mathematics.
Pauli Murray, law.
Nea M. Norton, psychiatry.
R. C. W. Prescott, psychiatry.
Charles A. Reich, law.
Charles E. Rickart, mathematics.
Julian M. Sturtevant, chemistry.
Josiah Thompson, philosophy.
Roy C. Treadway, sociology.
Cynthia M. Wild, psychiatry.
Mary C. Wright, history.
George Wolf, psychiatry.

OTHERS

Sigmund Abeles, Wellesley College.
S. P. Colowick, Vanderbilt University.
Flora Donham, Philip Donham, Irvin
Doress, Cardinal Cushing College.
Alexandra Elliot, Samuel Friedman, University of Michigan.
H. Gintis, Suffolk University.
Kenneth Greenblatt, Jerome Grossman,
H. L. Holcomb, Cambridge Electron Accelerator.
Sidney Kaplan, University of Massachusetts.
Hedda Korsch, Wheaton College.
Allen Kropf, Amherst College.
Carole Labrousse, Wellesley College.
Joan Levin, Emmanuel College.
Hilde Geiringer von Mises, Wheaton College.
Jane Marcus, Thomas O'Donnell, Pine Manor Junior College.
Ruth Anna Putnam, Wellesley College.
Mark Rich, Trevor Robinson, Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College.
Rebecca H. Shankland, Wheaton College.
Susan Raymond Vogel, Wellesley College.
Henry T. Yost, Amherst College.
(Institutional affiliation listed for purposes of identification only.)

If you approve of this statement, reprint it in other newspapers and write or wire: President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.

(The cost of presenting this statement is approximately \$6,500. A major portion of this amount was contributed by the names listed above. Further contributions toward the cost of this and subsequent advertisements are needed. Checks, payable to the Greater Boston Faculty Committee on Vietnam, may be sent to Post Office Box 543, Central Square Station, Cambridge, Mass., 02139. Prof. Everett Mendelsohn, secretary; Prof. Cyrus Levinthal, treasurer.)

PORTLAND, OREG., May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building.

HONORABLE SIR: Congratulations to you and Senator GRUENING for your courage. Perhaps one day when another book is written on Profiles in Courage, you will both be included. How sad that their aren't more Senators who have the courage to speak out

against the policy being pursued by our Government.

We are grateful to you and want you to know that you have our support.

Sincerely yours,

ROSE M. SCHULZ.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 21, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: There are a lot of words on radio and in papers about you being against the U.S. involvement in the "Goldwater war" in Vietnam, and the mess in the Dominican Republic.

If you are sincere, and if you are quoted correctly, it seems to me you should make a lot of professional politicians mad by proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding Americans from fighting on foreign soil—volunteers excepted.

At 65 I don't care what happens to any government. The cocksure ignorance of politicians has made a mess of the world, and proves that the rarest work of God is an honest politician. We Oregonians are also aware that "Salem and Washington, D.C., are the only insane asylums on earth run by their own inhabitants."

How about giving the constitutional amendment some thought? And words? Please don't bother to reply.

Respectfully,

E. P. CICHY.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Much like the boy in the USO advertisements, I picture you back in Washington wondering "Does anybody know I'm here?" Although I am a high school student, underage, and therefore, do not "count," I am very aware of your opinions on Vietnam (as is nearly everyone else). I know you are there. I am listening (even though the Oregonian does not quote you with enthusiasm) and I am proud that you represent my State.

Out of protest more than anything else, and because I do not want to support action that I am uninformed on, I have not made up my mind to one course of action or another on Vietnam. The reason? Because the American people have not been told the facts about Vietnam. I cannot believe that we are being dealt fairly with. There is a silence between those vast and diverse areas and the people—people who are being asked (or should be asked, somewhere along the line) in some measure to determine their fate. If the American Government steps into a country to maintain the status quo, rotten and corrupt as it may be, is it not, or should it not be, the American people who are stepping in? And if the responsibility is ours, does not the American Government have a responsibility to us? We are becoming the servants to a vast government machine whereas the Government should never be a machine and should always be the servant to the people. We are losing sight of our own system of freedom, in a grave sense. But is all this ideological banter set aside for wartime conditions. Indeed: Whose war? I don't recall it coming up before your august body of Representatives and Senators, do you, Senator Morse?

As I have said, I do not know what to advocate in Vietnam merely because I do not know enough. But I do know this. I feel that the job you are doing, is a bangup one, and I wouldn't trade you for all the hawks in the country. You are the loyal opposition, you and Senator CHURCH (I was born in Idaho) and precious few others, and you are vital. I know you are there, and I am proud.

Yours truly,

MISS MEGAN TAYLOR.

P.S.—This was not an assignment for an unimaginative social studies teacher. I just had to say it.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
May 17, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I include myself among many responsible citizens who are deeply concerned about our Government's policy in Vietnam. One serious source of dissatisfaction is the absence of any detailed assessment of the feelings and attitudes of the South Vietnamese regarding U.S. aid and also regarding the Vietcong.

President Johnson has assured us that the South Vietnamese desire our presence and detest the Vietcong. The only support for this viewpoint is the President's assertion that it is so. Unfortunately, we have not been given sufficient proof of this and there are, on the contrary, many good reasons for doubting its validity. I do not think, for instance, that the continued existence of the guerrilla movement in South Vietnam is adequately explained by Vietcong terrorism.

It seems to me that we were not helping either the South Vietnamese or ourselves by our armed intervention in Vietnam. For both practical and moral reasons it is unwise for us to continue our present policy. We could support the interests of democracy far more effectively by ceasing our bombings and leading in the negotiations to set up a viable and independent state in South Vietnam. The money we are now using to support the war could, if used differently, provide a means for the growth and development of South Vietnam.

I urge you to call for an immediate cessation of the bombings. I believe the United States could do far more for the Vietnamese and for our own prestige by taking the lead in a call for negotiations.

Respectfully,

SERENA A. WEAVER.

GREATER PORTLAND COUNCIL
OF CHURCHES,
Portland, Oreg., May 20, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Greater Portland Council of Churches is morally concerned with the Vietnam situation. We want you to know of this concern. It is rooted in our calling as Christian people to "seek peace and pursue it." We recognize also our responsibility to "do justly and love mercy." Our concern, therefore, is peace with justice. We wish to express our interest in the true needs of the people of southeast Asia, our hope for the most helpful and constructive American policy toward that region, and our concern about the continuing escalation of what you recently termed "a real war" in Vietnam.

We believe that American aims should be stated positively in terms of backing "the revolution of rising expectations" which characterizes the desires of Asian peoples along with African and Latin American peoples. We do not feel that our country has emphasized sufficiently our basic sympathy with the development of political, economic, and social justice in southeast Asia. In this connection, we urge that our Government support the Mekong Delta project now underway, which promises so much for the well-being of southeast Asia, in amounts comparable to our military expenditures in the area. This would confirm U.S. concern for a constructive alternative to present trends. It would be incontrovertible evidence of our peaceful aims for the region. It would contrast with any who seek to exploit or seize these areas for their own purposes. In connection with our special concern for South Vietnam, we would note that its future depends on making it viable in terms of integral relationships with the entire region.

We hold with all thoughtful and discerning men who prize freedom that communism is a grave hazard and a most exploitative form of social organization.

However, we are forced to accept the fact that to present the American case as basically that of fighting and containing communism is too limited and too negative a rationale for our foreign policy, and especially for our significant presence in southeast Asia. We are further aware of how little this interests and appeals to many peoples of southeast Asia, whose attention is fixed on other pressing concerns. Thus, we recognize the necessity of our Government's prudent use of the working concept of co-existence with governments in Asia which are not patterned after our own. We accept the fact that southeast Asian countries will evolve their own forms of government with which we must work, even though they may bear little resemblance to Western democracies.

We believe that our country must move beyond unilateral action in Vietnam before the escalation and expansion of war involves the overt intervention of Communist China and increases the hazards of nuclear war. We reject unqualifiedly any and all proposals for the preventive or preemptive bombing of China as an aspect of the present situation. Since negotiation is inevitable either during war or at the close of war, and protracted conflict extends the suffering, escalates fear and hatred born of war, and deepens the tragic aftermath of war into which communism can most successfully move, we urge the ceaseless exploration and use of all avenues of negotiation. We support your announced intention of "unconditional discussions," which we realize must include the Vietcong, which is composed of both North and South Vietnamese. We understand the impossibility and inadvisability of our policing the internal affairs of countries around the world. We believe that we should work energetically for the creation of an Asian International Armed Police Force for protective purposes in Vietnam to supplant our forces at the earliest possible moment. We are painfully aware of the difficult role the United States has been taking, and which to Asians and other colored peoples of the world can be so easily misconstrued. To secure the order and security with justice of that entire region now demands that we, in concert with other nations, find alternate, long-range solutions commensurate with the serious needs and great possibilities of that area.

We want you to know, Mr. President, that we keep you continually in our prayers, asking our God to sustain you in the midst of your heavy responsibilities, and to do in His power, mercy, and grace what we are unable to do in preserving peace in our troubled world.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. CATE,
Executive Secretary.

HERMISTON, OREG.,
May 19, 1965.

WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you on your stand against President Johnson concerning his interventionist foreign policy. We believe that if the United States continues to pursue this policy the results will be catastrophic. We find that by talking to people that there is more opposition than the polls show. We hope that you, Senator GRUENING and Representative GREEN will keep hitting at Mr. Johnson where it hurts.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. SNIVELY.
LOIS SNIVELY.

EUGENE, OREG., May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We profoundly support your efforts to alter U.S. policy in Vietnam. We equally urge you to do anything

in your power to halt our appalling intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely,

CONRAD D. MILLER.
LAURA J. MILLER.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 21, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to a letter which recently appeared in the Journal, I am writing to let you know my attitude toward your stands on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of your position.

Please know that I shall continue to urge my friends and acquaintances to listen to your excellent points of view. Your insight and courage is greatly admired.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DON HAROLD KILLIAN.

NORMAN, OKLA.,
May 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you for continuing to urge a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

The widening of the war has only made matters worse by increasing the risk of another world war.

Truly yours,

MARGARET E. SALMON.
EDWARD J. GOODMAN.

MADISON, WIS.,
May 11, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for having the courage to vote against the \$700 million Vietnam appropriation.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH H. MYRLAND.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am inexpressibly grateful for your voice of opposition to America's disastrous and cruel foreign policy, particularly regarding Vietnam. I find the thought extremely frightening, that if not for you and the Alaskan Senator, there would be virtually no official questioners of the lie the American people are being indoctrinated with. I pledge to work with you for the peace and justice the people of this earth deserve.

Sincerely,

IRA CHALEFF.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.,
May 14, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I want to be counted among those who are desperately against our action in Vietnam and intervention in other parts of the world.

The stand you have consistently taken is deeply appreciated by many Americans. The Congress is really our only hope to stop the American madness, but according to a Quaker visitation made in Washington early in April (259 calls), "the Congressmen are disturbed about Vietnam but none appeared to be interested in taking any initiative."—Gretchen Tuthill, who headed up the visitation for the American Friends Service Committee.

It is our responsibility, as the represented, to inform you that many of us feel that the work done by Senators like you and Messrs. GRUENING, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, etc., is the only means possible to retrieve our country from the mess it has built up for itself under the leadership of the

President and his advisers in the Pentagon and State Department. When a handful of men has this much power, our form of Government loses even its resemblance to a democracy.

If the Congressmen are to represent the people, as they are sworn to do, they must restrain the hand of America, or the future can be only a horrible question mark. Nobility really means great power in a hand that withholds its use.

May your leadership continue to be strong and inspired.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MONICA KERNBERGER.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
May 10, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I support wholeheartedly the statements you have made recently with respect to our stupid, shameful involvement in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

Your counsels of sanity, of morality, are to be vigorously applauded. For the sake of the world's future, I know that you will continue to advise as intelligently, as wisely, as you have in the past.

Very best regards,

ROGER E. LAMB.

LAWRENCE, KANS., May 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please add my voice to yours in opposition to the present Vietnam policy. You are not alone in speaking against those who now will not even deign to speak at all. It is no doubt the nature of "hawks" to fly above the "herd," but I hope Mr. Bundy is not so far away that you can't be heard.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH F. WETZEL.

FAIRFAX, VA., May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At this dangerous time when U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam and elsewhere seems to be succumbing more and more to impulsive and irresponsible action, your courageous, rational and balanced public statements are a beacon of hope.

I want you to know that you have earned the deep admiration and gratitude of Americans in all parts of this country.

Sincerely,

MYRTLE BRICKMAN.

BOULDER, COLO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courage in acting on behalf of the best principles of American democracy and humanitarian thought in voting against endorsing our rash policy in Vietnam and, at least by indirection, in the Dominican Republic.

For years we have known you to be a man of courage and high principle but this action must have been unusually difficult even for you. However, I hope you realize that the huge majorities in both Houses of Congress by no means reflected any such preponderance of support in the Nation. Many people we know have very grave doubts about our policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and some of us are sickened to realize that our country would use its massive armed might to force political decisions on other peoples.

Thank you and best wishes for many more years in the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL OLIN.
CAROL OLIN.

OLD BETHPAGE, N.Y., May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have recently read some of your remarks to the Senate on the President's request for more funds for Vietnam. I must advise you that your comments were masterful. I have long admired you and your courage and wisdom but this speech was the finest.

Isn't there some way we can stop the President from leading us in this terrible path to future war? I have written letters to all my Congressmen and Senators but it seems of little avail. Letters to the President seem futile, but still I write.

Keep up your wonderful work, for even though you may not receive the praises of the press you know that millions of ordinary people applaud you and wish you success. If there is some way that I can help I would deem it an honor to hear from you.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. BACH.

CHAPEL HILL, SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.,
May 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just now seen excerpts from your two speeches in the Senate on May 5 and 6. I am writing to express my deep gratitude for what you said there and for the great courage it took to express such views in the present atmosphere in the United States.

In tone and style, attitude and actions, President Johnson has generated this atmosphere. He has built upon the conditioning of 20 years of the cold war. And in the past 4 months he has undermined 150 years of American effort to build a world of international law and comity. He has returned to the insufferable self-righteousness and truculence in foreign affairs of President Theodore Roosevelt. The Johnson corollary to the Monroe Doctrine strikes at the heart of the inter-American system, flaunts treaties, charters, and the pledged word of the United States. In Vietnam he has done the same things, but with the infinitely greater danger of total war with China and perhaps the Soviet Union. He has destroyed the detente painfully and partially inaugurated by President Kennedy and former Premier Khrushchev. He has violated his own spoken word even as he uttered it to the people of the United States and to the world. Whatever his intentions his actions have widened the war, drawn America in deeper to that tragic situation, and alienated other governments and peoples throughout the world. He has acted unilaterally, arbitrarily, and intransigently; he has defied petitions and criticisms from the Senate and from many responsible persons in the academic world. He has profoundly frightened millions of people and brought not only the good faith but even the sanity of the administration into question. And he has surrounded himself with a group of advisers who are obsessed with fear of communism and the belief that it can be contained and defeated by the use of American military power and the threat of nuclear war.

I honor you for your heroic efforts to correct this appalling situation, and I beg you to continue in these efforts. Humanity and history will confirm and reward you.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID P. LEONARD.

KINGSTON, N.J., May 12, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was in the Senate gallery last Thursday, the sixth, just at the

end of Senator DIRKSEN's speech, in which he attacked you, not by name, for refusing to support the President on Vietnam. I thought your reply to him, that you would let nothing stop your criticism when you saw something wrong, was right, and that your entire course has been right; I am writing this to thank you for what you have been doing. I am one of those thousands in New Jersey who is unrepresented in the U.S. Senate, and I am glad to see that you and a few others are giving me a little bit of what the English used to call "virtual representation."

One thing more, Senator. I hope that in all your attacks on this evil, and, what is worse, stupid and shortsighted policy you will not neglect to propose alternatives. The President's offer of a TVA for southeast Asia in his Johns Hopkins speech is not only the most constructive thing he has done, it is the only constructive thing he has done. I hope that you will not advocate that we ignore the people there, but that we start trying to help them and stop trying to rule them by force.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT D. BULKLEY, JR.

P.S.—I'd appreciate copies of a few of your speeches on this, and being put on your mailing list.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE
AT FULLERTON,
Fullerton, Calif., May 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your honest and courageous stand against the current U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I feel we should withdraw immediately and unconditionally.

I would appreciate receiving any printed material that fully expounds your views on this matter.

I realize that it is physically impossible to answer each inquiry individually, but academic inquisitiveness leads me to pose the following question: If a secret ballot were taken in the Senate regarding Vietnam policy, what, in your opinion, would be the probable outcome?

Sincerely,

J. E. MORROW,

Assistant Professor of Psychology.

LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We strongly support your courageous stand in opposition to the administration's war against the people of Vietnam. It is our opinion that the United States should seek a negotiated settlement of that war, based on the 1954 Geneva agreement and leading to the withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces and military aid from southeast Asia. But even if negotiations should prove impossible or should end in failure, we feel that the United States should withdraw its military forces anyway. The time has come to end this reckless policy of military adventurism before it's too late.

Respectfully,

PHILIP OKE.
Mrs. RAYMOND OKE.

SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.
DEAR SIR: I am grateful to you for being the only articulate person in protesting the President's policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

P. G. MITCHELL.

(No reply needed.)

WOODMONT, CONN., May 16, 1965.
HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I write in support of your recent criticisms directed against the Johnson administration's foreign policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. I endorse wholeheartedly your negative vote on the Vietnam appropriation and regret that more representatives of the people did not show similar courage in opposing the measure. I fear that we in America are rapidly reaching the point where criticism becomes equated with subversion and where consensus politics becomes a substitute for hard thinking.

May I urge upon you the need for an immediate Senate investigation into the conduct of the war in Vietnam and into our invasion of the Dominican Republic. Such an investigation should be publicly held and constructive critics of the administration both within and without the Government should be heard. Too often the mask of national security is used to hide the failures of bureaucratic decisionmaking. Too often a veil of secrecy has hidden the narrowness of vision and the inbreeding of ideas which afflicts the executive branch of our Government in the conduct of foreign policy.

May your voice remain loud in opposition as long as reason lives in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL E. PARRISH,
Graduate Student, Yale University.

PORT CHESTER, N.Y.,

May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was very reassuring to read of your intervention in the Senate about foreign policy.

We are greatly impressed by your eloquence and clarity which is a consequence of maturity and knowledge. Senators like you are the hope of all Americans. A policy of arrogance, aggression, compulsive possessiveness only spells disaster. The American people are not Texas cattle to be branded with these characteristics. We voted for President Johnson because we thought he would continue the policies of the late great President Kennedy. Yet, it seems Barry Goldwater is in the Presidency. We live in times in which none of us can remain indifferent. The greatness of this country is due to the free enterprise of ideals and ideas. Why should we change now?

Very sincerely yours,

E. A. GOMEZ, M.D.
GERDA GOMEZ

BOSTON, MASS.,

May 18, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I Congratulate and thank you for the fight you are waging against an expanded war in Vietnam.

I would only amend your remarks in one slight respect. You say that China moves in on the ground, we will have to send 300,000 troops. But Walter Lippmann writes in a recent column that there is plenty of talk in State and Defense these days about sending 350,000 troops to South Vietnam, regardless of what China does. In this they are consistent. We can only have our way in South Vietnam at the cost of a massive military occupation of the country. The alternative is a government in which the Vietcong will play a large part, a government that will demand U.S. withdrawal, a government that will begin to normalize relations with the North and with China.

The greatest danger of a U.S. occupation in Vietnam, in my judgment, is not that it will bring about war with China or even Russia, but that it will bring, as the Algerian

war did in France, the destruction of freedom and of democratic institutions at home. We are already on this road; we will go much farther.

Sincerely,

JOHN HOLT.

ELLENSBURG, WASH.,

May 14, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I often discuss with my family and friends what should or should not be done about the escalation of the war in Vietnam. All give you credit for your great courage in speaking out on the Vietnam situation. It is the least I can do to inform you, that in truth, you have many, many backers in this area. If only there were some way we could speak a little louder.

This is the country of all of us—not just those in high offices. Mr. Rusk intimates we shouldn't object to what is going on and that we should consider the "real facts."

What are the real facts in regard to Vietnam and Santo Domingo? It is very frustrating to always have to be guessing what they are. We talk among ourselves and make statements as to what we think is back of all the fighting, but come up with no real facts. We wonder if, other than communism, they are racial, religious, political, plain showing of strength, or all of these together. We wonder if President Johnson is making all final decisions and/or is being dictated to by certain officials, special interests or leaders of other countries who may have something to gain politically or otherwise. If we were told the facts as events happen we would not come up with wild assumptions for which we could possibly be very wrong.

We and the press talk of freedom, the free world, the American way, and the right of all people to choose their leaders. Isn't there some way we can continue to make these expressions have real meaning. I, myself hope that some unknown event will arise or some minds be prodded into working out some kind of peace before use of the atomic bomb.

I would appreciate knowing of any source of information that would give some truths in regard to our deep involvement in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

Very truly yours,

MRS. BERTHA FIEGE.

HARVARD COLLEGE OBSERVATORY,

Cambridge, Mass., May 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing just to add my voice to those who praise you most highly for your continued opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam. Thank God for you and Senator GRUENING; I sincerely hope others will soon join you. Keep it up, and good luck.

Sincerely,

DAVID MORRISON.

COPENHAGEN F, DENMARK,

May 16, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I agree with the Danish papers, the London Guardian, and the London Observer: the United States must negotiate with the Vietcong. I completely agree with the statement printed in the New York Times by my fellow academics in the Greater Boston faculty group, "A Reply to Secretary Rusk on Vietnam," and with their conclusion, "We must arrange for an immediate cease-fire and offer to negotiate with the principal combatants, including the Vietcong; we must cease our air raids on North Vietnam; we should use

the good offices of the United Nations in bringing about these ends, and we must assure the world that we will not use nuclear weapons in the pursuit of victory or in the pursuit of peace."

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

Senator MORSE: I strongly support your courageous, strong stand against the U.S. action in Vietnam. All of Denmark does, too, from what I can read in the newspaper.

Above is a carbon of a letter mailed to President Johnson.

Your speeches give courage to us all.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

PLYMOUTH, MICH.,

May 15, 1965.

Senator MORSE: Thank you, Mr. Senator, for all you said at Detroit Town Meeting on channel 4, WWJ, Tonight.

When you left the Republican Party I felt very sad, but I have since learned why and have become an Independent too.

Keep on pounding out the truth. We surely need it. I feel better tonight. Most of the time I am torn as to what to believe—how must it be for our young people? I hope they keep it up on the college campuses of our country.

It was wonderful telling us again about our Senator Arthur Vandenburg. God bless him.

Sincerely,

MARGARET PIERCE
Mrs. Frank J. Pierce.

ASHFIELD, MASS.,

May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I must write to congratulate you on your stand vis-a-vis the \$700 million war appropriations bill rammed through Congress by the President. It is inconceivable that this should be done at a time when we have, as well as the rest of the world, so many social ills and problems which need immediate attention.

My son has just registered for the draft and I can envision 18 years of careful attention, love, direction, and guidance, as well as money, going into a square box. Having fought almost 4 years in World War II, narrowly missing extinction several times, I am fed up with this myopic megalomania for war displayed by men in positions of power in this country. Like you, I refuse to acquiesce to this concentrated drive toward war. Would, however, that I could do more.

In the recent past I have given up a well-paying job in a munitions factory (so-called defense) in order to pursue work toward a doctorate. Hopefully there will yet be time to practice what I have spent 2 years trying to acquire an educational background which is acceptable at the college level.

Meanwhile, my very best wishes to you and the few others who are courageously waging the battle for human survival.

Sincerely,

DONALD FITZGERALD.

P.S. 1.—May I have a copy of your speeches May 5 and 6?

P.S. 2.—Please put my name on the list of subscribers to your campaign needs. Also, would you pass this on to TED KENNEDY. Thank you.

PRINCETON, N.J.,

May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your noble and responsible speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6 regarding our foreign policy in Asia set you apart from your colleagues as a true Senator, a true leader. Everything I have read in my past 10 busy years as a mother of five has led me to the conclusion that in your line of reasoning is the only path to a world of hope for our children and their counterparts all over the planet.

I do not intend to stop reading and learning and I do not intend to stop writing my Representatives and my President, urging them to take heed of your longer sighted and wiser view of our changing world. Impatience and political expediency and military might cannot bring about the "better world" we must arduously work toward for those who come after us. President Johnson seems to want to create a world in his own image as a kind of personal "7 days wonder."

My husband, a busy physician, joins me in sending you best wishes and gratitude.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Alfred T. Halt.
MARIE J. HALT

MAY 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I express, belatedly, my appreciation and admiration for your stand against President Johnson's request for \$700 million for further military requirements in Vietnam. Today a similar message shall be forwarded to Senators GRUENING and NELSON for having joined with you in this action. I regret that I can't number myself among your constituents, and I shall so inform my own Senators who are either in accord with President Johnson's increasingly arrogant foreign policy or lack the courage to publicly denounce it—in any case neither of them represent my position in this matter.

President Johnson's rapid resort to and expansion of the old style "gunboat" diplomacy has led me to finally accept the proposition that he deliberately misled the American people in the last campaign when he argued that a difference existed between himself and Goldwater with reference as to what actions were necessary and proper in troubled areas like Vietnam. Either he deliberately misled us, or he has been, in an amazingly short time, completely sold on the position taken by the "war hawks." Apparently no "dove" can reach him now.

It would seem that the only action left to those voters feeling as I do is to do what apparently we should have done last November—refuse our vote for either candidate. If the mule kicks you once, it is the mule's fault; but if it kicks you the second time, it is your own fault.

Sincerely yours,

ANN V. KING
Mrs. G. Barr King.

SPOKANE, WASH.

FARMINGTON, Pa., May 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to thank you and express our appreciation for your courageous and lonely fight during the Vietnam crisis. We were grateful for what you expressed on May 5 and 6 when the \$700 million appropriation measure was considered. We simply want to support and encourage you in your stand and we hope for both a growing awareness of the wrongness of our Government's position and a militant pursuit of peace.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL and SHIRLEY BRANDIES.

MOYLAND, Pa.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I send my devout thanks for your determination for morality and reason in our Vietnam policy.

I am deeply worried. Surely there seems to be a juggernaut under way carrying the administration and with it all of us to the brink of mad actions. What do you suggest that citizens do to reverse the disastrous policy of the United States in Vietnam? The President fails to listen to friends abroad or reasoned advice from Congress, the press, and educators.

Should those who are concerned use their bodies to stand in the path of this mad policy? I picketed with the religious group at the Pentagon last week. Should we come again and stay longer?

Very urgently,

ROBERT ANTHONY.

MAY 19, 1965.

ST. AGNES SCHOOL,
Albany, N.Y., May 18, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to you for a heroic defense of the only realistic and safe foreign policy I've heard mentioned near the White House for Vietnam.

Keep up the good work. We're on your side and we'll do our best where we live to help people understand how valuable our stakes really are in Asia and how important it is that we change our present bankrupting war for a more humane method of containing communism.

Respectfully yours,

ESETER J. LANGWORTHY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday I was privileged to see a film dealing with Vietnam which you made for a Yale protest group. I can not help but admire your courage in standing up to the administration, the Pentagon, and the State Department, and thereby presenting the viewpoint of a substantial portion of the American people. I sincerely wish that there were more Senators and Congressman with your perspective and conviction to a sound and moral foreign policy.

I fervently believe that continuation of the war in Vietnam can only result in creating a deep hatred for the United States and with it a misunderstanding of the truly democratic principles on which this country was built and in which the vast majority of Americans believe.

May I offer my support in your continued efforts of opposition.

Very truly yours,

LOUISE SCHNEIDERMAN.

FREEMONT, MAINE,
May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations, my heartiest congratulations on your two prophetic and magnificent speeches in the Senate, May 5 and 6. I agree with you absolutely, nor could what you have said be better expressed. Yours is patriotism of the highest and wisdom beyond dispute. I am writing in the same vein in a couple of newspaper columns here in Maine.

God be with you.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. GHAMAM.

AUTOMOTIVE NEWS,
Detroit Mich., May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I commend you for your efforts to keep the United States from drifting into war in the East.

Is it not possible to have a full-fledged debate in Congress as to what our foreign policy should be?

How can we citizens help?

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. FINLAY.

MAY 18, 1965.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a short note to say that I approve of your stand on Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. It is good to know that some representatives of the American people have not been cowed by the dictatorial methods of the Johnson administration. We are not supporting freedom in the civil wars that exist in these two countries.

As a Johnson supporter for the presidency—politically, financially, and morally—I feel that I was deceived into voting for what I believed was a policy of intelligence and moderation. Now our foreign policy is applauded by the John Birch Society, the American Nazi Party, A.C.A., Richard Nixon, Joseph Alsop, Barry Goldwater and the rest of the far right.

This country needs an antipoverty campaign—in the State Department, the Pentagon, and the CIA. There is a poverty of intelligence, ideas, justice, humility, and moral values.

Keep up your wonderful fight for a truly free world and the rights of all mankind.

Sincerely yours,

LEE HORVITZ.

MONROEVILLE, Pa.

SOCIETY OF BROTHERS,
Farmington, Pa.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With this letter my wife and I want to express our gratitude and respect for how, and with what courage you have spoken out protesting against what is going on in Vietnam.

In these last weeks we have been following very closely and with great interest the happenings and atrocities going on in the world. We are deeply troubled how much hate and violence there is and how rapidly it is increasing. So little respect is paid to individual lives, and life seems to be considered unimportant and worthless by so many men.

We read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from your speech on May 5. It moves us deeply to know that you stand for justice and world peace and we support you fully in this. It is so very important that that kind of voice as yours and that of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. GRUENING, are heard. Again we want to thank you and ask that you do not feel alone, and continue to express what you feel is right.

We greet you warmly.

Yours,

ALLISTER and JUDY MARCHANT.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 14, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to express my gratitude to you for the stand you have taken on Vietnam. I realize what terrific odds you are facing when the machine is all oiled up ready to explode at any moment.

To me I don't seem to understand why anyone would want to push us into another war. As the saying goes, "we win the wars but lose the peace." I am sure that the people of the world must think we Americans a very vicious nation. To my way of thinking our troops should be brought home as one boy's life isn't worth the entire strip. The reason I speak is, I lost a brother in the first war and that was supposed to be the war to end wars.

Was I wrong in my way of thinking about the Dominican Republic, as I thought the President said he was only sending in the Marines to get our American people out of danger. Now we are not only there but we are telling them who they should put in power.

I wonder what this Nation would do if De Gaulle or any other foreign nation came

over here with their troops and said "you can't have Senator Morse in the Senate," just what would we tell them? I am sure you know the answer. I am sure if the President keeps on going the way he has been he will go down in history as a very much hated man. Along with him the same goes for Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara. When I mention to some people the things I have put in this letter they say I am either a Communist or a John Birchler and I can assure you I am neither.

Anyway Senator MORSE I want you to know that you have made many, many, friends and may God bless you for your stand on the affairs of our people.

Cordially yours,

CHARLES T. COX.

MAY 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been meaning to write you for a long time to advise and agree with you in your position on Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

Further, I just want to say I have high admiration for you and regard you as a man of great wisdom, courage, and honesty.

With all best wishes for your continued good health and good work.

God bless you.

Very respectfully,

I. C. KREMEN, M.D.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

ST. LUKE'S METHODIST CHURCH,
Columbus, Ohio, May 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Every thoughtful, well-informed and fairminded man agrees with you that the war in Vietnam is stupid and unnecessary.

I am back of you 100 percent.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES B. WHITMAN,
Pastor, St. Luke's Methodist Church,
and Lieutenant Colonel.

BRYN MAWR, PA.,

May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express admiration and appreciation for your courageous stand against the U.S. increasingly dangerous and clearly illegal military involvement in Vietnam. Such reports as I have read of your speeches on the Senate floor convince me you are one of only two Senators brave and honest enough to make clear the lack of justification for this country's aggression against North Vietnam, and its virtual military occupation of South Vietnam.

I would appreciate being sent any copies of your fine statements on Vietnam which you may have available. My address makes it clear I am not one of your constituents; but it seems to me that the Vietnam crisis goes far beyond the boundaries of any one State. Your recent speeches against the \$700 million carte blanche which President Johnson virtually extorted from both Houses were greatly to your credit.

I wonder if you feel yourself as poorly covered by the mass media as I think you are. To me, there is a systematic elimination or distortion of all anti-Vietnam criticism. Senator GRUENING's excellent speech to the students who protested in Washington, D.C., went almost completely unnoticed by the press.

You may be interested to know that citizens not in your home State are following

your courageous battle and are hoping that your stand for sanity and frankness will at last convert some of your rubberstamping colleagues to sense and fairness.

To me, the invasion of the Dominican Republic, with all the incredible lies and evasions that flowed from top U.S. officials—this put the Johnson administration into a very fearful perspective. I keep pinching myself to convince myself I'm not dreaming: for Barry Goldwater, not Lyndon Johnson, seems to have won the presidential election.

To me you are a "profile in courage," and your prophetic condemnations of President Johnson's antidemocratic policies will in the future be seen as the patriotic cries against political folly that they so clearly are.

Yours truly,

RICHARD C. KOHLER.

MAY 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your speech and actions of last week, May 5 and 6.

There weren't too many voices raised with respect to Vietnam, unfortunately.

The conscience of Congress seems to have fallen apart.

May I have a copy of your speeches of both May 5 and 6?

Thank you.

STANLEY ROSENBERG.

SAN BERNARDINO HIGH SCHOOL,
San Bernardino, Calif., May 19, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate your sending me documented material expressing your stand on the Vietnam situation and the Dominican fiasco.

I am an ardent follower of your sane approach to world affairs in an age where the majority of this Nation's leaders are wildly flaying blindly at the so-called Communist threat.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN R. SCOTT.

MAY 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like you to know that we stand firmly behind your Vietnam position. Keep up the good work.

JONATHAN H. HARRIS,

ROBERT MALTEZ,

Harvard Graduate School of Design.

LEONARD OSHINSKY,

Harvard Law.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,

May 19, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not a constituent of your State, but must tell you I wholeheartedly agree with your views on the war in Vietnam and admire your courage in expressing them. The average citizen opposing the administration's policy in Vietnam feels so powerless to do anything. At least we feel we have a spokesman in you. If copies of your speeches in the Senate May 5 and 6 opposing the President's \$700 million request for Vietnam are available, I should very much appreciate receiving three copies so I may distribute them to friends.

Sincerely,

NANCY D. KENT
Mrs. D. R. Kent.

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RELATIONS OF THE MENNONITE CHURCH,

Goshen, Ind., May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On May 4-6, 1965, a number of religious leaders were in Washington engaged in a consultation on Vietnam. We called on a number of Senators and Representatives and also had a conference with the Vice President. I think we were scheduled at one time to have a meeting with you, but due to the debate in the Senate on the President's request for an appropriation of \$700 million in support of the Vietnam program, you were engaged in that debate and the meeting with you was not held.

I wish to say that a number of us were in the Senate on Wednesday afternoon when you made your eloquent speech objecting to the President's proposals. I wish to congratulate you for the stand which you have taken, and I do hope that your influence and those of others who share your viewpoint may have their influence in shaping American foreign policy in the direction of peace. I would be happy to have you keep me informed of any developments which should be shared with an informed citizenry.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

GUY F. HERSHBERGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 21, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support an immediate ceasefire in Vietnam, and application of Mr. U Thant's formula for negotiations.

Very sincerely,

MICHAEL GELLER.

TRENTON, N.J.,
May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Please keep up your wonderful work. We admire your courage and foresight. I agree, we should not be in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Best wishes,

JOHN A. KINCZEL, M.D.

YAKIMA, WASH.,
May 20, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding the recent \$700 million President Johnson requested for the Vietnam war, we find words inadequate to express our thanks and deep admiration for your brave "nay" along with Senators GRUENING and NELSON.

The Pentagon computers are unable to measure the future hatred and distrust mankind will hold for the people of the United States. This Vietnam war is truly one of the gravest mistakes this country ever made.

Sadly and sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. M. E. HERR.

MOUNT VERNON, WASH.,
May 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your opposition to the President's policy in Vietnam and your vote against his \$700 million appropriation for that policy. How sad that those who agree with you are in such a minority.

I am sick at heart over the course of criminal folly that our Government is pursuing in Asia, and, yes, in South America, too. What can a small private citizen do, be-

sides writing frequently to the President, Senators and Congressmen?

Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

COLLEEN DICKINSON.

RUTHERFORD, CALIF.,
May 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After listening to an interview given by you to ABC and broadcast by short-wave on May 20, I am proud of the stand you have taken against the administration regarding our policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I agree with you and wish there were more people like you in Washington to guide and keep our foreign policy on the right track.

I feel that the President of the United States is being misinformed by the Pentagon and the State Department.

Please, Mr. Senator, keep on informing the American people of what is going on. The administration does not. They tell us half the truth.

Let's hope that some day they will realize their mistakes. I hope it will not be too late.

I am a naturalized citizen of the United States, born in France, and served in the U.S. Navy during World War I; was always proud of what America stands for.

I am now a little apprehensive of what our foreign policy is leading us to. Three wars in one generation is tiresome and our foreign policy might lead us to another war worse than the others, in which half our population might be wiped out. Think of it, Mr. Senator.

I regret that the two Senators from California have remained silent on this subject.

Thank you, Mr. Senator, for this wonderful interview, and God bless you.

Respectfully yours,

EDMUND A. MANDIN.

POWER, MONT.,
May 20, 1965.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are sick and tired of the hypocrisy of the U.S. Government and ashamed of its actions which smack of Hitler tactics and imperialism, hidden and abetted by our elected representatives.

We would like to know by what right you OK'd the \$700 million for President Johnson to spend on wars and aggression? We are doing what Hitler Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany did, spending billions of dollars for wars of aggression to keep people enslaved. Under the name of "freedom" we go around the world killing, torturing, maiming, and destroying people's property—what a tragedy. It is time we faced up to what is wrong with an economic system that can't stay alive without wars.

We blame others for exactly what we ourselves are doing. No matter what we say to justify our immoral actions, they will not be justified.

We are the only active colonial power today outside of Portugal. We should stop and view ourselves as others see us. If we have the right to control southeast Asia, Russia should have the same right in South America. If it is unthinkable for us that the Russian military might should control South America, then how can we think it is right for us to do this in southeast Asia?

The present governments of Russia and China are not so brutal or ruthless. Drew Pearson attests that the Chinese method of conquering does not consider killing but mainly infiltrating with their people in business contact. Russia's method is similar. If we can't compete with them in peaceful competition, what we are doing will be the end

of everything. How foolish and insane can we be? It's time to take stock of ourselves, not of others, before we commit the ultimate blunder.

Sincerely,

HAROLD and ROSINA WOODHOUSE.

WEST ORANGE, N.J.,
May 20, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to tell you that I admire your willingness to express your unpopular views on our position in Vietnam, and I agree with your stand.

I do not like to differ with our Government's views but I think it is my obligation to say when I think we have made a mistake. I hope that our right to criticize constructively will never be abridged. There are some disturbing signs that criticism is unwelcome, but I am trying to teach my children to speak out for what they think is right. Thank you for setting the good example.

Respectfully yours,

RUTH E. GOODMAN.

DENVER, COLO.,
May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam.

I join with you and many other people in the United States who are hoping for a cease-fire to stop the brutal killing of all people involved.

Thanking you,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ANNE K. ROBINETT.

CARMEL, IND.,
May 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am not one of your constituents, but I want to commend you for your stand against our military intervention in Vietnam and our dangerous escalation of the war there.

You have shown admirable courage in opposing the administration's inexplicable foreign policy, especially in the face of President Johnson's efforts to silence the opposition.

I only wish there were more Senators and Representatives to join in your protests. At least your voices are heard.

Yours truly,

Mrs. R. B. SMITH.

THE LASATER RANCH,
MATHESON, COLO., May 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you on your recent addresses to the Senate, on May 5 and 6, on the matter of our foreign policy.

We stand ready to help you in any way we can. Please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Mary and Tom Lasater
Mr. and Mrs. TOM LASATER.

MELODY FARM,
WASHINGTON COURT HOUSE, OHIO,
May 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Since I heard you say on the television, "We shall not be silenced," I have wanted to write my approval of your opposition to our actions in Vietnam.

Someday you may be nominated as one example of a profile in courage.

I would like the names of the other Senators who voted against the bill to grant extra moneys to carry on the undeclared war.

Sincerely,

WILBUR W. KAMP.

SUN VALLEY, IDAHO, May 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note to add to the many you must receive expressing my support of your strong and lonely stand on Vietnam.

Thank you,

Mrs. NAN HARRIS.

EUCLID, OHIO, May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for doing all in your power to stop the senseless killing of American troops in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

Contrary to international agreements, the United States has introduced many new weapons like napalm, and white phosphorous bombs and increased the number of American troops to a point where there are now almost twice as many American soldiers as there were estimates of Vietcong soldiers only 1 year ago.

In Santo Domingo, American troops are again engaged in aggression and violation of international agreements. American troops again outnumber the native insurgents and while they publicly cry for a cease-fire allow the rightwing generals to bomb and attack and mass troops from areas controlled by American troops.

We are fast becoming the most-hated nation in the world while the American people allow the military to tell lie after lie and suppress our own reporters at the scene.

Not once in recent history have Americans troops been used to protect democratically elected governments from military purges and coup d'etats. Only when a military dictatorship is threatened by democratic insurgents who might have the backing of the Communists, do we intervene.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN L. DAHLMANN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been meaning to write to you for some time and now must postpone the writing no longer.

I wish to congratulate you on the position you have taken on Vietnam and on the reasons you have put forward for taking that position.

It seems to me your views are not given the circulation on the radio and in the press which they deserve.

I consider the last presidential campaign the biggest hoax practiced on us in my lifetime. Only my friends who voted for Goldwater are happy today.

I offer you my best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

HOWARD RICKERT.

WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF.,
May 24, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Both my wife and myself would like to convey our great admiration for your honesty and courage for standing against the current Vietnam policy. We also are very much against it and wish there was something we could do as citizens. Keep up your marvelous efforts.

Sincerely,

VICTOR and MARILYN FELDMAN.

May 27, 1965

THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH
OF COLUMBUS, OHIO,
May 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From the bottom of my heart, thank you for your tireless and courageous insistence upon providing leadership for what small loyal opposition exists in the consensus society our beloved maximum leader has created.

It must seem sometimes that you have "lived out your life talking to scolding men," as Vanzetti said, but those of us who shudder from the insane escalation of this new hip-shooting Barry Johnson deserve a voice also.

Trust for us is, of course, irrevocably destroyed in Latin America; no change in policy can undo that catastrophe. We have succeeded in making certain that the Vietcong government will indeed be Communist—as we always said—and that Laos and Cambodia will follow.

Thank you, sir, for your voice of sanity amidst the cries of "Ave Caesar."

Sincerely,

Rev. J. FRANKLIN CHIDSEY.

EXCELSIOR, MINN., May 19, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It is obvious to me, as I believe it is becoming clear to many if not most Americans, that our foreign policy has reached a new depth of immorality, illegality and senselessness during recent months.

Our involvement in Vietnam has been of doubtful value and legality, to say the least, from the beginning. Our present formula of retaliation against and hypocritical offers to negotiate with the North is absurd and may lead to disaster. Yet now our activities in the Dominican Republic occasion nothing but outrage and horror on the part of thoughtful citizens. Our actions there have been cynical, from the start of the present disturbance, and are now being proved unbelievable folly from any point of view.

Worse, however, is the bludgeoning that the people are being subjected to by your office. This treatment, so far, has been in the form of a stream of "information" that is, in fact, a compound of evasion, wistful prognostication and patent lies. We feel buried under the weight of platitudes and half-truths to the point where our urge to protest is suffocating; as, apparently, our Congress is now stifled. It is this suppression of dissent under the guise of "consensus" that will bring us either to ruin on foreign ground or to a dangerous reaction at home; or, more likely, to both.

Like millions of others, I suspect, I am quite disturbed by the pretensions and apparent megalomania of our executive. Our present expansionist foreign policy will succeed in doing nothing but isolating this country and eventually, one fears, bringing us to a level of frustration where the only solution will be an explosive, annihilating one.

Social revolution is necessary, desirable, and will continue to occur throughout the world despite the icy hysteria and armed evangelism of this administration. Our late President had recognized such a reality and had begun to deal with the world rather than to browbeat and subject it to his will. Anything else, such as our present policy, seems madness.

Yours,

ALLEN F. HARRISON.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Redding, Calif., May 18, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have my vote of confidence for your vote of "no confidence"

in the program of mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

Keep up the position.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. HAWTHORNE.

GARDENA, CALIF., May 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your efforts on behalf of the American people is greatly appreciated. We admire your courage and stamina to stand by your convictions with regard to our foreign policy. Although we are unable to vote for you we would like to thank you for representing our opinion.

Yours truly,

DOROTHY and ARTHUR Y. KOBAYASHI.

AMHERST, MASS.,

May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your courageous remarks on our foreign policy. But I fear that we are being headed toward a showdown with China, and protest will become more and more difficult or unpatriotic. Please continue to speak out against U.S. militarism in Asia and in Latin America. Your voice is essential.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN A. ALLEN.

FRESNO, CALIF.,

May 20, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your stand in the opposition to our Government's policy in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

We have no business in committing our troops and planes in either of these places. I am sure that you have more support in your stand than is readily visible. Please continue in your outspoken opposition to this insane and dangerous policy.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. HANS E. FRANOSCH.

PARIS, ILL.,

May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You may never see this letter but at least it can be added to the ones in the basket marked "for." I appreciate the stand you have taken on our foreign policy, you are right all the way. It is hard to believe that you and Senator FULBRIGHT are the only ones who believe as you do but what holds them back. I feel sorry for Mr. Johnson, he inherited this mess and in trying to get out of it he seems to get in deeper every day. However he did not inherit Santo Domingo.

They say the good we do lives after us, maybe so but there can be no question about the mistakes we make, they grow and grow. Our country is suffering from the mistakes of John Foster Dulles and Joseph McCarthy. I believe that we should recognize China and that China should be admitted to the United Nations. Communism in Russia has changed and it will change in China but our present policy will not help bring that about. If we are the country we think we are we do not have to be afraid of communism.

If we are the Christian nation that we like to think we are, we should take care of our needy at home and feed hungry children the world over to the very limit of our ability and forget guns and bombs.

Yours sincerely,

MAE L. EADS.

NORWICH, CONN.,

May 23, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I join those nonconstituents who appreciate your courageous

stand on Vietnam, and I have so notified Senator RIBICOFF and Senator DODD.

With much gratitude,

CLIFTON W. GRAY, Ph. D.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Fort Collins, Colo., May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous opposition to recent American policy in Vietnam. At a time when the President is attempting to stifle free expression of opinion your stated position becomes not simply a critique of foreign policy but a defense of democracy here at home; everyone, whether or not he agrees with you, must be in your debt.

Your characterization of our Government as "drunk with military power" is most apt. Would that more officials of our Government had your appreciation of the fact that one does not win friends among people by dropping bombs on them.

Sincerely yours,

IRWIN WALL.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

May 16, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I, with many of my colleagues, admire your firm stand for consistency, justice, and commonsense in opposing our administration's policy in Vietnam. We take courage from you, and continue to speak up for a peaceful settlement through negotiations with the belligerents involved—and this includes the obvious * * * the Vietcong—whom we are fighting and shooting, not only the North Vietnamese whom we are bombing.

Do not fail us, the Nation, and the world by backing down now—continue to speak for your earlier proposals.

With admiration and respect for you.

Sincerely yours,

S. MEDORF, M.D.

SEPULVEDA, CALIF.,

May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you on your courage and good commonsense on your views on Vietnam. Especially for your courage to speak out against the overwhelming majority who do not share your views.

I'm sure there are many average housewives like myself who agree with you, but how can we be heard?

I thank you so much. I would be very proud if you were our Senator from California.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HILARY WEAVER,

Mother of Three.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,

May 20, 1965.

HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am one of the many millions who worked hard and voted for you in the last election. Most of us did so because we felt so strongly that Senator Goldwater's foreign policy proposals were dangerous, immoral, likely to achieve the precise opposite of their professed intentions.

Why do you insist, by your bombings in Vietnam, and invasion of the Dominican Republic, in proving just how wrong Barry Goldwater was?

We already believed it before the election. We are more convinced now than ever. I, and many others I know who supported you, are determined to work against, and vote against, any public official regardless of

party, who supports this incredibly inflammatory and discredited policy that assumes our military might obliges us to slaughter people worldwide (and get many of our sons slaughtered in the bargain) in the hypocritical guise of aiding self-determination.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH MACCOLL.

SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to express my sincere gratitude to you for your position on foreign policy. Please keep up the good work.

HUGH MACCOLL.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C., May 20, 1965.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I feel sure you will be interested in this clipping from the Durham Herald of today showing that a spokesman for the State Department excuses the bombing of North Vietnam on the ground of necessity.

As I recall it, this was the excuse of the Germans in their illegal invasion of neutral Belgium in 1914.

Yours truly,

PHILLIPS RUSSELL.

NORTH VIETNAM BOMBING TERMED AS NECESSITY

A U.S. State Department official here Wednesday afternoon gave a direct reason for our bombing of North Vietnam—necessity.

Turner Shelton, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, gave the explanation during a public lecture at Duke University. His topic was "The Situation in Vietnam."

"Let us speak in simple candor," Shelton said. "These bombings are not pleasant; they are not by choice, they are of necessity."

Evidently alluding to the American criticism of our Vietnam policy, particularly from segments of the academic world, Shelton said, "We cannot obscure the facts by engaging in wishful thinking."

Calling attention to American men and women who have been killed in Vietnam, Shelton then added, "In self-defense, we are bombing bridges, roads, and ammunition dumps in a totally reasonable effort to prevent the men and supplies causing the deaths of American and Vietnamese alike from reaching the south."

Noting the Communists' reaction to our bombings, Shelton said, "The fact that all this is so distressing to the Vietcong Communists gives the lie to their claim that they are an indigenous South Vietnam group engaged in civil war."

Asserting that we and the South Vietnamese "are engaged in the pursuit of the basic right of self-defense," Shelton added that "It is an action totally consistent with the spirit of America."

America has pledged itself to aid the South Vietnamese, Shelton said.

"This is a great and worrisome responsibility, but it is the responsibility that goes with America's tremendous power," he asserted.

DOWNNEY, CALIF.,
May 18, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you for the commonsense attitude you take regarding our military intervention in troubled areas, and for your courage in forthrightly opposing this.

We unalterably oppose the deplorable trend which seems to say that only brute force can preserve our way of life. If this be so, then democracy is already lost—why pour blood over the corpse?

And if it would achieve good results, why are we then not using it in our own benighted South?

This inconsistent pattern of behavior would seem to indicate that we are willing to defend our freedom on others' soil and at the expense of their land and people; hardly a noble stand for a great nation.

Please continue to use your gifts to get us back on a more American (as we would like the word to signify) course of action. We are behind you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN N. VON RAAPHORST.
NAN VON RAAPHORST.
MRS. J. N. VON RAAPHORST.

SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.,
May 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I commend you for your courage to vote "no" on President John's request for \$700 million more. It is good to know that at least a few want to take a second look and may wish to try to solve problems by other means than the military or war. Keep up your courage.

Sincerely,

ROLLAND THOMPSON.

MENASHA, WIS.,
May 25, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you and thank you for your fearless expression of your views on our current wars.

I think that you have done our Nation a service in showing the world that our militaristic path is not approved by all of the people.

In admiration and gratitude,

EBBE BERG.

DENISON UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH,
Granville, Ohio, May 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you for your two speeches in the Senate, on May 5 and on May 6, in which you severely criticized American involvement in South Vietnam. Our involvement there is indeed cruel, for Asians now and, as you point out, for Americans in the future. In my opinion there can be no justification for our intervention in what is essentially a civil war—as substantially the war is in the Dominican Republic—and I think we ought to withdraw immediately from both Vietnam and from the Dominican Republic—withdraw militarily, that is, for I think we ought to give nonmilitary aid to the emerging countries, where there is a need and whether they profess to be our friends or not. The Biblical injunction, "If thy enemy hunger, feed him," seems more appropriate now than ever.

Our country, which at one time was looked up to as an inspiration for social revolutionary movement, is now considered, and rightly, the enemy of such movements. I personally am dismayed by that, and I am disheartened that there is so little resistance at home to our quite immoral foreign policy. But resistance to our intervention in Vietnam does seem to be growing, and I find it especially encouraging that young people are more and more employing the techniques of civil disobedience in order to make their "No" more profound.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES MISSEY.

BELLWOOD, ILL.,
May 24, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of approval of your good, sound political policies.

Keep up the good work. Wars only bring misery.

Sincerely,

JOHN SKOJOU.

MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY,
Houghton, Mich., May 23, 1965.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your reports, May 14, 1965, which are always welcome and for including a copy of the Record—"The undeclared war in Vietnam." Very good, and double thanks for your fine, revealing statements. Keep up the good work.

Best regards,

MILTON E. SHERER.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
May 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I believe you were one of three Senators who had the courage not to support the recent supplemental military appropriation to assist in covering the cost of our amplified operations in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic. It is certainly difficult for a citizen at this time to obtain sufficient information on which to base a valid opinion. Our conventional news sources have presented conflicting stories. If we can believe "The Invisible Government" by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross published last year, there is evidence that our foreign relations have sometimes been complicated by intrigues originating within our governmental security agencies, and outside of diplomatic control.

Certainly if the executive branch of our Government receives the impression that they will get automatic support for any hasty venture, then indeed our position is perilous. Your vote against such a mandate was therefore wise.

At times like these, our international image depends to a considerable extent on the quality of our ambassadors. Their appointment is subject to senatorial influence. I lack detailed knowledge of most of Latin America but I do have friends who are familiar with Colombia. One of our former ambassadors there made little attempt to know the people or their language at a time when his English equivalent was studying Spanish and touring through outlying areas. More recently, however, we have done much better. In maintaining this improved record our Senators will be well advised to set up certain basic criteria of competence for such appointees.

Yours very truly,

C. W. SHEPPARD.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., May 21, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thought you'd be interested in seeing the enclosed copy of a letter which appeared in this morning's San Francisco Chronicle.

H. H. Fisher is an emeritus professor of history at Stanford and for a number of years was the head of the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace and Hoover Research Institute, now designated as the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace.

Sincerely,

DAVID S. JACOBSON.

THE REAL ROLE OF VIETNAM TEACH-INS
EDITOR: The teach-in debates are good for what ails us—complacency at the top and conformity below. We cannot afford complacency in times like these and conformity atrophies the precious right of dissent. Debates are less useful, however, if they focus

exclusively on the hot local issues and we lose sight of the larger questions of which the local issues are symptoms.

Have we, for instance, lost sight of the most vital national interest thus ignoring the consequences of our repudiation of our treaty commitments to the global and regional organizations we took a leading part in creating in order to lessen the dangers of war?

Have we lost sight of recent shiftings in the alignments of nations and assumed that communism has become so menacing that the United States has the duty to prevent its further establishment in Asia or Latin America regardless of our agreements and the wishes and policies of friendly governments?

We claim that we are not only protecting our own national security which every nation has a right to do, but are protecting the national security of all nations not under Communist rule, which they have not asked us to do. Many of the presumed beneficiaries would feel more secure if we were not so trigger happy. And the Communists naturally allege that we are not protecting but endangering general security just as imperialists are supposed to do.

Conflicts of national security interests are not new; and they have led to war when one country has followed the advice of its practical realists who believe in the efficacy of preemptive violence. After two wars of mounting scope and destructiveness, world opinion seems to have recognized that in one matter there could no longer be a conflict of national security interests. The overriding security interest of all mankind has come to be the prevention of a third world war in which for the first time man has the nuclear chemical and biological weapons to impose an eternal peace on this contentious planet.

Global and regional peacekeeping arrangements are now in some disarray when, perhaps, we need them more than ever. The basic issue at this moment is do we serve the security interests of ourselves and the rest of humanity by adding to this disarray by repudiating our commitments to these organizations? Resort to armed intervention in violation of treaties, which we have loudly condemned ever since the Germans tore up that "scrap of paper" and invaded Belgium in 1914, has always been done to force an opponent to mend his ways and come to the conference table, preferably to surrender unconditionally. We are violating, and not in the exercise of the right of self-defense, our pledges to both the United Nations and the Organization of American States "to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." The effect, regardless of our motives, can only unify our enemies, shake the confidence of our friends, discourage collective security with us and stimulate collective self defense against us.

We take this risk because, so we are told, the Communists must be stopped at all costs from expanding in Latin America and taking control of all Asia, and there is no one else who can do the job. The administration does not seem to recognize that the conditions in Western Europe, where containment was so successful, do not exist in the developing countries of Asia and Latin America. Nor do the bipartisan supporters of our present policies seem to suspect that the splits between Russian and Chinese and other styles of communism can have any bearing on the world conspiracy or on how to deal with it. Nor is any significance attached to the appearance in several developing countries of single party dictatorships using Communist totalitarian and organizational methods but not Communist ideology, as the most effective way to achieve modernization. The spread of polycentrism, this loosening of alignments is bound to be a growing obstacle to Communist ambitions unless we continue to help the national Com-

munist Parties to minimize their differences with each other while we cause our allies to exaggerate their differences with us.

As the President has said, there is a job to be done and there is no one else who can do it. In this he is certainly right, but he is mistaken in his priorities.

He has acknowledged that it is not just a matter of trying to contain communism by force. His excellent proposal of multilateral development aid is a necessary part of the job. But another part of the job has, under present circumstances, a higher priority. This is first, to recognize that the security of the world's most powerful nation is linked with the security of both friendly and unfriendly nations, and secondly, that in the long run, the security which is the common interest of all peoples can be strengthened only if we, the strongest, uphold and use the global and regional institutions of peaceful change and pacific settlement.

H. H. FISHER.

PALO ALTO.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 17, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish again to commend you for your courage and for your forthright speeches in the Senate on May 5 and May 6. It must feel lonely to take such a stand in the Senate which, in abdicating its powers to declare war is surrendering to an aggressive President and leading our country to destruction.

We sincerely hope enough Americans will support your position so that we may yet be saved from a worldwide holocaust.

Please send us copies of your most recent speeches in the Senate.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. ALFRED STEIN.

THE VALE METHODIST CHURCH,
Fairfax, Va., May 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for those good statements in the Senate May 5 and 6. You are most intelligent and courageous. God bless your worthy endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT DORR.

P.S.—Have you seen this statement by James P. Warburg?

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 22, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much indeed for having sent me the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I am on your mailing list.

That reprint covers your speeches on Vietnam starting with the one you delivered before the Senate on May 5, 1965.

Although I am not a resident of Oregon and consequently not your constituent, I am indeed delighted with both your courtesy in sending me material covering your speeches and legislation you sponsor, as well as with the views you hold and express particularly on Vietnam and foreign affairs issues in general.

As I spent considerable time in southeast Asia generally and in Vietnam particularly throughout 1963 I am in fullest agreement with both the views you so forcefully express and fight for as well as with the conclusions you have reached about the eventual outcome of the war in Vietnam.

It is regrettable to note therefore how little support of your views you have found so far in the Senate and it is equally to be regretted how the President on the advice of

a small coterie of people around him bypasses the United Nations and the Geneva accords and instead of attempting to settle the conflict by negotiations around the conference table with all concerned (and that, of course, means also the Vietcong and Red China) rather escalates the war.

There is now no longer any doubt in my mind that eventually all of southeast Asia will be drawn into this conflict on Vietnam and who knows if an expanded war covering most of southeast Asia may not be the start of world war III.

Once a war has been escalated—and soon it will be fought by 70,000 American men on Vietnamese soil—it will be hard to stop it. Is there no way that public opinion in this country can be aroused to a point that it may bring the White House to think twice before it is too late?

Am really so much in agreement with the views you expressed on Vietnam in your various speeches and for which you are fighting so valiantly that I would like to ask you to kindly let me have eight more copies of the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which I referred on the preceding page, so that I may forward same to a number of friends and acquaintances of mine.

Please continue to let your office send me everything on Vietnam—i.e., not only reprints of your speeches before the Senate but also of talks you give before universities and other gatherings.

Thank you for your courtesy and with all good wishes to you personally and for the wonderful fight you are carrying on, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE H. CORD,
Journalist.

MERZIFON, TURKEY,
May 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It must be difficult to maintain a position such as yours over Vietnam and the Dominican Republic in the face of the apparently widespread support for these policies in Congress and the Nation. If you were as concerned with consensus as the President seems to be, you would have to tailor your ideas accordingly but you seem more concerned with the correctness of your ideas than their popularity—it's good to have you where you are, raising the intelligent objections to this new American indulgence that ought to be raised.

I doubt that the President has all the support for his policies that it may appear he has at first glance. Consensus has some unpleasant connotations and one is that it's a fine companion for apathy. Consensus seems to be assumed wherever there are no contrary voices to be heard which is a negative definition of a term that ought only to be used when positive agreement can be found. The lack of objection from an essentially passive public that tends away from stringently independent thought has perhaps led Mr. Johnson to suppose he has backing where merely silence prevails.

My very secondhand appraisal of the American situation may be wrong though from here it appears that the public is hardly as aroused as it ought to be. The Turkish viewpoint—at least of the man on the street whom I come into contact with—seems quite opposed to what is being done by the United States particularly in Vietnam but in Latin America as well. It looks very frankly like what it is, unwarranted intervention in the national affairs of sovereign nations and others can only wonder when America will decide that their country needs our help. In Vietnam we've a spectacular military playground that seems easily capable of geometrical expansion. Where our notion of international proprietorship has

come from I don't know, perhaps it's the old adage that power corrupts.

I am in the Peace Corps here and trying hard to be proud of my country as well as understand it. There are plenty of people here, Turks and Americans, who support you in your proposals. I simply thought I'd write to support and encourage you in your opposition to the foolhardy and immoral turn foreign policy has taken.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS DEMERS.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,

May 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My profound gratitude for your courageous "No" vote on President Johnson's demand for \$700 million and a "blank check" re the mounting Vietnam and Dominican fiascos. But for you and your small number of brave and honorable colleague dissenters, the resemblance of Capitol Hill to the old Reichstag would be more horrendous than it is.

Respectfully,

SAM HENZEL, M.D.

LEESBURG, VA.,

May 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My congratulations to you for the forthright stand you are taking on the actions of our Government in Vietnam. I am utterly sick over what our country is doing in building up the hatred of the world. Your consistent stand has been most heartening. I trust you will continue to lead the opposition against our very dangerous policy.

Sincerely,

AGNES SAYLER.

RIO DE JANEIRO, GB, ZC 07 BRAZIL,

May 22, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your courageous criticisms of the Government policy in Vietnam.

Let me assure you, as an American living abroad, that the United States is breeding a horrible hatred among the peoples of the world. Our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are no less than infamous.

Yours truly,

ALLEN YOUNG.

P.S.—U.S. residence: Glen Wild, N.Y.

RIVERDALE, N.Y.,

May 24, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was heartsick that your efforts and your brilliant speech of May 5 opposing the President's \$700 million request for Vietnam, failed to stop the Senate's ratification.

I believe with you that continued escalation of the war in Vietnam by our Government, can only lead to disaster for us all.

Will you and your colleagues continue to try to persuade the President to stop the bombing, seek a cease-fire, and press for negotiations without conditions with all concerned, including the Vietcong—before it is too late.

Gratefully yours,

GERTRUDE GOTTLIEB.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,

May 24, 1965.

Senator W. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you in appreciation for the courageous stand you

have taken regarding U.S. policy in Vietnam.

As many others have stated, "We have Barry Goldwater in the White House." President Johnson seems to be committed to the same reckless foreign policy that Barry Goldwater advocated in last year's campaign. He appears to desire a "blank check" to commit the United States to any military action he desires. He has already put the power to wage war in his own hands, rather than place it in the hands of the U.S. Congress, as our Constitution requires. The recent White House suggestion that Congressmen not voice their objections to U.S. foreign policy in public is a massive strike against our system of government.

Americans must stand up and reject the Johnson foreign policy. Although we are now in a minority, I know that some day this country will honor you and your distinguished fellow Senator, Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, for standing up against these illegal acts of President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL BASCH.

GREENFIELD, IND.,

May 22, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I appreciate your passionate plea for the Senate to retain its valuable control over warfare. Let us all work to convince enough Americans that we can have a candidate in the next presidential election who will actively promote a foreign policy run to promote freedom everywhere.

May I please have a copy of your comments on May 5 and 6?

Very sincerely,

MRS. KATHRYN PARNELL.

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.,

May 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While there is still time, I want to express my respect, and admiration, for your undaunted courage; standing for what is right—nearly alone, among the lame ducks—and southern fossils.

It is indeed tragic, that the President is taking the advice from the wrong people—the military. It is horrible to contemplate; that we who thought we voted for peace, got more war; and more gunboats.

There should never be any interference, in another country's civil wars; except by the United Nations; the brutal dictators we have supported in the past, doesn't speak well of our democracy.

I wish you, and Senator GRUENING, more power, and more strength; and peace for all of us—before it is too late.

Yours sincerely,

AGNES AANES.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,

May 20, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write to you for a long time to commend you for your fearless stand on U.S. involvement in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, yours is an unpopular position with too many Congressmen and the White House. I only hope that serious, global tragedy does not confirm the wisdom of your position.

While unafraid (if one can be) to go to Vietnam himself, and this is quite possible, I am willing to go to be of service to our young Americans there. However, on a national scale I do fear a ground war of attrition with the Communist Chinese or, what is worse, a nuclear war on a worldwide basis. Please continue to speak your mind despite the reactionary trend in Washington.

As a Catholic I would like to go on record as saying that in no way is William F. Buck-

ley, Jr., a spokesman for the Catholic Church. Though I disagree vehemently with his ideas, I must grant his liberty to express them. However, there is little danger of his not doing so, his wealth, power, prestige and magazine enable him to; but, his Catholicism being well known, by some he may be regarded as one of the Catholic Church's spokesmen despite the fact that his ideas do not reflect current thinking in the church and still less the teaching of the gospels.

Eventually the Bolte legislation will reach the Senate and I do hope that you will vote in favor of that legislation.

With all due respect to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's feelings on the sale of mail-order guns, personally I do not think this sale is a serious menace to national well-being. Stolen guns do far more damage and even worse is the slaughter we can expect a week from now on the highways over the Memorial Day weekend.

In conclusion, I am troubled by our Latin American position which seems to always favor reactionaries driving the masses of impoverished people in these lands into the eager arms of the Communists. This bothered me some years ago but I naively thought things would improve.

Having expressed some of my thoughts, I again want to commend and thank you. Continue your courageous fight against bad thinking.

Respectfully yours,

FATHER THOMAS J. ENDEL,
U.S. Air Force.

CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on Cuban Independence Day, May 20, 1965, I spoke in the Senate, as did my colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOT] and other Senators, to point out the desperate condition of freedom under the present Castro government. I placed in the RECORD that day the first part of the American Security Council's report on Castro's inspired subversion, dealing with subversion in the United States.

The second portion of that report, dealing with such subversion, is now available. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and thus be available for study by Members of Congress and the American people in general.

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

CASTRO'S SUBVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES—PART II

At a recent State Department briefing on Latin American affairs, the briefing officer concluded his remarks with the observation that the Communists had a chance to make a showcase out of Cuba but they had failed miserably. This conclusion was first offered by President Kennedy 3 years ago and it remains today as the accepted State Department attitude toward Castro and Cuba. Such an attitude fails to take into account that communism has never been a social or economic success anywhere; but as a showcase from which to spread subversion, it has done admirably—and Cuba is an excellent example.

Our Washington report of last week illustrated the point by outlining the activities of the Cuban General Directorate of Intelligence. However, Castro's greatest success against the United States has been in the area of agitation and propaganda.

Sad to say, almost all his field workers here are U.S. citizens. They are citizens who follow the Moscow, Peiping, or Trotskyite line. They range all the way from hard-line Communists to soft-line dupes.

A 2-year investigation by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security into the activities and membership of the now defunct Fair Play for Cuba Committee, organized in April 1960, proved that FPFCC had been heavily infiltrated by known Communists and fellow travelers. Some of the ads it ran on behalf of Castro were actually financed in large measure by the Cuban Government. Following State Department's issuance of travel restrictions to Cuba on January 16, 1961, many Fair Play for Cuba Committee members traveled illegally to Havana and, upon their return to this country, gave lectures on behalf of the Castro regime.

One of these was James Jackson, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Another was James O'Connor, whose lecture were advertised in the Communist Daily Worker, as were the lectures of at least a dozen others. Jean Pestana, Rose Rosenberg, and Helen Travis—all identified as Communists before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—were indicative of the Cuban guest list which numbered in excess of 150 U.S. citizens in a 2-year period.

The best known member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was President Kennedy's assassin—Lee Harvey Oswald. He formed a chapter of the organization in New Orleans in April 1963 and discontinued it in September following his failure to reach Cuba.

The FPFCC was a Communist front. Its effect on the American public was negligible. But through its activities and the close contacts some of its members formed with the Castro regime, there grew up in its midst other more militant groups. The most important of these was the Progressive Labor Movement.

PLM was organized in January 1962. Its president, Milton Rosen, and vice president, Mortimer Scheer, had both been expelled from the Communist Party for disruptive activities. In December 1962, PLM attempted to send a group of "students" to Cuba and failed because the Canadian Government refused clearance to a Cuban plane to pick them up. A year and a half later, PLM succeeded.

On June 25, 1963, 59 so-called students, ranging in age from 18 to 36, left for Cuba in defiance of the State Department ban on such travel. Some of the 59 were attending college; others were graduates; some were dropouts; and 1 was a college professor. They traveled to Cuba via Paris, Prague, and Havana. All expenses, including transportation and living expenses while in Cuba, were paid for by the Cuban Government. Each traveler donated to PLM's Permanent Student Committee for Travel to Cuba \$110. The air fare alone cost the Castro regime \$30,000.

While in Cuba, a number of the so-called students made statements attacking U.S. policies, particularly in the field of civil rights and aid to South Vietnam. Some of these statements were beamed around the world and reprinted in Communist publications.

In June, 1964, the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba arranged air transportation to Cuba for 84 students. The reservations were made by PLM members Yvonne Marie Bond and Morton B. Slater, with Wendie Nakashima Rosen assisting. The over all direction appears to have been supplied by west coast editor of PLM publications, Lee Coe. Prior to his association with PLM, Coe was active for over 20 years in the Communist Party of the United States. Mrs. Rosen, the wife of Jacob Rosen, had traveled to Cuba with the 1963 group. Her husband, brother of Milton Rosen, president of PLM, made the trek in 1964. This time not only did the Castro government pay for the entire

trip, but it also gave each visitor \$10 a week spending money.

Again concealing their destination, the students proceeded in two groups to Paris, then Prague, and finally Havana. Leader of the enthusiastic contingent was Edward Lemansky. Lemansky's own testimony will serve as an indication of why Castro has been willing to pay out in excess of \$75,000 to bring certain U.S. citizens to Cuba. As to his political identity, Lemansky stated, "I identified myself as a member of the Progressive Labor Movement, which is a Communist organization, a Communist movement."

As to the declaration signed by 61 of the "students" while they were in Cuba, Lemansky admitted to participating in its drafting. The declaration said in part: "We, the undersigned young North Americans visiting Cuba, offer these statements of support for the people of South Vietnam in their just fight for liberation from the imperialist oppression directed by our Government. Today our Government is unleashing one of the most brutal and criminal wars in history. All over the world—in Spain and Portugal, in South Africa and Latin America—the United States supports racist and reactionary regimes which oppress the people, and that the intransigence of U.S. imperialism forces the people to take up arms in order to gain and defend their liberty."

The essence of this declaration was widely broadcast throughout the world.

Most of the Cuban travelers returned to the United States in mid-August. On August 15, many of them joined with members of the May 2 committee formed at Yale University in March 1964 to demonstrate against U.S. support of South Vietnam. The demonstrators got violent and some were carted off to jail. The May 2 committee's purpose is to protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam. Its organizers include members of the Communist Party and the Progressive Labor Movement.

On April 15, 1965, Milton Rosen, PLM president, announced from the Albert Hotel in New York City, the founding convention of a new Communist Party paralleling the Chinese Communist line—110 delegates attended. A declaration proposed by the PLM national steering committee said in part: "The most hated government in the world today is the Government of our country * * * the initials U.S.A., which once stood for hope, have replaced the crooked cross of Nazi Germany as the symbol of tyranny and death."

One of PLM's vice presidents and its Harlem leader is William Epton, arrested last August after the Harlem race riots on charges of advocating criminal anarchy.

PLM has three offices in New York City and boasts of six others scattered across the country—one in Berkeley, Calif. PLM publishes leaflets, booklets, and a quarterly magazine, and it expects to bring out a weekly soon. Its political thrust is aimed at disrupting civil rights progress and stirring race hatred. Its members were active in the recent Berkeley campus revolt and they can be expected to be active in similar undertakings on other campuses (WR 65-4). Victor Riesel in a recent column quoted a top Government security official as saying: "They (PLM) are a very successful and militant band of young revolutionaries and have had ample money since the first day they went into business. * * * They don't just pass resolutions. They're zealously working for a revolution." The question is how much of their financial support is coming from Cuba?

The pro-Castro, pro-Peiping Communist movement in the United States has its man in Havana. He is Robert F. Williams. In May 1959, Williams was removed from his

position as head of the Union County, N.C. branch of the NAACP for advocating violence as a means to gain social justice for his race. In August 1961, he fled the country following a racial clash which he instigated in Monroe, N.C. Against him was placed a charge of kidnapping, which was recently dropped. Williams escaped to Canada with his family and, on October 3, 1961, the Castro government granted him "political asylum" (WR 63-2). From that day to this, he has been spouting race hatred while offering instructions in terror tactics on his program "Radio Free Dixie" broadcast over Radio Havana and beamed into the Southern States. Williams also writes a monthly pamphlet called the Crusader. Every edition is devoted to the hatred of, and the eventual revolutionary overthrow of, the white man. Publication and distribution costs are taken care of by the Cuban regime. No figures are available on the number of copies distributed each month in the United States, but it is known that Williams' followers have made a point of handing them out to civil rights groups.

Lest anyone dismiss Williams as just another fanatic rabble rouser, it should be noted that when he traveled to Red China in August 1963, he was not only greeted by Mao Tse-tung and other high-ranking Chicoms officials, but Mao also made his first official policy pronouncement in 6 years. As a result of his statement, Moscow charged that Peiping "was guilty of racism and was trying to set the colored races against the whites."

In the winter of 1963, followers of Williams organized the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM). Today, they have branches in six key cities. It is they who distribute the Crusader and are in direct contact with Williams. Some of them made the trip to Cuba in the summer of 1964.

When they returned, recruitment was stepped up. They are known to have infiltrated the Black Muslims and the Malcolm X group. RAM's fronts include the Afro-American Youth Council, the Afro-American Student Organization, and in Detroit they set up UHURU, which means "freedom" in Swahili.

RAM's manifesto advocates organized violence and the formation of guerrilla bands. Like PLM, it follows the theories and tactics of the Chinese Communists. Its present membership is small and selective and it refers to itself "as a movement composed of hard core, young, intelligent, militant, Afro-Americans seeking worldwide black revolution."

Until recently, the Communist chain of command could be traced directly from the Kremlin to the party here. Today, whether it be the recently formed W. E. B. DuBois clubs taking their cue from Moscow, or the Progressive Labor Movement taking its from Peiping, the impetus and driving force for both is channeled out of Cuba. Politically, financially, psychologically, militarily—Havana is the directing agency for Communist agitation and propaganda in the United States. It is the secured outpost of both Moscow and Peiping in our hemisphere.

In the aggregate, we can say the threat to our own security from Castro himself is nonexistent. But he is the agent of a world force that does threaten our survival. As its agent, his followers have been at work here; they are at work now. Because our security agencies are competent to handle such as PLM and RAM is no cause to ignore them. If nothing else they prove the folly of considering Castro a failure. It is we who have failed in allowing him to perpetuate his regime in treating it as a nuisance and not a genuine and continuing threat to the entire hemisphere.

TAX CREDITS FOR HIGHER EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and I and 33 other Senators have cosponsored a bill that is before the Committee on Finance to provide tax credits for a portion of the costs of higher education. In my opinion, this is one of the most important bills that will be before the Senate. It will most certainly come up for a vote during this session.

One of those who have been supporting the bill is Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr., of South Bend, Ind. Dr. Carmichael was formerly president of a university and is now a member of the boards of trustees of other universities. Dr. Carmichael has received a letter dated March 1, 1965, from Mrs. Raymond Nelson, wife of the clerk of the District Court of Anoka County, Minn. The letter ably expresses the problems that the forgotten people of American politics, the middle-income people, have in trying to give their children or their neighbor's children an opportunity to obtain a higher education.

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

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

ANOKA, MINN.,
March 1, 1965.

Dr. OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL, Jr.,
South Bend, Ind.

DEAR DR. CARMICHAEL: May we give you some fuel for the "fire" in support of the Ribicoff bill proposing tax credits for families who are supporting young people in college? Your stand came to our attention in reading the publicity about the seminar of Education Writers Association held at Atlantic City.

We would strongly favor this bill for the following reasons: One of the major concerns in America today is the development of responsible community citizens. In order to be effective in today's world, it is becoming more and more necessary to have a college background. For a great many people, college is only a status symbol or a means for earning a more lucrative living. These goals are not wrong in themselves, but if we stop at these horizons, we are missing the real purpose of education, which is to develop more useful citizens with a sense of loyalty and responsibility to their communities.

At the present time, there must be many families in a situation similar to ours who are thwarted in providing their children with a college education for the above-mentioned purpose.

My husband is a local county elective official. As such, he is adequately but not highly compensated. Our income is about \$10,000 a year. Because we are very much interested and involved in the community, we lend hearty financial support to its needs, such as building a new hospital, church, financing local charities. Because my husband is a public official, much is expected of him. We have four children who, according to school aptitude tests, are all "good college material." Because of their father's position in the community they have all been reared to value the importance of giving time and effort to community projects. Yet, on \$10,000 per year it is going to be difficult to finance college educations for four children, only 2

years apart. Our pledges for building a hospital and church amount to several thousand dollars, given sacrificially, and with a view to setting an example for our four future citizens. We are told by the schools that an income of \$10,000 per year would not qualify the children for scholarships since there are those who are needier, even though these, our children, are top students. In other words, we have the "material" to be educated, we have provided an atmosphere in the home for these children to prepare themselves for higher education and yet, financially, because of our community responsibilities, we feel the "squeeze" as much as those with much lower incomes who do not feel the responsibility to their communities, of which we know there are many. It would be a great help to those of us in the \$10,000 to \$15,000 income bracket to be allowed a tax credit while we are bearing the burden of providing our youngsters with a college education with a view to training them for better and more willing community service. Hope something can be done to further this. How can we help?

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. RAYMOND NELSON,
Wife of Clerk of District Court
of Anoka County.

LEONARD HORN, COLORADO LIVESTOCK MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently the Denver Post published an excellent article entitled "Award-Winning Colorado Cattleman Maintains Hectic Pace," written by a good friend of mine, Monk Tyson. The article relates to an award to another good friend of mine, Leonard Horn. Mr. Horn is a rancher, a businessman, a community supporter, and a person who believes in progress. The award, which is a recognition of him as livestock man of the year, and which he recently received from Colorado State University, is well deserved. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LEONARD HORN OF WOLCOTT: AWARD-WINNING COLORADO CATTLEMAN MAINTAINS HECTIC PACE

(By Monk Tyson)

WOLCOTT, COLO.—It is a difficult chore to catch up with Leonard Horn. But Colorado State University managed to corral him long enough this year to hang an honor on his hide.

The 55-year-old cattle rancher was chosen Livestockman of the Year by CSU. The honor is based on success in his business and service to his community and industry.

Horn and his wife, Dorothy, operate the 2,000-acre V Eleven Ranch near this western Colorado village. They raise 500 to 700 Hereford cattle on the ranch and on Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service grazing allotments. They also raise quarter horses.

Horn estimates one-half of his time is devoted to work on a variety of boards and committees related to livestock and grazing range. While he's away, the V Eleven is run by Mrs. Horn.

He might finish today's work with cattle and horses, tonight grab a bite to eat and catch a plane to Washington, or drive his car to some experimental grazing plot in the Rocky Mountains. If the trip takes him through or near Denver, Horn often stops to confer with officials of the Colorado Cat-

tlemen's Association and the American National Cattlemen's Association.

His cattlemen friends say that dropping out of high school after completing the 10th grade didn't stop Horn's education. He's well informed on legislative matters concerning lands and is a member of CCA's Federal lands committee. He is chairman of that organization's range improvement committee. He has an intimate knowledge of grasses and other forage plants on grazing ranges.

Horn spends considerable time working on State, regional, and national boards and committees connected with BLM and is a member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Multiple-Use Committee on National Forests. He is chairman of ANCA's public lands committee.

None of these pays a fee or salary and only two of them pay per diem expenses. But Horn never complains.

"If people are going to run the Government, they have to work at it," says the soft-spoken rancher. "More ranchers should serve on committees. And that applies to people working in all industries. I have very strong feelings about this."

Horn was born at the village of McCoy, "just over the hill" from Wolcott. His father, the late Arthur Leonard Horn, and his mother came from Bailey, Colo.

Horn's childhood was spent in the saddle. While working as a cowboy he homesteaded a piece of land near Wolcott. He sold the homestead and purchased the George Watson ranch in 1938.

"I've had some tough times," said Horn. "But I was always too busy to realize that I was hard up. I always had plenty to eat during the depression, thanks to beans and buckskin (venison)."

While venison is considered a great meat delicacy by many, Horn said that during the depression he looked forward to the day when he would not have to depend on it for food. Big herds of deer roam the Eagle and Colorado River country and gather by the hundreds to feed on his haystacks when deep snow blankets the hills and valleys.

Horn jokingly recalled that he had money—\$5—"about half of the time" during the depression. So did his neighbor, Earl Boore.

"When Earl had the \$5 I'd get the best of him in a horse swap," he said. "He'd give me \$5 to boot in a swap. Later on, Earl would get a horse that I wanted. I'd trade and give \$5 to boot."

"We didn't dare spend the money. It would have ruined our horse-swapping deals."

During his 2 years of high school Horn was a diligent student in Spanish. His ambition was to manage a ranch in Argentina for a big packing company. He never made it. His duties as a cowboy caused one delay after the other—until he became so well established in ranching that going to South America would have been a poor prospect.

Mrs. Horn has a son, Dick Reese, by a previous marriage. He is a sophomore at CSU. Horn has two daughters by a previous marriage. They are Mrs. Don (Jean) Gates of Meeker and Mrs. William (Jo) Monroe, of Lakewood.

"I just can't be optimistic over the immediate future of cattlemen," he observed. "Importation of foreign beef is still our biggest problem. Foreigners can raise cattle for a fraction of what we pay to raise them."

"And there are too many noncattle businessmen in the business in this country—some for tax writeoffs, some for hobbies and some who just have desires to be cattlemen whether they succeed or not."

He believes noncattle businessmen prevent natural fluctuations in prices and disrupt a bona fide cattleman's ability to anticipate market prices and trends.

As far as a large price spread between the cattle raiser and the grocery store is concerned, Horn said: "I'm puzzled over it. I guess there are many factors that I don't understand—such as labor costs, processing, and packaging."

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, ETC., FOR ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate. The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 25, 1965, p. 11666, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is the conference report on legislation to authorize appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces.

A tabulation that I propose to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks shows that the Department of Defense sought authorization of \$15,297,200,000 for these purposes; that the Senate version of S. 800 authorized \$15,283,800,000; the House authorized \$15,303,400,000; and the conferees have agreed on an authorization figure of \$15,402,800,000.

I should like to say a word or two about the significant differences in the versions of the bill and the manner in which these differences have been reconciled by the conferees.

In aircraft procurement the Senate had reduced the Navy total by \$99.8 million, the amount that had been requested for 10 E-2A aircraft. The E-2A aircraft has had some technical difficulties and as a result the Department of Defense canceled the 1965 procurement and stretched the procurement authorized in earlier years over a long period. The Senate deletion of this procurement reflected a committee desire to review progress on solving the technical problems before approving additional procurement. The committee was informed by the Secretary of Defense that there is reason for increased confidence in the success of the E-2A improvement program and the Senate conferees agreed to the restoration of funds for this procurement.

In the authorization for the construction of naval vessels the Senate eliminated 2 of 4 fast deployment logistics ships, for a reduction of \$64.2 million;

5 of 10 motor gunboats, for a reduction of \$21 million; and added \$133.6 million for 2 nuclear-powered attack submarines, for a net addition of \$48.4 million. The House had added 1 nuclear-powered guided missile frigate for \$150.5 million.

The conferees have agreed on a program of only 2 fast deployment logistics ships for the next year, the restoration of the 5 motor gunboats deleted by the Senate, and retention of the Senate addition of 2 nuclear-powered attack submarines and the House addition of a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate.

Neither the two additional nuclear-powered attack submarines nor the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate was requested by the Department of Defense.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had been unanimous in their recommendation that nuclear-powered attack submarines be constructed at the rate of six for this year, and the Navy strongly supports a requirement for a nuclear-powered guided missile frigate to provide more air defense for the nuclear-powered carrier task force.

In research and development the Senate had provided an additional \$82 million for the Air Force in an attempt to encourage the accelerated development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft, the so-called follow-on manned bomber. The House bill provided an additional \$7 million for this purpose.

The Senate addition of \$82 million was intended to provide the amount for this development that had been requested by the Air Force in its original budget submission for fiscal year 1966. With the passage of time and the absence of a decision to proceed to the program definition phase, it is clear that all of the \$82 million added by the Senate could not be effectively expended during fiscal year 1966.

There is some indication that the additional \$7 million in authorization might be applied to this development. Acceptance of the lower figure by the Senate conferees should not be construed as any change in the committee's conviction that the accelerated development of a new manned bomber is highly desirable. Congress has done practically everything within its power to encourage the Department of Defense to proceed faster with this development, and without repeating the arguments for a new bomber, I merely remind the Senate of General LeMay's concern that the B-52 fleet would fall apart before we get a replacement for it.

Disregarding the amount added for the accelerated development of a new bomber, the House had reduced the amounts sought for research and development by \$77.3 million more than the Senate reductions. The Senate had reduced R.D.T. & E. by \$44 million and the House had cut \$121.3 million from these programs. The Senate conferees acceded to the House reductions partly from the realization that the Secretary

of Defense can apply amounts provided in his emergency fund to any research or development project that urgently needs more money. The amount of the reduction in R.D.T. & E. is less than 2 percent of the total authorization requested.

The House bill contained six general provisions not considered by the Senate. Perhaps the most significant of these provisions is the one intended to discourage the inclusion of the so-called 65-35 provision governing the allocations of conversion, alteration, and repair work on naval vessels between public and private shipyards.

The Secretary of Defense has asked that this 65-35 provision not be included in the appropriations act this year because of his objective to provide a greater workload for the lower number of public yards that will be operated in the future.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services had not addressed itself specifically to this problem during hearings on the authorization bill, but the House conferees were unyielding in their insistence that the bill include language directing the assignment of conversion, alteration, and repair work on the basis of economic and military considerations, rather than on the basis of a 65-35 distribution. For himself, the Senator from Mississippi desires to point out, however, that if the Committees on Appropriations desire to do so, they can recommend continuation of the 65-35 distribution in the appropriations bill notwithstanding the adoption of this provision in the authorization act.

Another general provision to which the Senate conferees have agreed is the one redesignating the Military Air Transport Service as the Military Airlift Command, effective January 1, 1966. The House conferees were strongly convinced that a change in designation from a service to a command for our military airlift forces would elevate their status and enhance their prestige and the Senate conferees have agreed to the change with a deferment of the effective date until the first of next year in an attempt to keep the cost involved as low as possible.

The other general provisions retained under the conference agreement would: First, repeal archaic tonnage balances for the construction of Navy ships; second, continue the provision for alternating the construction of vessels between public and private yards, unless the President deems this procedure to be inconsistent with the public interests; third, subject "tracked combat vehicles" to the requirement of an annual authorization; and, fourth, require authorization for any amounts appropriated to the Secretary of Defense for use as an emergency fund for research and development.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana. I know this is a matter in which he is interested.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, in the past 3 fiscal years with the assistance of my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, and others, we were able to place in the Department

of Defense Appropriation Acts the following language:

Of the funds made available in this act for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels, at least 35 per centum shall be available for such repair, alteration, and conversion in privately owned shipyards: *Provided*, That if determined by the Secretary of Defense to be inconsistent with the public interest based on urgency of requirement to have such vessels repaired, altered, or converted as required above, such work may be done in Navy or private shipyards as he may direct.

Mr. President, I am now informed that on at least four occasions the intent of this provision has been violated. I am not permitted to go into the details, but there appeared on page 743, part 2, of the House Department of Defense Subcommittee hearings a quotation which would indicate that work was given to certain Navy shipyards not to meet urgent fleet requirements but to prevent the dissipation of valuable employee skills—something that was not included in the escape clause that I have just quoted.

As the Senator knows I personally objected to the provision that we are now discussing. That provision was included in the House bill as section 303. It reads:

Sec. 303. The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

In the report which accompanied the bill from the House, there appeared this language:

The Armed Services Committee has always felt that this (the 65-35 provision) constituted an unreasonable restriction on the freedom of action, military and economic, of the Navy in executing its ship conversion, alteration, and repair program. In the past, the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee have vigorously opposed it on the floor. This amendment is designed to preclude by specific language the insertion of such limiting language in any future legislation.

In view of the language that is now in the conference bill, as well as the quotation I have just made from the Armed Services Committee report, I ask my good friend from Mississippi this question:

As the Senator from Mississippi knows, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended and the Senate has included the so-called 65-35 formula for the allocating of naval ship repair, alteration, and conversion work between the naval and private shipyards in the DOD Appropriation Acts for fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965. I note the conferees agreed to a House amendment that seeks to limit the right of the Appropriations Committee to recommend, and the Senate to include a limitation in the DOD appropriation bill providing for the 65-35 formula. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me that this House amendment cannot so restrict the rights of the Committee on Appropriations

to recommend and the Senate to include the 65-35 formula in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 if the facts developed during the consideration of this bill justify the continuation of the 65-35 formula?

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I have consulted with members of the staff who are fully familiar with all the facts. They are of the opinion that the limitation could be put in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would come within the purview of a limitation?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. It would come within the purview of a limitation on the dollars the Appropriations Committee writes into the bill. I am advised that there are precedents for that by persons competent to pass on the question. I made the comment in the conference that I felt it was correct, as a member of the conference I felt that we had a right to vote for a limitation if the facts justified.

This is a policy question, to a degree. It is a proper subject for legislation, but that does not preclude the Appropriations Committee from putting the limitation in if the committee thinks the facts justify it.

Until the Senator from Mississippi got fully into this matter, he felt the facts did not justify a change in the 65-35 formula, but the facts that prevail now are somewhat different from what they were when the original limitation was put in. I believe that a wise and discreet administration of these funds under the language of this bill would work out all right and perhaps be acceptable generally, but we think the Appropriations Committee has jurisdiction under the conditions we have already described.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am assuming the Appropriations Committee will be able to make a case. If it cannot make a case, the situation will be somewhat different.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wished to make it clear that, although the language remains in the bill, the Appropriations Committee would not be precluded from placing in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1966 the language we have heretofore incorporated.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is correct. It would come under the idea that the Appropriations Committee does have power to make a limitation.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It is rather sad to me that this matter should have developed as it did with the elimination of the fixed 65-35 percentage on alteration, repair, and conversion built into the authorization at this time.

As the Senator knows, we in New York are suffering from the proposed closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. It is a very valuable and experienced facility, and has served the Nation well. We feel that a factor in the decline in work

at this yard was the fact that we had these fixed percentages. I, too, would like to reserve the right to study it in terms of practicality with respect to the elimination of the 65-35 ratio.

My judgment, with the Senator from Mississippi, is that we ought to try it out on that basis instead of restricting the authorities within a fixed percentage.

Had that been the case, there would have been much more flexibility for considering the defense desirability of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

I am glad to see now the facts developed—and I would like to ask this in the form of a question—because the managers said they now realize that the fixed overhead required by the needs of the country in these fixed installations is a factor which exists, so why not take advantage of it in the matter of repairs.

I am not going to argue the question of points of order or anything like that. We will get into that at another time if necessary. But I am assured by the Senator from Mississippi, with the distinction he has in this field, that he will take a new look at the picture with perhaps some different concept of the facts, based on the experience of the conference report and contemporaneous requirements.

Mr. STENNIS. May I reply to that point at this juncture?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from New York understands that the Senator from Mississippi is merely saying now he thinks the Appropriations Committee has the power to impose limitations. I am not announcing what my position may be. That will depend on what the facts will develop later.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; I gathered, however, that the Appropriations Committee will regard the question with the possibility of a different point of view.

Mr. STENNIS. I think so; and if there is any abuse of discretion or substantial change in the facts, the Appropriations Committee can enter into the picture.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator, with his usual open mind, will recall that when we had a colloquy about the E-2A Hawkeye early warning aircraft when S. 800 was on the floor on April 6, during which I called attention to the fact that there had been some new developments, affecting the performance of this aircraft, practically contemporaneously with consideration of this bill, and the Senator said he would look into it. I am pleased that the Senator and his colleagues, upon a consideration of all the relevant facts, determined to include funds for the Hawkeye.

Mr. STENNIS. We went into that question and were happy to find some developments, which were not very substantial, but were of the type which would clear the way for further substantial developments in this field, and put it back in the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New York on behalf of all the conferees, both House and Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation comparing the amounts authorized and appropriated for the purposes

of this bill in 1965, with the amounts requested in 1966, the amounts approved by the Senate and the House, and the amounts agreed to in conference.

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

Comparative tabulation on S. 800

[In thousands]

	Author- ized, fiscal year 1965	Appropri- ated, fiscal year 1965	Requested, fiscal year 1966	Senate	House	Conference
Procurement:						
Aircraft:						
Army	\$443,600	\$442,200	\$344,500	\$344,500	\$344,500	\$344,500
Navy and Marine Corps	1,854,900	1,936,258	1,915,800	1,816,000	1,915,800	1,915,800
Air Force	3,663,000	3,563,737	3,550,200	3,550,200	3,545,200	3,550,200
Missiles:						
Army	282,600	233,900	253,700	253,700	253,700	253,700
Navy	660,100	660,100	364,000	364,000	364,000	364,000
Marine Corps	13,100	2,600	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Air Force	1,730,000	1,730,000	796,100	796,100	771,100	796,100
Naval vessels: Navy	1,996,000	1,930,076	1,501,100	1,549,500	1,651,600	1,721,000
Subtotal	10,613,300	10,398,871	8,738,400	8,687,000	8,858,900	8,958,300
Research, development, test, and evaluation:						
Army	1,345,045	1,340,045	1,438,000	1,429,500	1,406,400	1,406,400
Navy	1,378,000	1,372,700	1,472,600	1,462,600	1,439,200	1,439,200
Air Force	3,140,100	3,112,000	3,147,800	3,221,300	3,103,900	3,103,900
Defense agencies	500,215	498,715	500,400	483,400	495,000	495,000
Subtotal	6,363,320	6,323,520	6,558,800	6,596,800	6,444,500	6,444,500
Total	16,976,620	16,722,391	15,297,200	15,283,800	15,303,400	15,402,800

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me add one further word, partly of a personal nature. I am satisfied that a further presentation of the facts now existing will show that the authorization bill for hardware, ships, and related military equipment is sufficient for a sound and solid military program.

By that, I do not mean to imply that it closes the door on further authorizations for this year, or appropriations that have not been set forth and outlined because of the increasing drain upon military supplies and resources for the war in Vietnam. It is steadily increasing. I believe that it will continue and will require additional authorization.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is an integral part of the broad-scale effort which the

American people have determined should be made to deal with the great changes that are taking place in America today as a result of the increasing complexity, sophistication, and maturity of our society. Consequently, we are moving forward on many fronts: education, medical care for the elderly, water and air pollution, the war on poverty—the list could go on for pages.

Through this Economic Development Act, Congress is saying to all the people of America that it is the view of their elected representatives that no community or town, no matter how small, shall be allowed to fall victim to a changing technology, to be left in the backwash of the advance into new frontiers of social and economic development. Each community or region, if it desires to help itself, will receive assistance in this direction from the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with the States. Grants and loans for public works and development facilities, loans for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial or commercial usage, the guarantee of certain loans, partial payment of interest charges on certain loans, technical assistance, research, and information will be available to areas which meet the certification requirements of low income or high unemployment.

It is my fervent hope that the eligibility requirements will be such as to afford assistance to those many small communities partially dependent upon industry but primarily agricultural in nature, whose unemployment rate is kept low because of outmigration. I believe that these communities will be aided through the low-income provision. I shall watch the administration of the act closely with this in mind.

In a recent letter from Mr. Henry C. Sullivan, chairman of the Collingsworth

County Overall Economic Development Planning Board, it was pointed out that the chairman of the Texas Industrial Commission, Mr. Harry W. Clark, expects that if present trends continue, the roughly 800 small communities in Texas will be reduced to 600 by the early 1970's. I hope that this does not happen so long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate. This bill is the way to see that such a grim destiny does not come to pass. It would provide grants and loans for waterworks and sewage disposal systems, the surest guarantee of survival of small towns.

I believe that the carefully reasoned eligibility requirements worked out by the committee should be given a chance to work.

I am particularly pleased that the ARA approach is being retained in this bill. ARA, in the few short years of its existence, has meant a great deal to my State. As of January 31, 1965, a total of 134 projects involving almost \$10 million have been approved for Texas, creating over 3,200 new jobs. Through waterworks, public buildings, or other grants, whole towns have been revitalized. Through industrial loans, new industries have lifted smaller cities from depression to rapid growth.

With the passage of this bill, we provide for this Nation another of the building blocks to a Great Society in which all regions of the country share the fruits of economic progress and not the despair of being left behind on the great adventure upon which we are all embarked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the mayor of Brady, Tex., Mr. John Rudder, dated May 10, 1965, as well as a résumé from pages 61 to 63 of the hearings on the Public Works and Economic Development Act, 1965, which shows how an eligible area obtains benefits under the proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

We receive many inquiries from constituents saying that they cannot find out how the act will work, and this summary of 31 points will give them that information.

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

[A letter from the mayor of Brady, Tex.]

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Brady, Tex., May 10, 1965.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Knowing that you are always interested in what the people back home think of various Government programs, we want to let you know what the ARA program has meant to the economy of McCulloch County.

On May 14 and 15, 1961, Mr. B. C. Broad, manager of McCulloch Electric Cooperative, and Mr. George Purcell, manager of the Brady Chamber of Commerce, attended a Rural Area Development Conference in Washington, D.C., where the ARA program was outlined. However, at that early date we were not eligible to participate in the program. In the latter part of 1961 we were made eligible on the basis that our unemployment had been above the national level for 3 years.

We called a meeting of every segment of our economy. We all agreed that we had

lost 24 percent of our population in the past 10 years. What we needed was to provide work or part-time work for our small farmers and ranchers so they could remain on the farm. This group formed a county building program and developed our own OEDP. In this plan we not only found out what we needed but made a long-range plan to solve the problems. The various State agencies approved this OEDP program and it was also approved in Washington, D.C., by the ARA.

Some of our people had started a local industry in Brady. This industry had great promise but had run into financial trouble. The Small Business Administration was about to foreclose. We formed an industrial foundation and approached Spencer Safford Loadcraft, Inc., of Augusta, Kans., to make application for an ARA loan to purchase the property and take over the existing industry. We personally raised our 10 percent and a local savings and loan made a loan for 20 percent and ARA approved a loan for 65 percent. Total amount of this loan was a little over \$300,000. After 1 year this company had 350 people working, however, at present the employment is down some due to a lack of contracts.

The city of Brady had just voted bonds for about \$1½ million to build a lake. Our sewer system was about to be condemned by the health department and was inadequate to handle the load. Our water distribution system had to be improved and enlarged. We were granted two grants under the Public Works Acceleration Act for about \$350,000. We also secured two good small industries which were financed by personal capital.

Today the population of Brady is about 1,000 more than it was in 1961. We have a new modern motel, a new restaurant, and a new apartment house. These were financed by private capital. We have made over \$600,000 improvements in our school system and two of our rural communities have drilled water wells and put in water systems.

The city of Brady has developed a long-range plan for the city. We feel that none of this would have been accomplished had the ARA program not sparked us and gave us some help both financial and technical.

Part of the ARA program was not practical for us but when we worked out our own OEDP it was practical because it was a program developed by our people for our people and the help we got through the ARA made it possible for us to develop a working program.

We are asked many times why we were for the ARA program. Our answer is that we are for it because it has helped our county which had to do something or we would have continued to lose population.

We have faith that the money loaned to our industry will be paid back 100 percent and the grants we received made it possible for us to vote a like sum in bonds to build a new modern sewer and water system. Without the 50-percent grant we could not have done this job.

We would like to see the good parts of the ARA program continued as it has proven it has merit and will help any rural community not only to exist but put them in a position to add a lot to the welfare and economy of our Nation.

We want to thank you and your staff for your help and thank our Government for having faith in our community.

Sincerely,

JOHN RUDDER, Mayor.

BRIEF STEP-BY-STEP RESUMÉ OF HOW AN ELIGIBLE AREA GETS BENEFITS UNDER THE PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

(Tentative and subject to changes in the act and revised administrative requirements)

1. If the area had previously been eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act and had

an approved overall economic development program (OEDP) under that act, it will be eligible to submit projects for approval immediately.

2. Pending projects under the Area Redevelopment Act will automatically be reviewed by EDA and reactivated without further action on the part of the community.

3. Pending projects under the Accelerated Public Works Act will have to be resubmitted.

4. If an area had not previously been eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act, it will be necessary for the area to prepare an OEDP and submit it to the Administrator for Economic Development for approval. Assistance will be available from EDA upon request.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

5. Public Works and development facilities projects may be submitted by any community, governmental organization, or private nonprofit organization from an eligible area.

6. Projects should be submitted to EDA on forms which will be made available.

7. EDA will publish a book indicating which areas are eligible for 80-percent grants, which for 70-percent grants, which for 60-percent grants, and which for 50-percent grants. Communities will be able to guide themselves accordingly.

8. When an applicant wishes to apply for supplementary grant for a project for which the basic grant is coming from another agency, the applicant will fill out a supplemental form to EDA at the same time the project is submitted to the other agency. Announcements of approval will be made simultaneously with the announcements of approval from the other agencies. Funds will be transferred to the other agencies in the amount of the supplementary grant.

9. Applicants will be required to justify all projects on the grounds that the projects will either directly or indirectly tend to improve the opportunities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial facilities; or will assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities; or will substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Applicants will also have to demonstrate that the project will fulfill a pressing need of the area and that it is consistent with an approved OEDP.

10. Where a supplementary grant is requested the applicant will have to certify that funds are not available locally for the required community share without a supplementary grant.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

11. Application for loans for public works and development facilities will be handled on the same basis as grants and will require the same justification.

12. Application for business loans may be from public or private borrowers and should be made directly to EDA on appropriate forms provided.

13. Applications for guarantee of working capital loans will be made a part of the application for the business loan as appropriate.

14. Applications for interest rate subsidies will be made directly to EDA by the borrower on appropriate form which will be available from EDA.

15. Applications for loan guarantees or interest rate subsidies will be required to exercise a certification of nonrelocation on appropriate EDA form.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

16. Communities requiring technical assistance in carrying out their economic development programs will make application directly to EDA in accordance with published

instructions similar to those now available for the Area Redevelopment Act program.

17. States, district organizations, and communities wishing grants-in-aid for economic planning staff and administrative expenses shall submit requests directly to EDA on appropriate forms to be made available. Detailed budgets and justifications will be required.

18. Eligibility of areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act on the date the new bill is enacted will automatically be considered eligible for benefits under the new act. Specific instructions will be given to these communities at a later date on the maintenance of their eligibility.

19. Those areas which will become eligible under the new act which have not heretofore been eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act will receive a communication from EDA explaining how to prepare an OEDP and to qualify for designation under the new act.

20. When the new area has submitted an OEDP and it has been approved it will become eligible for benefits under the new act.

21. EDA and State officials will work together to establish tentative boundary lines for districts under part B of title IV.

22. State and EDA representatives will work with representatives of local communities to establish district development organizations.

23. When district development organizations are established, requests for grants-in-aid will be submitted to EDA on appropriate forms to be provided.

24. When these grants are approved the district organization will arrange to prepare their district development plan and submit it for approval.

25. One year after the date of enactment of the act or whenever the district development plan is approved, whichever comes later, the district will become eligible for benefits under part B of title IV. These will be administered in the same manner as projects submitted under title I and title II.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

26. The Secretary of Commerce will, upon enactment of the bill, notify Governors of the provisions of title V regarding regional action planning commissions.

27. Representatives of the Governors and EDA will meet informally to agree upon preliminary general boundary lines for regions.

28. After this agreement the Governors will submit a formal request for recognition of the region, and a temporary budget for initial operation, accompanying this request with appropriate justification in terms with the purposes of the act.

29. After review and/or modification, the Secretary will approve the establishment of the regional planning commission and its initial budget and the President will name the Federal cochairman.

30. The Governors will name their representatives to the regional planning commission; the commission will organize itself and submit a detailed annual budget.

31. The Secretary will approve the budget and make the funds available for the commission to organize itself.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order of May 26, 1965, that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order of May 26, 1965, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27, 1965:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning John C. Aarni, Jr., to be second lieutenant, and ending Furman E. Thomas, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 23, 1965.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Thomas R. Dooley, to be captain, and ending Raymond A. Sanders, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 19, 1965.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning James L. Abbot III, to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Timothy J. Vogel, to be ensign in the Navy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 5, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures: Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, on Memorial Day we approach a time that brings back not only a strange medley of memories, praises, sorrows, and disappointments, but of dreams and hopes and better days.

For some of us Memorial Day makes scenes which are vivid and horrible and which, we pray God, we will some day be able to forget, for mankind has suffered much, hoped much, and dreamed much, but the new age and better world that we expected has been wholly inadequate and is still without imperishable remembrance.

Those brave men and women, who fought those wars of the past, revealed an incredible heroism; they did not fear or falter or fail; they fought many great wars but we were guilty of making a little peace that did not touch the reverent imagination of humanity or become forever memorable in the annals of history.

May our vision of a lasting and enduring peace continue to grow and abide and prove its immortality for Thou hast created mankind not for failure but for victory and we must adjust our thinking and living to fit that eternal faith and hope and love.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 21, 1965:

H.R. 7064. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended; and

H.R. 7855. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard.

On May 22, 1965:

H.R. 66. An act to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced;

H.R. 3043. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4338. An act to authorize the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to rent certain property in the District of Columbia for certain office purposes; and

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, D.C.; to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product;

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

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

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 1564. An act to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1689. An act 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).

KURE BEACH, N.C.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H.R. 821, "An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.," with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 12, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader the program for the rest of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the minority leader will yield to me, I am pleased the gentleman made this inquiry at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise that we expect to finish up the legislative business for the week today and have a meeting tomorrow for the purpose of being able to go over until Tuesday. It will be my purpose after announcing the program to ask permission to do this.

Monday is Memorial Day holiday. There will be no session if my request is granted.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday the 1966 appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies. Also on Tuesday, H.R. 3584, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act amendments, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday, H.R. 8371, to reduce excise taxes.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 4623, further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate, and H.R. 8464, to provide a temporary increase in the

public debt ceiling for the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966.

This program is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible we may have additions to announce to the program sometime next week.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO TUESDAY, JUNE 1

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I did not quite understand the distinguished majority leader as to whether raising the debt ceiling is going to come to the House before the tax reduction bill or whether the tax reduction bill is going to come before the raising of the debt ceiling.

Mr. ALBERT. The tax reduction bill is coming up on Wednesday. The other bill later. There is no significance in the sequence. It is just a matter of when the bills are reported and rules are granted.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care to take the time of the House at this time, and I am sure the Speaker would not indulge me all of the time necessary under a reservation of objection, but I could argue a long time with the gentleman about the relationship of a debt increase to a cut in taxes.

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure the gentleman could.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

UNIFORM POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE BENEFITS AND COSTS OF FEDERAL MULTIPURPOSE WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1229) to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multipurpose water resource projects, and for other pur-

poses, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, HALEY, SAYLOR, and SKUBITZ.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 193)

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, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of the locomotive inspection activities of certain personnel employed by or attached to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I have stressed that we must reorganize and modernize the Government's organization structure in order to focus responsibilities, increase efficiency, and meet present-day needs more effectively. The reorganization plan, which accords with recommendations made to me by the Interstate Commerce Commission, supports these objectives. It will make possible necessary changes in the organization and administration of the Commissioner's railroad safety operations.

The Commission's ability to organize and carry out most effectively its responsibilities for railroad safety is now severely limited by certain anachronistic provisions of the locomotive inspection statutes. These provisions go back to an earlier period before steam locomotives were replaced almost completely by diesel engines. At that time locomotive boilers were temperamental and dangerous, and special measures were required to enforce adequate safety standards. Present law specifies in detail the method of appointing locomotive inspectors, the functions to be performed by them, and the organization structure for administering inspection activities. While these provisions may have been suited to conditions 50 years ago, they are clearly inappropriate today.

Progress in railroad technology has not eliminated the need for locomotive inspection. Locomotive inspection is still essential for the safety of employees, passengers, and cargo. The Interstate Commerce Commission, however, properly should not be held to account for the performance of this important function as long as it lacks authority to make those changes in organization and operations which it deems necessary to meet current safety needs and to promote maximum economy and efficiency. The primary purpose of the accompanying reorganiza-

tion plan is to terminate outdated arrangements which now stand in the way of the most effective management of the Commission's railroad safety program.

Organizational flexibility is at present restricted by the statutory requirement that there be 50 locomotive inspection districts and at least 1 inspector for each such district. The number of inspectors and districts cannot be adjusted to accommodate to changes in workload or other relevant factors.

Locomotive inspection is rigidly separated from related railroad safety activities performed under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The locomotive inspection statutes restrict inspectors of locomotives to the inspection of locomotives only and prevent the inspection of locomotives (except brakes and safety appliances) by other Commission railroad safety personnel. Thus, the Commission is prevented from making the most effective utilization of its total staff of locomotive and train inspectors. In order to eliminate the present uneconomical duplicate visits to railroad yards and otherwise to promote the most economical and effective administration of its railroad safety responsibilities, the Commission should have the authority to assign staff to duties for which they may be qualified by training and experience. The reorganization plan will make this possible.

Organizational flexibility is hampered further by the provision for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of a Director and two Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection. Originally, these officials were to be selected with reference to their practical knowledge of the construction and repair of boilers. Later amendments broadened their responsibilities to embrace all parts of the locomotive and tender. These clearly are not policymaking positions, warranting Presidential appointment. As is now the case with other comparable positions where appointments should be based primarily on professional and technical qualifications, personnel supervising locomotive inspection functions should be appointed under the classified civil service.

By eliminating the present cumbersome restrictions on inspection districts, the duties of locomotive inspectors, and the appointment of the Director and Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, the plan will make it possible for the Commission to utilize its personnel more efficiently, integrate the work performed by locomotive inspectors with that performed by other Commission railroad safety inspectors, and take full advantage of recent improvements in the organization of the Commission's central office and field activities.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan:

1. All functions of the Director of Locomotive Inspection, the Assistant Directors of Locomotive Inspection, and district locomotive inspectors will be transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Suitable powers of delegation with respect to the functions so transferred will be conferred upon the Commission.

2. The position of Director of Locomotive Inspection, the two positions of Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, and all positions of district locomotive inspector will be abolished. The Commission will be required to appoint to a position under the classified civil service, as provided in the reorganization plan, each person who immediately prior to the taking effect of the plan held the office of district inspector of locomotives; such appointments will be deemed to be made without any break in service.

3. The function of dividing the territory comprising the several States and the District of Columbia into 50 locomotive boiler-inspection districts will be abolished.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that, by reason of the reorganizations made by the reorganization plan, it is necessary to include in the plan the provisions contained in section 5 thereof. The rates of compensation thereunder are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable positions in the executive branch of the Government.

The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 2(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 4 of the act of February 17, 1911, chapter 103, 36th Statutes at Large, page 914, as amended.

The reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will produce some immediate savings and significant long-range economies. The latter will result from future improvements in the organization and administration of the affected functions made possible by the plan. Since the plan will open the way for the more effective utilization of safety inspection staffs of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will yield a significantly increased measure of safety inspection activity for each dollar spent for this purpose. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

Under the accompanying reorganization plan, all essential Government railroad safety services to the traveling public and employees will continue to be performed. The plan provides urgently needed modernization of the organization and procedures in the Interstate Commerce Commission's railroad safety program. I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1965.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 194)

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, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations of various committees and other similar bodies.

The strength and vitality of our democracy depends in major part upon the Federal Government's adaptability, on its capacity for fast flexible response to changing needs imposed by changing circumstances. If we are to maintain this capacity, we must have a government that is streamlined and capable of quickly adjusting and readjusting its organization and operating procedures to take up and surmount new challenges.

As Government grows more complex and programs increasingly cut across traditional agency lines, we must exercise special care to prevent the continuance of obsolete interagency committees and other coordinating devices which waste time and delay action and the undue proliferation of new committees. Interagency committees are a valuable and often indispensable means for facilitating coordination, but we should be sure that a committee is the most efficient way to accomplish a given task and that it is structured to meet current needs effectively.

At my direction, guidelines for the management of interagency committees have been established. I have recently asked the heads of departments and agencies to give their personal attention to a complete review of all the interagency committees in which their agencies participate to determine which ones might be eliminated, consolidated, or otherwise reorganized. We will take appropriate action to obtain essential improvements in the organization and use of those committees which have been established by the executive branch.

The reorganizations accomplished by the reorganization plan transmitted herewith will enable us to take similar action with respect to a number of committees which have been established by statute. In many instances the statutory provisions creating these committees are very specific as to membership and describe in detail the functions to be performed. These provisions are rarely sufficiently flexible to permit the membership or role of the committees to be accommodated to changing circumstances or to permit their termination when they have outlived their usefulness.

The accompanying reorganization plan will abolish nine statutory committees. In each case the responsibility for providing suitable arrangements to assure effective consultation and coordination is placed in a specific official. Wherever the continuing need for and usefulness of a committee has been demonstrated, I would anticipate the establishment of a successor committee along the general lines of the body now pro-

vided by law. Certainly prompt action will be taken to create successor committees to such bodies as the Board of Foreign Service and the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. But we will have the flexibility promptly to make such changes in functions and membership as might be required to eliminate overlapping and duplication and to adjust to the development of new programs and shifts in executive branch responsibilities.

A number of the committees affected by the reorganization plan are advisory to the President or have functions which are closely related to responsibilities already vested in the President. The functions of those committees will be transferred to the President by the reorganization plan. The functions of the others will be transferred to the appropriate individual agency heads.

The management and control of interagency committees have been a matter of growing concern to both the executive branch and the Congress. The taking effect of the reorganization plan will contribute significantly to better management of interagency committees and will assist efforts to simplify and modernize coordinating arrangements within the executive branch.

Executive Order No. 10940 of May 11, 1961, provides for the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to consult with that Committee on matters of general policy and procedure arising in the administration of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 and to consider certain recommendations of that Committee—42 U.S.C. 2546(b). To require the Secretary by law to consult with a committee established by Executive order is clearly anomalous. The plan abolishes the relevant functions of the Secretary with respect to consulting and considering the recommendations of the President's Committee. The reorganization plan does not otherwise affect the Committee; it has no effect upon Executive Order No. 10940. The statutory authority for the exercise of the functions to be abolished by section 13(b) of the reorganization plan is contained in section 7(b) of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, 75 Stat. 574.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 4 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.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs and in a more timely manner than at present. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1965.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 195)

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, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1965, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for certain reorganizations relating to the National Science Foundation.

The plan contains two reorganization measures. First, all committees provided for in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 would be abolished. That section provides that there shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation, having not less than five members who are appointed by the National Science Board for 2-year terms. Section 8, as affected by section 23(b) (3) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, 76 Stat. 1255, directs each such committee to make recommendations to and advise and consult with the Director of the National Science Foundation with respect to matters relating to the program of its division. Originally the Foundation had three such committees, corresponding to its three divisions. With the growth of the Foundation, five additional divisions have been established; consequently the Foundation, in accordance with the requirements of section 8, now has eight divisional committees. This multiplication in the number of committees has proved cumbersome. For example, three committees are now concerned with scientific personnel and education matters instead of the original one committee, even though one committee is all that is required to meet the Foundation's needs in this area. The elimination of the various statutory divisional committees will simplify the structure of the Foundation and improve its administration.

The second reorganization measure contained in the accompanying reorganization plan would empower the Director of the National Science Foundation to delegate functions vested in him by law or delegated to him by the National Science Board. The expanding responsibilities of the Foundation and the Director indicate that it is necessary that the Director clearly have such authority.

Upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan, the National Science Foundation will institute such new arrangements, in lieu of the divisional committees now required by law, as it deems appropriate. Such new arrangements may include the establishment of com-

mittees under section 6 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and such other devices for obtaining advice as may be available to the Foundation.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The reorganization plan will permit more effective management of the affairs of the National Science Foundation. It is, however, impracticable to specify or itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the reorganization plan.

The statutory authority for the exercise of certain functions which would be abolished by section 1 of the reorganization plan is contained in section 8 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 152.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1965.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. 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. 114]		
Anderson,	Farnum	Ottinger
Tenn.	Fino	Pool
Andrews,	Flynt	Price
George W.	Grider	Purcell
Ashbrook	Hagen, Calif.	Randall
Ashley	Hanna	Resnick
Ashmores	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Ayres	Harvey, Ind.	Scott
Baldwin	Hays	Secrest
Bates	Hebert	Skubitz
Berry	Hull	Stafford
Bonner	Hungate	Steed
Brown, Calif.	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Brown, Ohio	Lindsay	Toll
Clark	Madden	Weltner
Clausen,	Mathias	White, Idaho
Don H.	Miller	Willis
Clawson, Del	Morgan	Wilson,
Cramer	O'Hara, Mich.	Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

VIEWING OF "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS," AT 25TH CLASS REUNION OF HARVARD 1940

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 426) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940, in Cambridge, Mass.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that this does not set any precedent, that we are not going to show this film as a commercial film throughout the country, but that this will be the one and only time it will be shown?

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the gentleman that the language of the resolution states specifically that this picture will be made available for viewing at a private showing to the class of 1940, graduates of Harvard University, their wives and their families.

Mr. BOW. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I understand why this is being done at Harvard. The point I would like to make crystal clear is that this is not a precedent that will be followed in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON RES. 426

Whereas the graduates of Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, of the class of 1940, will be observing the twenty-fifth anniversary of their graduation during the days of June 13-June 17, 1965; and

Whereas the late beloved President of these United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was a member of the class of 1940 and was held by his classmates in deep bonds of respect, loyalty, and affection; and

Whereas the class book memorializing this occasion is dedicated to John Fitzgerald Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late President Kennedy "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," available for viewing at a private showing to said Harvard University class of 1940, in the city of Cambridge, Massachusetts, on or about the days of June 13-June 17, 1965.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONDING PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 393 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 393

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be

equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 393 provides for consideration of H.R. 5883, a bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 5883 would amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to provide for a fidelity bond—to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others—in place of the provision for the "faithful discharge" bond presently required. The present provision requiring the labor organization to obtain its bond from a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury as an acceptable surety for Federal bonds is amended to allow the labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required." Such other arrangements must first be approved by the Secretary of Labor and would include arrangements with foreign sureties and at a comparable or lower cost. This gives to the Secretary of Labor, under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, discretion similar to that he now has under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to bonding arrangements.

The bill would also amend the act to provide that the surety company reports required shall be made public, shall be available for inspection and examination, and shall be available to State agencies.

A new section is added to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act requiring each surety which has issued any bond required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to file with the Secretary of Labor a report, signed by two responsible officers, which lists and describes its bonding experience under each of the acts for the preceding fiscal year, and which specifically shall include: Gross and net premiums, total claims paid, total contingent claims, administrative and legal expenses incurred in connection with the processing of such claims, and amounts recovered by way of subrogation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 393.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a very important piece of legislation that the House is going to consider today and I believe it is highly unfortunate that once again we are witnessing, in effect, a short circuiting of the legislative process in that this bill is being brought to the floor of the House without any current hearings. The last hearings on this subject were those that were held by the 88th Congress in October 1963.

Mr. Speaker, there may be those in this House who interpret the results of the election of last November as a mandate of the administration to get everything for which it asks.

On the other hand there may be those who feel that we ought to go through the formality of holding hearings and bringing up to date the information that the House ought to have before it acts on a very important measure of this kind. I think the gentleman from New York has stated what the purport of this is. Very simply it would water down, it would dilute, it would weaken the present bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Disclosure Act of 1959, and substitute for the standard of faithful performance which is required when the bonds are obtained for union officials, it would substitute therefor another standard of fraud and dishonesty. You would have to prove fraud and dishonesty on the part of union officials before you could recover under the bond, whereas now he is held to a higher standard of faithful performance of his duties under the language of the bond that may obtain at the present time.

I think the reason is clear, and it is referred to in the minority views offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, joined in by other Republican members of that subcommittee.

Section 501 provides that the union agent who handles funds shall be held to the standard of a fiduciary. That is the language of section 501. The section that precedes the section to be amended by this bill charges us with handling responsibility. That section says that the officers, agents, shop stewards, and other representatives of a labor organization occupy positions of trust in relation to such organization and its members as a group.

That is the standard set out in section 501. Then follows the language of 502 (a), which the majority is seeking to amend here today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is a coincidence or not, but just a few days before we are called upon to handle this bill on the floor of the House I came across an article appearing in the New York Times of May 21, 1965, the headline of which was "Meany Charges Witch Hunting in U.S. Studies of Union Funds." The article went on to say that Mr. Meany has accused the Labor De-

partment and their investigators of "witch hunting and harassment" in checking into the financial records of unions. I do not know whether we will be launching into a campaign to generally relax the provisions of our labor laws or not. I have looked at the 1963 hearings. There are no hearings subsequent to that time. But I ask, where is the pressure from the rank and file of the labor unions for this amendment? Where is the laboring man of America? Where is his voice reflected in these hearings saying we ought to water down the bond of the man who handles his union dues? I think the omission of that kind of evidence in the record is highly significant.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, does the present bill in the gentleman's judgment weaken or strengthen the protection of the rank and file union members?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi I cannot see that it does anything but weaken, water down, and dilute these provisions. It substitutes for the higher standard of faithful performance a standard requiring proof of fraud and dishonesty, before there can be a recovery on the bond.

Mr. COLMER. I am constrained to agree with the gentleman's conclusion.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I call attention of the Members of the House, because I think it is not irrelevant, to the fact in this same article to which I referred, a Labor Department official stated that in the year ending June 30 the Department of Labor received 51,090 union official reports, and in that same period investigators found violations in about half of the complaint cases. I think 70 were resolved by voluntary compliance, but there were 66 convictions and 9 acquittals of present or former union officers or employees for embezzlement or failure to keep proper records.

So I think we are dealing not with just something shadowy here. We are dealing with a problem of real substance. We ought to remind ourselves that union funds—and I do not know what they run to in terms of millions of dollars—but it is big business, not just peanuts that we are talking about. I think we ought to have a little concern—as the gentleman from Michigan and his colleagues on the committee pointed out—we ought to have a little concern in this body for the protection of the rank and file union member and not simply bow to the wishes and voices of a few officials who argue that it is going to be more expensive to give this protection.

I want very quickly to point out one other thing and this was alluded to by the gentleman from New York, that under the proposed amendment this is going to make it possible for foreign surety companies to provide bonds for labor union officials; that instead of just drawing these surety companies

from a list of domestic companies approved by the Secretary, that foreign insurers will now be brought into the business.

Has anybody stopped to think what the possible impact might be on our balance of payments? Maybe this is not important—I do not know—but I think that maybe it would have been proper if hearings had been conducted on this bill in this session of the Congress to have gone into the balance-of-payments aspect of the question and decide whether or not foreign sureties, if we are going to have them, would have some further adverse impact on this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are others better qualified than I in this legislative body who are going to speak so I am not going to take any more time.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I just want to satisfy the gentleman on the question of balance of payments that all financing, for instance, to Lloyds of London are made to banks here in dollars and there is no loss of dollars to the United States. So there is no question of the balance of payments being affected.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am very grateful to the gentleman from California for making this statement to me now. I certainly could not get it as a result of reading the bill or the report or the 1963 hearings. I think perhaps there will be other questions left unanswered in the minds of a great many Members and this is all because of the lack of hearings.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. With reference to the answer made by the gentleman from California, I can only observe that surely he does not base his answer on anything in this bill. Under the bill, a labor organization can go to the Secretary of Labor and seek approval for "some other bonding arrangement," and if it is approved the union would be exempt from the bonding requirements of the existing act. There is no limit in the bill as to what that "other binding arrangement" might be. There is no requirement, certainly not in this legislation, that says funds must remain in this country, and I would be interested in knowing the basis for the assurance by the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I think the comment he made and the observation he made reinforces the point I sought to make that that question is left unanswered as far as the record is concerned.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, even the gentleman who just addressed the House, the gentleman from Michigan, would say that section 502(a) as presently written is not necessarily perfect. Maybe we ought to talk about some

amendments to this particular section of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959. We are making a very important basic and fundamental change here today and I do not think we are going about it in the right way or with the proper degree of information and knowledge that we ought to have. I think we are going to end up, if we adopt this particular amendment, in weakening rather than strengthening the protection that the Congress intended the rank and file of the union members to have when this bill was enacted in 1959.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. I call your attention to page 2 of the report where former Secretary of Labor Goldberg, testifying in the Senate hearings had this to say:

I think our experience during the last 2 years has proved very effectively that the Landrum-Griffin bond is not the proper type of bond.

He goes on further to state:

We ought to have a simple honesty bond of the type which is exacted with respect to all banks, various financial trusts, and which has been found effective and adequate on handling of funds in other cases in a businesslike way.

That is what the Secretary stated.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I have read the report. I was aware that in 1961, almost 4 years ago, he made that statement.

Frankly, with all due respect to Mr. Justice Goldberg, since he had come freshly, as he did at that time, from a position as counsel for a labor union, I can see how he might have felt and testified as he did.

Let me point out again that the statement is 4 years old. I should like to know what the experience has been since that time.

If the figures I have just read to the House, which purport to be figures from the Labor Department spokesman, are true, we have a problem of some magnitude.

Before we change the bonding requirements in section 502, since it seems to me we are getting the cart before the horse, we ought to change the language in section 501, which says he shall be a fiduciary. In most States, as is true of my own State of Illinois, that means a man is held to the standard of the prudent investment rule. He must prudently handle, as a fiduciary and trustee, funds which come to him from someone else.

Until we change the fiduciary standards set forth in the law in that section, I do not believe we ought to change the terminology or the language on the bond.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 20a(12) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 392 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 392

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5241) to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 392 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5241, a bill to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes.

The bill would make it clear that the prohibition against the holding by "any person" of the position of officer or director of more than one carrier, without prior approval of the Commission, applies to the holding of such positions by different members, officers, employees, or directors of the same firm, copartnership, corporation, association, or joint stock association, or to the representation of a person on the board of directors of more than one carrier through an agent or nominee.

The filing and processing of formal interlocking directorship applications entail considerable time and expense both for the applicant and the ICC. During the period 1960 through 1963, a total of 851 such applications were filed. Only about 2 percent of these

applications involved positions in unaffiliated carriers and the time and money consumed in filing and processing approximately 98 percent of these applications could have been saved if legislation such as H.R. 5241 had been enacted. Also, a considerable reduction in record-keeping expenses would have been realized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 392.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5241 proposes to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to—

First, eliminate the necessity for prior Commission approval for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one railroad where the carriers are part of a single integrated system, lawfully operated under common control; and

Second, it would make clear that the prohibition against the holding by "any person" of the position of officer or director of more than one railroad applies to the holding of such positions by different members of the same firm and would require obtaining prior approval of the Commission in such instances.

In other words, with respect to the second objective of the measure, if you have two attorneys from the same law firm, one serving as a director for one railroad and the other member of the same firm serving as a director of another railroad that is not commonly controlled, then under this proposal, it would make it clear that prior approval of the Commission would be required and necessary.

The effective date of the measure is January 1, 1966.

With respect to the first objective of the bill, there seems to be unanimous agreement on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads on the desirability and advisability of eliminating the necessity of having to come to the ICC for prior approval before a person can be an officer or director in two or more railroads that are under common control. In fact, whenever such application is made to the ICC, approval is forthcoming as a matter of course.

There is unanimous agreement with the ICC point of view that the requirements of application and process in such situations casts an unnecessary administrative burden upon both the Commission and the carriers.

Hence, the ICC has recommended in 2 consecutive years that the law be amended to eliminate this unnecessary administrative work to save considerable time and expense for both the applicant and the Commission without an adverse effect on the public interest.

Out of a total of 851 interlocking directorship applications that were filed during the period 1960-63, only 2 percent of these applications involved positions of unaffiliated carriers; hence, the time and money involved in processing 98 percent of these applications could have been saved if the act were amended, as well as reducing recordkeeping expense.

There is opposition from the industry to the recommendation of the ICC in this measure making it necessary for approval to be gotten from the Commission before a second member of the same holding company, brokerage firm, or other noncarrier may hold a similar position as director or officer with another carrier not under common control.

Such opposition has been expressed by the Association of American Railroads, the Transportation Association of America, and American Short Line Railroad Association.

Their reasoning is that it is too restrictive in nature, that its need has not been shown, and it would make it more difficult to obtain capable and talented men as officers and directors since such personnel are frequently found as directors, officers, and partners in the same non-carrier organization. Hence, if such an organization were to be represented on one railroad, this proposal would serve as an obstacle to having anyone else from the same organization serve as another railroad officer or director. It could conceivably impede the efforts of the railroads to obtain the services of the best qualified individuals.

In the course of the record of hearings that was developed, Mr. Harry J. Breithaupt, Jr., of the law department of the Association of American Railroads, furnished the committee with a report on the legislative history of section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act and concluded with this paragraph—page 107 of the hearings:

There appears to be no evidence of any present-day abuse resulting from the fact that under the existing statute different representatives of the same firm or corporation may serve as officers or directors of different railroads without prior Commission approval; and, therefore, there appears to be no occasion for amendment of the act in that regard.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONDING PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAWS

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

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 consideration of the bill H.R. 5883, with Mr. UDALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the

gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I arise to explain the purpose of H.R. 5883, to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The bill proposes the substitution of a "fraud or dishonesty" bond for the presently required "faithful discharge of duties" bond under section 502(a).

The question has arisen as to whether or not the proposed substitution would diminish the protections given to union funds, and whether or not the fraud and dishonesty bond would sufficiently cover the violations of section 501(a) of the act.

Solicitor of Labor Charles Donahue, in a letter to the gentleman from California, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor, presented the well-considered views of the Labor Department favoring the bill and the proposed substitution of bonds. He stated in part:

It is and has been the position of the Department that the bond required by section 502(a) need not cover all violations of section 501(a). This position is expressed in an interpretative bulletin promulgated by then Secretary of Labor Mitchell shortly after the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act was enacted which states in part:

"The bonding requirement in section 502(a) relates only to duties of the specified personnel in connection with their handling of funds or other property to which this section refers. It does not have reference to the special duties imposed upon representatives of labor organizations by virtue of the position of trust which they occupy, which are dealt with in section 501(a), and for which civil remedies for breach of the duties are provided in section 501(b). The fact that the bonding requirement is limited to personnel who handle funds or other property indicates the correctness of these conclusions. They find further support in the differences between sections 501(a) and 502(a) of the act which sufficiently indicate that the scope of the two sections is not coextensive."

The committee endorses the soundness of that interpretation.

The bond which is substituted is the same type of bond which is now required under section 13(a) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended.

The words "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others" are the same as under section 13(a) of the latter act.

The committee can see no reason why officers and other representatives of labor organizations who handle funds other than those of welfare and pension plans should be bonded differently from those who handle such funds. There has been no testimony suggesting that the "fraud or dishonesty" bond provided under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has failed to protect those funds and, as previously stated, there is no reason to think that such a bond will not protect equally as well any funds other than welfare and pension plan funds.

There is no justification for requiring an expensive 25 percent surcharge for "faithful performance of duty" bonds which extra charge fails to secure any defined increase in protection as intended under the present act. In actual practice there are few instances where a loss cannot be attributed to dishonesty or fraud.

Under the bill as reported by the committee, the present provision requiring the labor organization to obtain its bond from a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury as an acceptable surety for Federal bonds is amended to allow the labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required" by section 502(a). Such other arrangements must first be approved by the Secretary of Labor and would include arrangements with foreign sureties and at a comparable or lower cost. This gives to the Secretary, under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, discretion similar to that he now has under section 13(e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to bonding arrangements. It is not the intention of the committee in giving discretionary power to the Secretary, to sanction self-insurance on the part of labor organizations.

Section 211 of H.R. 5883 adds a new section which requires each surety which has issued any bond required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to file with the Secretary a report, signed by two responsible officers, which lists and describes the bonding experience under each of the acts for the preceding fiscal year, and which specifically shall include: Gross and net premiums; total claims paid; total contingent claims; administrative and legal expenses incurred in connection with the processing of such claims, and amounts recovered by way of subrogation.

The surety company reports shall, like the other reports required under the acts, be made public, shall be available for inspection and examination, and shall be available to State agencies inspecting same.

I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the distinguished chairman of the General Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5883 which seeks to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The bill has four parts.

First, It would change the present provision for a "faithful discharge" bond and substitute a bond "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others." This refers to the bond required of every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any labor organization, or of a trust in which a labor organization is interested, who

handles funds or other property thereof. This is a substitution of a normal, commonly used, commercial fidelity bond for the unusual and uncommon bond required by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. The new substitute would be the same type of bond now required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Second, The bill would amend section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to allow a labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required" when approved by the Secretary of Labor. This is the same provision that exists in section 13 (e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Third, A new section is added to the act requiring surety companies to file reports with the Department of Labor which will show their experience with the class of bonds required by Federal law.

Fourth, The reports filed by the surety companies are to become public information.

Each one of these amendments has its own justification and rationale. I shall demonstrate this as I take each one in order.

The purpose of the amendment to section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act is twofold. It is to provide protection for the funds of labor organizations and to conserve those funds by preventing an unwarranted frittering away due to excessive and undue costs resulting from the vague nature of a "faithful discharge" bond.

Former Secretary of Labor, now Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Arthur Goldberg stated:

We ought to have a simple honesty bond of the type which is exacted with respect to all banks, various financial trusts, and which has been found effective and adequate on handling of funds in other cases in a businesslike way and that type of bond we submit we should have in this case, too. The words "faithful performance of duties" are vague and indefinite in character. We have found that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium. If we should use and extend to all trusts, even those in which labor organizations are interested, the well-known fraud and dishonesty bonds as we would provide for in this bill, then we would be giving adequate coverage at a reasonable cost to the fund, rather than coverage at excessive costs.

The bond which we would require is the same type that protects the much greater assets of pension and welfare funds under existing law. We see no reason why the two areas of concern should not receive identical protection. There was no testimony to the effect that this would provide inadequate coverage. Neither the Justice Department nor the Labor Department saw any threat to adequate protection of these assets. The Labor Department endorses our objective and favors the bill. If the protection is in practice the same, and we believe it is, then it is a shameful waste of the assets that we seek to protect to require an imprudent and unnecessary expenditure

of union funds through excessive and unduly priced bonds.

The question has been raised as to whether there exists today a 25-percent surcharge of the "faithful discharge" bond over the rates for a common fidelity bond as proponents claim. In a letter dated May 17, 1965, Mr. Frank Kleiler, Director, Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports, wrote:

We do understand that there is a 25-percent surcharge in the rates for coverage under a bond required by section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act over the rates that are charged for an identical amount of insurance written in connection with a bond under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The proponents of this measure claim that there is a concrete, present, demonstrable waste of the assets of labor organizations today because of the present provision of the law. The 25-percent surcharge provides no realized added protection. Quoting Mr. Kleiler once again, "While we are aware of certain claims having been filed against sureties for losses due to embezzlement under bonds required under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, we have no specific knowledge of claims having been filed against such sureties for losses which would not have been covered by the usual fidelity type of bond."

The opponents of this measure assert that there is added protection. They claim that it is conceivable that under some situation the funds of a union might be preserved under the present bond, but not by a fidelity bond. It is conceivable. But we are not talking about what is conceivable. We are addressing ourselves to a present and real loss of union funds. The office responsible for enforcement of this provision states that they have heard of no cases where a fidelity bond would not have provided adequate protection and coverage. But meanwhile, while we await some conceivable, hypothetical future case in which a union may collect for a loss possible only with the present type coverage, many thousands of dollars are going down the drain.

Yes, the opponents of this measure will argue that there is some added undefined protection. Witnesses from the surety company industry, however, have something else to say on this subject. A representative of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies said:

When you had the passage of the Landrum-Griffin you substituted for that fixed standard (a fidelity bond) this amorphous thing called faithful performance of duty in an area where it had never been used in that broad aspect before.

The term I think was taken by the draftsmen, perhaps unwittingly from the procedures and the kind of coverage which historically had been available to public officials. It was the common and ordinary broad coverage which was available to people who are required as officials of State and Government to be bonded—faithful performance of duty.

In that area, of course, when you had a public official his duties were known. They were fixed by statute. They were fixed by the customary practices of the office, by the common law definition of what the faithful performance might be, but when you

took it into the area of this type of bonding for labor union officials you had no fixed standard anymore. In this area we don't know what it means.

At this point, I asked the witness the following question:

The reason for the higher rate is the underwriting. In other words, if, as you very well said a few minutes ago, you are required to underwrite something and you are not sure as to its implications, you are going to charge more money so as to safeguard yourself against this uncertainty?

The witness responded that this was exactly accurate. He then stated:

We can only guess as to what faithful performance coverage means in the frame of reference of the duties of an official of a union.

Mr. Charles Donahue, Solicitor, U.S. Labor Department, stated on this subject:

The words "faithful performance of duties" are vague and indefinite in character. We have found that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium.

My colleague on the General Subcommittee on Labor, the gentleman from Illinois, brought this entire point to a head with this question:

I have been listening to this testimony all day today and I am still trying to find out this point. What in your judgment is faithful discharge of duties as applied to bonds for labor unions?

The vice president of Niagara Fire Insurance Co. stated:

I believe it has already been made abundantly clear that the faithful discharge of duty is not definable.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this measure ask us to continue along this same path while unions continue to pay 25 percent extra for a vague and unrealized alleged benefit. A survey of 122 national and international unions found not a single faithful discharge claim had been filed. Six affiliated departments of the AFL-CIO reported that not a single faithful discharge claim had been filed. And the Surety Association of America has not been able to cite a single claim for a violation of faithful discharge of duties by a union officer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we bring this section of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act into line with the more realistic and advantageous provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and bring to an end this shameful waste of money belonging to labor's rank and file.

The bill also seeks to amend section 502(a) to end this virtual monopoly among bonding companies eligible to provide the required bonds. Presently a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury is required. The bill would allow the labor organization to make "other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required" when approved by the Secretary of Labor. This is the same provision that exists under section 13(e) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Though the Treasury list of acceptable sureties includes 231 companies, most of

these are financially unable or undesirable of handling the large bonds required of unions. The small group remaining hold a virtual monopoly in this area due to the narrow language in section 502(a). This monopoly is bad per se. It is bad because of its undue power. It is bad because it creates a great possibility of collusion. It is bad because there is power to disqualify the duly elected officers of labor organizations.

The Secretary of Labor has used his authority under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act carefully and cautiously, assuring the utmost protection. The same prudence will be shown in the administration of this provision.

The bill adds a new section 211, to the act requiring surety company reports, and requires that such reports shall be made available to the public. This will allow interested persons the opportunity to see the basis upon which their premiums are set. Since we require the bonds by act of Congress, we should provide the opportunity to affected persons to assure themselves that they are not being unfairly treated or taken advantage of.

Mr. Chairman, this will bring two significant laws protecting the assets of union members into harmony. It would not impair the protection afforded. It would conserve the assets of labor organizations by eliminating the cause of excessive and unjustifiable costs. And, finally, it would require the reporting of certain information which will allow interested persons to discover whether their resources are being depleted unjustifiably through undue rates on bonds required by their National Government. I urge support of H.R. 5883 as reported from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I shall ask in the House to include excerpts from the hearings of October 16 and 24, 1963, for further support of this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. First, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement and say that I am going to support this legislation. I understand that there are claims which have been made to the effect that it might be possible for fraud or collusion to take place. There is nothing in this act or any other act of Congress that would prevent a prosecution against any member of a union or a bank or anyone else who is charged with a fidelity of funds from being prosecuted if he is guilty of any illegal act; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is not any question about it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to point out in respect to that question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in section 501(c) of this act there is provision for a criminal prosecution which carries up to a \$10,000 fine and a 5-year

jail or prison sentence for an act of dishonesty in violation of the public relations section, and that is not disturbed in this proposal now pending before us.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Someone might say, why did we put it into the original act, and I believe the answer is that the draftsman perhaps unwittingly took it from the precedents and the kind of coverage which historically has been available to public officials. It was the common and ordinary broad coverage which was available to people who are required as officials of a State or local government to be protected for the faithful performance of duty. Those duties are well defined in the law of each instance. This is not true of the application "faithful performance" to labor officials.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is reporting a lot of information on this, and I do not propose to contest those facts but, having had no hearings on this bill since 1963, I do not know where he is getting the information. I have had no opportunity to cross-examine witnesses. The gentleman is making statements I presume he is going to document later.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will state categorically that the chairman of the subcommittee asked witnesses—

Mr. GRIFFIN. When?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The witnesses that previously appeared before the committee, whether there was any change, whether any other plans had been made, and we received assurances there were none; therefore it was obviously a waste of time to have them come back.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman personally made those inquiries?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. There is a question about a part the gentleman spoke of.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The first part of the bill?

Mr. DOWDY. The first part of the bill. I think when we passed this Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1963 the words "faithful discharge of duties" were included in the bill.

I believe that on any claim brought under a bond for failure to faithfully discharge duties recovery could only be had of any provable pecuniary loss. I cannot conceive of anything else that a bonding company would be responsible for. It is this particular first part or first section of the bill that I am afraid of.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say to the gentleman the problem is that those words, as the insurance company officials as well as public officials said, are not definable. There is no definable way in which they can be applied. Therefore to be safe, because after all insurance companies are in business for a profit, they charge this extra 25-percent premium because they do not know what this thing means. I do not think you or

anybody else wants to write a law which requires something to be done when everybody tells us they do not know what it means, and if they do not know what it means, certainly the people who wrote it in the first instance did not know either.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. I do not recall the exact phrasing of the bond that I made when I was a district attorney in Texas before I came to the Congress, but it was along the line of faithful discharge of duties because I did not handle any money.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As I said to the gentleman, for public officials it is different. There we know precisely what it means. We do not know what it means when it is applied to labor union officials.

Mr. DOWDY. I do not have any feelings about these surety company reports and providing the making of them public but if that is included in the bill, certainly by that information being made available to the public, if there is too high a charge for a bond for faithful discharge of duties, that should be corrected.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not know how we could correct it. We have no power to correct it. They can charge all they want to. They charge 25 percent extra for this bond and they admit, themselves, there have been no claims under the act.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield briefly to my colleague.

Mr. DENT. I just want to say that one of the reasons the committee took into consideration the language which was just alluded to by the gentleman who preceded me in questioning the gentleman from California now in the well of the House, was the fact that because of this language the cost of the bond is prohibitive. For instance, under a regular bond that can be obtained now under the Pension and Welfare Act and other surety proposals in private enterprise or otherwise, bonds for coverage of \$40 million worth of assets would amount to \$500,000 worth of bonding. As it is now, under this act, to cover \$40 million worth of assets, because of the language contained in the act, you have to purchase bonds up to the amount of \$7.5 million which is entirely out of proportion and out of reason.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman I include at this point in the Record excerpts from hearings on bonding provisions of Federal labor laws—H.R. 4669, 4670, and 4671—October 16 and 24, 1963:

MR. DAVID Q. COHEN, ASSOCIATION OF CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANIES

Mr. COHEN. When you had the passage of Landrum-Griffin you substituted for that fixed standard this amorphous thing called faithful performance of duty in an area where

it had never been used in that broad aspect before.

The term I think was taken by the draftsmen, perhaps unwittingly from the procedures and the kind of coverage which historically had been available to public officials. It was the common and ordinary broad scope coverage which was available to people who are required as officials of State and Government to be bonded—faithful performance of duty.

In that area, of course, when you had a public official his duties were known. They were fixed by statute. They were fixed by the customary practices of the office, by the common law definition of what the faithful performance might be, but when you took it into the area of this type of bonding for labor union officials you had no fixed standard any more.

Mr. PUCINSKI. What does faithful performance mean? How do you now define faithful performance?

Mr. COHEN. I think Mr. Mayer is quite right. In this area we don't know what it means.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The reason for the higher rate is the underwriting. In other words, if, as you very well said a few minutes ago, you are required to underwrite something and you are not sure as to its implication, you are going to charge more money so as to safeguard yourself against this uncertainty.

Mr. COHEN. Exactly, Mr. Chairman. You stated it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then, Mr. Cohen, if I understand you correctly after this entire colloquy, you really don't know what you are insuring this union for or against. The underwriters have set a fee on a bond that they themselves are not quite sure what it covers and they are strictly in the dark on this whole question.

Is this what we are concluding?

Mr. COHEN. We can only guess as to what faithful performance coverage means in the frame of reference of the duties of an official of a union.

MR. HAROLD GIBBONS, VICE PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS

Mr. DANIELS. Do I understand you correctly that there are only four or five bonding companies who could write the type of bonds that your unions needed?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am saying that there are some 231 companies listed who are eligible to write. That is the No. 1 figure. No. 2, of those 231, there are a large number of them that are simply not large enough companies to write a half million dollar bond.

Mr. DANIELS. About how many bonding companies would be excluded because they do not have the assets?

Mr. GIBBONS. Our insurance total is \$109 million, the policies we were seeking. That excluded over, say, 50 percent of them, that is one problem.

Mr. DANIELS. So of the 231 you have now eliminated approximately 111 companies.

Mr. GIBBONS. Now, I would reduce the balance down to maybe a handful which I would guess, and the committee has it in their files here, the telegrams are available for your scrutiny, I would say there were not over a half dozen companies who were big enough, and who made it a practice or had a desire to write this type of business.

No other segment of the community is required to deal exclusively with sureties on the U.S. Treasury list without some safety valve proviso.

The U.S. Treasury list for surety companies was originally established for the purpose of providing reputable guarantors for specific performance of Government contracts. But in this instance, the law provided for an alternative type of arrangement; 6 U.S.C. 15 provides: * * * "the amount of such bonds required to be furnished."

At least there they have an alternative if they faced the same problem as we faced. Similarly, each of the States where corporate surety bonds are required for the performance of public contracts, the alternative of collateral in the form of bonds, cash, certified checks, is authorized.

However, under section 502(a), the Secretary of Labor is without discretion to accept any form of collateral as an alternative to bonds issued by a corporate surety on the U.S. Treasury list.

No bank, no insurance company, or other corporate entity is required to write "faithful discharge of duty" bonds for any of their officers or employees. It was at a surcharge of 50 percent of the premium and now it is 25 percent. We are not critical of the surety companies charging 25 percent, but there can be no basis for even a 25 percent charge because nobody knows what the phrase means.

Solicitor of Labor Charles Donahue, after 2 years of day-to-day experience in the administration of Landrum-Griffin bonding concludes:

"The words 'faithful performance of duties' are vague and indefinite in character. We have found that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium."

Former Secretary of Labor Mitchell stated in the first annual report of the administration of the act:

"Although many facets of the section were susceptible to differing interpretations, neither the act nor the legislative history supplied specific guidance or direction. For terms like 'faithful discharge,' where legal meaning was sought there was a paucity of case precedents on the subject."

The only parallel for the faithful discharge of duty bonds for labor union officers was the faithful performance bond of public officials, which conditioned that the principal would perform the duties of his office as defined by law.

On this basis, surety companies had standards which they could apply in establishing the liability for the mishandling of public funds.

The experience of labor unions disclosed that out of a survey of 122 national and international unions, not a single faithful discharge claim has been found. Six affiliated departments of the AFL-CIO reported that not a single faithful discharge claim had been filed.

To this date, John F. Fitzgerald, of the Surety Association of America, has failed to cite one single claim for violation of faithful discharge of duties by a trade union officer.

The prime objective of the bonding section is to protect the membership against defalcation by its officers. Any arrangements which will meet this test should be approved on the basis of objective standards promulgated by the Secretary.

MR. CARROLL YOUNG, VICE PRESIDENT, NIAGARA FIRE INSURANCE CO., NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have been listening to this testimony all day today and I am still trying to find out this point. What, in your judgment, is faithful discharge of duties as applied to bonds for labor unions?

Mr. YOUNG. I believe it has already been made abundantly clear that the faithful discharge of duty is not definable.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to clarify a point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. Under section 502 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosures Act of 1959, which requires bonding, there is a maximum liability or bonding requirement of

\$500,000. So when the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to figures above that amount, it should be clear he is not talking about any requirement under this act.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Why does the gentleman not take a look at page 59 of the report? You will see there under those particular provisions of the act, 15 members of the executive boards of the international unions were required to be bonded for \$500,000 each, or a total of \$7.5 million, whereas under the requirement of the bonding features of the Welfare and Pension Act, they would be required to carry \$500,000 total bond for assets up to \$64 million, as against \$7.5 million of bonds for assets up to \$40 million.

It is in your own report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the bill before us does not change the limit of liability in any way.

I should like to turn now to the merits of the bill before us.

Lawyers in this body—and a good many Members of the House are lawyers—will understand the term “fiduciary responsibility.” When the 1959 labor law was being drafted and considered by the Congress, we could have limited the liability or responsibility of a union official handling union funds merely to a responsibility not to steal the funds himself and not to be guilty of fraud. However, Congress was aware of the fact that compulsory unionism is allowed in most States, and since workers can be required to pay union dues in order to hold their jobs, it was concluded that union officials who handle funds have a quasi-public responsibility. So, the Congress decided wisely, in my opinion, to impose upon union officials handling union funds a higher degree of responsibility, that of a fiduciary.

Bonding companies, over the years, have been accustomed to writing the two forms of bonds that we are discussing here today. One is a simple fraud and dishonesty bond; obviously this coverage is cheaper, though it is only 25 percent cheaper than coverage under a faithful discharge of duty bond.

For many years, the officials of fraternal organizations, such as the Elks, the Masons, and other lodges, have been bonded for the faithful discharge of duties. In other words, they must comply with the general bylaws of the organization in the handling and disbursing of funds.

Local government officials, local municipal officials, and county officials, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has already pointed out, have been bonded for many years, not merely to protect the public against stealing and fraud on their part but also for the faithful discharge of their duties in the office.

Now, we come to the question of what additional protection is provided by the coverage of a bond providing for faithful discharge of duties as opposed to a bond merely for fraud and dishonesty.

Let me pose some cases, some of which are not altogether hypothetical.

Suppose a union official is required by the bylaws of his union to deposit funds at they come into his hands in a bank? Suppose he is precluded from keeping more than a certain amount of funds in his personal possession? Suppose he disregards the bylaws of his union and leaves large sums of money in his desk, and suppose the funds are stolen? He did not steal them. He was not guilty of fraud. But the funds are gone.

Under section 501 of the act, which imposes a fiduciary responsibility under the act upon union officials, he is liable. And, the bonding company is liable under a faithful discharge of duties bond. However, if the pending bill should pass, the bonding company would not be liable, and the union members would be limited in their recourse to a suit against the union official. If the union official was “uncollectible,” if all of his property were in his wife’s name, the union members could obtain a judgment and nothing more.

Suppose that the union bylaws require that a union official, the treasurer of the union, cannot delegate his responsibility; that he cannot turn funds entrusted to him over to a subordinate or somebody else who had not been elected to office?

Suppose he disregards his responsibilities. Suppose he does entrust those funds to a subordinate and that subordinate absconds with the funds. The official who is bonded did not steal the funds. He was not guilty of fraud. He will be liable under section 501, which imposes a fiduciary responsibility on him. The surety company would be liable under the existing law because the loss would be caused by failure to faithfully discharge his duties. However, if this bill is passed, and the required bond covers only losses caused by fraud and dishonesty, the bonding company would not be liable. Only the union members would be out.

Let us make no mistake about this bill. Those who vote for this bill are not voting for or against the management of small companies or big companies. Employers in general could not care less what happens to this bill. However, a vote for this bill will be a vote against rank and file union members; it will be a vote against the protection they have now under the 1959 Act.

Now, suppose that the bylaws of a union provide that a union official shall not employ his wife or any relatives on the union payroll, and suppose the union official does give his wife a job. No funds would have been stolen, and this could happen without the involvement of fraud. He might be liable under section 501, but would the surety company be liable on a simple fraud and dishonesty requirement?

I wish to call attention to another situation. In 1963, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed a district court judgment against officers of Teamsters Local 107 of Philadelphia requiring them to repay \$24,921 in local funds used to pay legal fees incurred in the defense of civil

and criminal actions against them. It enjoined the payment of their union salaries until the judgment was satisfied or a bond filed. An article in the New York Times referring to legal funds from the Teamsters’ treasury used to pay for the legal defense of high officials in various criminal actions says that some sources “have estimates ranging from several thousand dollars up to \$1 million.”

Suppose a union board uses union funds to pay the legal fees of an official of the union who is charged with a crime. I wonder if such an unauthorized use of funds would be covered under a simple fraud and dishonesty bond. Such a loss would be covered under a faithful discharge of duty bond.

I think most of the Members know that most of the pressure for this bill has come from the Teamsters Union. There may be lip service support coming from some of the other unions, but they do not seem to be so interested in it. I have not received any particular pressures from companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Two years ago a representative of the Surety Association of America did come in and testify on this bill when we had hearings on it. They indicated no particular objection one way or another to what coverage Congress might provide in the bond for union members. The surety companies writes both types of bonds. It is true that the premium of one may be a little higher than the other, but they did not take a position on it or oppose the bill on that ground. The association did oppose it on the ground that the reporting requirements of the bill involve Federal regulation of surety companies, even though it is very limited. They pointed out that, historically, the regulation of insurance companies has been left to the States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has cited a series of hypothetical propositions.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does the gentleman consider the payment of legal fees for Teamster officials as hypothetical?

Mr. PUCINSKI. In every instance that the gentleman mentioned he said, “Supposing this happens, supposing that happens,” so properly, I think I may describe his proposition as hypothetical. Using his own language, I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Can the gentleman tell me with any assurance or certainty—and if he can I wish he would cite me his authority for his reply—that the hypothetical situations which he has raised here in his dissertation would, indeed, be covered by the present bonds in existence dealing with faithful discharge?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I will.

The gentleman has asked me a fair question and I would like to answer it. In 1963 when we did have hearings on

this bill—and we have not had any since then—there appeared before our committee a Mr. Fitzgerald, who is the secretary of the Surety Association of America. He was questioned at length along these lines by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Illinois, and I read verbatim some of his testimony:

Faithful performance of duty coverage has been available for many years. While it may not be possible to predetermine precisely the application of faithful performance of duty coverage to a given situation, such coverage is not, therefore, so indeterminate that the nature of the coverage cannot be understood or an appropriate rate established for it. In my opinion, it is no more indefinite or uncertain than insurance based upon negligence or legal liability.

The courts have defined the failure to perform duties as "anything which the law does not excuse." There are a multiplicity of cases largely in the public official area applying the duty to faithfully perform to varying circumstances and this whole body of law is available to companies and to labor organizations in order to determine the application of faithful discharge of duty coverage to specific circumstances.

Perhaps one or two examples would help to clarify the application of this coverage to situations in which dishonesty is not involved. For example, a secretary-treasurer of a labor organization is by constitutional provision made personally responsible for the funds and other property of the union. A subordinate of the secretary-treasurer causes loss through dishonesty.

The secretary-treasurer is liable under the faithful discharge of duty requirement for the acts of his subordinates by reason of the duties imposed upon him by the constitution and therefore, recovery could be had under his bond for his failure faithfully to discharge his duties even though he was not personally dishonest.

He goes on with several other examples. I hope that will answer the question of the gentleman.

Now, does he have any others?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I submit that the gentleman has not answered the question. The gentleman has cited testimony. Can the gentleman tell me with any certainty, and cite authority of any case that has been prosecuted under this language? Can the gentleman tell us of any hypothetical situations that were covered by the present bonds?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have been quite busy with many matters. I would assume that if we are going to bring a bill like this to the floor we would hold hearings and delve into some of the questions the gentleman has raised today. Of course, the committee has not done that. And, I will be very frank to say that I have not had time to go out around the country and make personal inquiries. But if the gentleman is satisfied that because I cannot point to an exact case which has actually been litigated that, therefore, these protections are only hypothetical and are not meaningful, then I just respectfully disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I refer the gentleman to page 15 of the hearings of 1963 and refresh the gentleman's recollection? The hearings, I believe, were rather substantial on this matter. On page 15 we have the testimony of Mr. David Q. Cohen who is the manager of the Fidelity and Surety Department of the Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 110 Williams Street, New York City, and is also a member of the bar, and on page 18, when I asked the gentleman what does "faithful performance" mean. I asked him, "How do you now define 'faithful performance'?"

The reply from Mr. Cohen was:

I think Mr. Mayer is quite right. In this area we don't know what it means.

May I refresh the gentleman's recollection further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, I decline to yield further at this time. I appreciate that contribution for the Record but I must decline to yield further.

I would like to refer to other testimony by Mr. Fitzgerald who testified before the committee, representing the American Surety Association, concerning coverage of the bond. On page 109 of the hearings held in 1963 he stated as follows:

Mr. FITZGERALD. Every case has to be decided on its own merits and its own facts. I would not want to put myself up as the arbiter of the industry, to specify what loss would be paid and what loss would not be paid. I can only go on the basic principles that are involved, which relate to the failure of an official of a union to perform his duties faithfully. If this investment was a failure to perform faithfully as set forth in the constitution or regulations or the procedures of the organization, or as required by law, there would be a liability.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now may I also remind the gentleman that in the further testimony of Mr. Cohen, reading from page 18 of the transcript of the hearings, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] asked the following question of Mr. Cohen:

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then, Mr. Cohen, if I understand you correctly after this entire colloquy, you really don't know what you are insuring this union for or against. The underwriters have set a fee on a bond that they themselves are not quite sure what it covers and they are strictly in the dark on this whole question. Is that what we are concluding?

Mr. COHEN. We can only guess as to what "faithful performance coverage" means in the frame of reference of the duties of an official of a union.

So, I submit that no matter how sincere the gentleman from Michigan is, and he is sincere and I certainly respect his sincerity in telling this House that the members of these unions are paying a 25-percent additional premium for insurance, they do not know what it means and do not know what it covers.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Even though the gentleman in his own mind is not satisfied

as to the outer reaches of this coverage, even though he does not believe that there are definite boundary lines for this coverage, is the gentleman willing to concede that the coverage and protection provided under a faithful-discharge-of-duty bond is good protection and represents more protection than will be provided by a simple fraud-and-dishonesty bond?

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, on the contrary; I believe if the gentleman from Michigan will read the language of the bill he will see what we say in the proposed amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Now, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield further if the gentleman will answer that question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does he concede that?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No; on the contrary.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The present language in the act now gives that member of a union less protection than the language that we are proposing today.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is that why the surety companies charge 25 percent more for a faithful-discharge-of-duty bond?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. The colloquy just concluded between the gentleman from Michigan and myself brings up a very significant point. There has been testimony before our committee by officials of surety companies and associations who clearly and frankly admitted to the committee they have no idea what it is they are bonding. They have not been able to ascertain or determine what "faithful discharge" means. But they are charging thousands of local unions throughout America a 25-percent additional premium simply because they do not know what it is they are supposed to be insuring against.

There has been a great deal of talk about big unions. I do not think that the big internationals are particularly concerned one way or the other with this proposition. They have the money, and they will meet these costs. But there are in this country 75,000 local unions, small unions, with limited resources, which have found it to be an extreme hardship to pay this additional premium ranging from 25 to 50 percent more than straight honesty bonds. These are the people we want to help, and I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that the bill before us will strengthen the protection of local union funds for their members.

The bill now reads "every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any labor organization—other than a labor organization whose property and annual financial receipts do not exceed \$5,000 in value—or of a trust in which a labor organization is interested, who handles funds or other property thereof, shall

be bonded for the faithful discharge of his duties."

That is the bill as it is on the books today. We are proposing to take this mystery language, "for the faithful discharge of his duties" out, and put in its place this language which is clear and concise: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others."

There is a serious question if many of the hypothetical situations the gentleman from Michigan has cited would be covered under the language in the bill as it now stands. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the language proposed in H.R. 5883 would actually give the rank and file membership of labor unions greater protection for their union funds than the vague language in the present bill. My colleague cannot state with any certainty that the examples he cited are covered in the present law. But I can assure him most of them would be covered under the bill I propose here today.

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

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The reason we have a bond is to protect the fund; is that right?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You have no objection then to making this read "to provide protection against loss of any funds entrusted to his care"? If you will do that I can go along with the bill, because that will protect the funds.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think that is the language we have in our proposal.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You say "against loss by reason"—and so forth. It is hard to prove fraud, it is hard to prove dishonesty, but it is not hard to prove that the funds are not there. If you will change this to provide against loss of any funds entrusted to his care you will cover the whole waterfront.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If my colleague will permit a consultation with the legal staff, I will answer him later on. I would like to study his suggestion before I can reply.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have talked with representatives of the unions who came to me, and I asked them: "Do you have any objection or do you think this provision here would still protect your funds?" They said they were assured it would. I said, "If a man made a poor investment as a matter of judgment, if he was negligent, if he was incompetent," are you covered?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Nor are they covered under the present language of the bill. When a union official now uses poor judgment, his union or any member has the right to recover through a civil suit, and there is nothing in the present "faithful discharge" bond that would cover recovery of funds spent through bad judgment unless it can be proven that such bad judgment constitutes lack of faithful discharge of his duties.

The language we are proposing here is identical to the language which now pro-

fects helath, welfare, and pension funds of unions, totaling in excess of \$70 billion in the United States. All we are doing here with H.R. 5883 is imposing the same kind of provisions on union funds that we now have on the books to protect health, welfare, and pension funds, totaling in excess of \$70 billion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I just want to say to the gentleman from Missouri I do not think you want, in all seriousness, to propose that we try to write legislation which will protect against errors of judgment? We do not require that, even in the case of a fiduciary or anybody else. The funds might still be gone and under the language you have proposed, it might be the result of error in judgment. We certainly do not want to write legislation requiring a bond against an error of judgment because in that case the premium would be impossible. We would have no way to enforce that, would we?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not agree with the gentleman. The purpose of the bond is to protect the funds and if the funds are gone, you have the bond to protect you. I have had some experience with bonds in municipalities and I know what it takes to get money back. But if you have your bond covering the loss, regardless of what it is, and if you make your bill read that way, you will not have any trouble in getting the bill passed. But where you are only providing for fraud or dishonesty, you get into a lot of litigation and you can never prove it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to call the attention of my colleague to the situation. Under the existing law, if there is a breach of a fiduciary relationship by virtue of bad judgment or a bad investment and one that is free of any fraud, collusion, conspiracy, connivance or knowledge thereof, or otherwise, and where it is an honest mistake, we now provide, and have laws that provide, under section 501 for a civil action against that union official. Now if there is an act of dishonesty on the part of a union official in the handling of these funds, under section 501(c) we provide for a criminal penalty and that person can be tried and prosecuted and is subject to either a fine of \$10,000 or being sent to the penitentiary for 5 years. We do not disturb that provision. That provision continues in the bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. As I understand the argument of the gentleman from Illinois, he is suggesting that under section 501 of the act we impose a fiduciary responsibility on union officers and union members and that there would be a civil action against that person under those circumstances which would not be covered. Does it bother the gentleman at all that

perhaps a claim against a union official might not be collectible? Does this protect the union members?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, as much as it bothers me that in this country there are thousands of bankers who are covered by the same procedure and every day we read in the press of a banker or an employee of the bank going south with \$200,000 or \$300,000 and there is no more recovery of those funds than there is under this act. At least in this act we provide a prison term for a person who commits a dishonest act and he may be sent to jail for 5 years.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That may be fine but it does not get the money back to the members of the union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Now wait a minute. If it is an act of dishonesty, collusion, fraud, connivance, or conspiracy, the bond that we propose would cover every penny of the loss of that money. The gentleman, if I understood his question correctly, raised the question of an honest mistake. Is that what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman was telling us a few moments ago about a sort of liability that was imposed under section 501.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct. Under section 501, a union may sue to recover any losses that accrue as the result of an honest mistake by one of its officials. But if there is any element of dishonesty or fraud, no matter how remote, such dishonesty triggers the responsibility of the bonding company and there is full recovery of losses under the bonding procedure I propose.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And he was then impressing us with the fact that there was a civil action possible against the official.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct, if it is strictly a matter of an honest mistake devoid of any fraud or dishonesty. The language I propose in this bill gives the rank-and-file members greater protection than existing law. Let me assure the gentleman I would not be introducing this bill if I was not deeply concerned about protection of the rank and file.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know what situation the gentleman is talking about himself, but I am assuming he is talking about a situation that would not be covered by a simple fraud or dishonesty bond; otherwise he would not be mentioning it. I only point out that you are satisfied with a judgment in a civil action against the official and you are not concerned that it may not be collectible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] 2 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled here and have asked for this time in order to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, a question.

I had always understood, although I am not an insurance attorney, that insurance companies based their premiums upon experience in the particular field.

Yet I heard my colleague, the gentleman from California, stand up here and cite, supposedly, the wonderful experience that the unions have had in this particular field.

At the same time, I hear from him and other members on that side of the aisle arguments that the premium is too high; that is, the 25-percent additional.

I should like to ask my colleague from Michigan about this, for I do not understand it. If the experience is so good, it would seem to me that the premium should be quickly lowered by the insurance companies.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman has asked a good question, and I should like to answer it in the following way: In 1959, following the passage of the act requiring bonds for labor union officials for the first time, the surety companies looked into the rates that were then in effect for faithful discharge of duty bonds which were written for the officers of fraternal organizations. They believed that a fraternal organization was somewhat in the same order of things as a labor organization. At that time the surcharge for a faithful discharge of duty bond for the officer of a fraternal organization was 50 percent more than the charge for a simple fraud and dishonesty bond.

After several years of experience under the act, and findings, as people have said—in which I concur—that in general the experience has been good, that the number of defalcations and embezzlements and actions on the part of union officials has been relatively small, and perhaps even less than for bank officials, which may well be demonstrated, the surety companies were requested by the AFL-CIO to review their rates. At that point, on the basis of experience, the rate was reduced from a 50-percent surcharge to a 25-percent surcharge. At the same time they reduced the rates that were in effect for treasurers or officers of fraternal organizations.

It may be that over a period of time further experience will justify a further reduction of the additional premium, but even if it remains at 25 percent the additional protection which the union members are getting as a result of this bond is worth much more than 25 percent.

I wonder if I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The gentleman has. I was going to ask a second question, which the gentleman has almost answered. If the good experience continues, would the gentleman agree with me that it would be reasonable to expect the insurance companies to continue to lower the premium?

Mr. GRIFFIN. It would be reasonable to expect that, yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I call the gentleman's attention to a letter received by the committee on May 25, 1965, from the Surety Association of America, signed by Mr. J. F. Fitzgerald.

Mr. GRIFFIN. When the gentleman refers to the "committee," I wish he would keep in mind the fact that I am a member of the committee, also, and I have not received any such letter, though I do not deny that the gentleman has received one.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure Mr. Fitzgerald would be happy to send a similar letter.

Mr. GRIFFIN. No doubt the gentleman is going to report that the 25 percent surcharge is still in effect. I am aware of that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Shall I report it, then?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] reported it earlier.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In reply to the gentleman who asked the question earlier, then, as of May 25, 1965, 6 years after the bill was passed, they are still charging the local unions 25 percent more for services they do not know they provide.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is incorrect, because they reduced the rates several years ago from a 50-percent surcharge to a 25-percent surcharge.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. The gentleman is proving that the rates charged by the surety companies are not consonant with the experience, and this has convinced me more than ever that the bill is necessary. I believe he has proved a valid point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman feels that way, that is his privilege.

I should like to conclude this portion of the debate by reiterating this statement, which I will reiterate everytime I have an opportunity to do so: a vote for this bill is not a vote for any surety company or any corporation or management of any kind. A vote for this bill is a vote against the rank and file union members of America.

And do not give me the argument that we should pass this bill because we have only limited coverage under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. I was not in favor of limiting the bonds under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Many may regret the day, if scandals ever come to the front, concerning what has happened to some of the funds for which we do not have protection for the rank and file union members.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for the remaining time on this side.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I only rise because I have talked to some of the Members who have asked me what we were doing in this legislation. In order that my word be kept and that the Record be clear, let me say what we are doing or intending to do or attempting to do here.

Subsection (a) of H.R. 5883 would change the present requirement that

bonds furnished under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act be of a "faithful discharge of duty" type and would change that to require that they be of a type of bond which would provide protection against loss due to fraud or dishonesty. Other than fraud or dishonesty, how can any reasonable person demand that a bond cover more than that from an official? If you want to cover more than that, I would suggest you go into the field of banking where 531 banks in the last year had 2,000 individual cases of internal bank fraud.

In the entire picture of bonding we know that this particular feature was so unfair in the beginning that the rates charged by the American bonding companies was \$2.78 as compared to 17 cents per 1,000 prior to the passage of this act. It was only because of pressure that they established a figure of a 50-percent surcharge, and only because of the introduction of this legislation did they reduce it to a 25-percent surcharge.

The loss ratio is something we all ought to take into consideration here. In all of the labor unions covered in the United States the loss under this particular act covering even the faithful discharge of duties requirement, beyond the fraud and dishonesty, was \$2.25 on the average for all the local unions in the United States compared to \$725 per average loss for the banks in the United States.

None of us here are suggesting that you go further in demanding better protection for depositors, because you have better protection built in by the U.S. Government, which reduces the cost of the bonds for the banks. Otherwise the bonds would be prohibitive.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House, H.R. 5883, dealing with an amendment to the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, will eliminate what appears to be a gross inequity in the present law. It does not appear that the real intent of the original act is being carried out. Bonding costs appear to be out of proportion when compared to other areas where bonds are required. I, therefore, support this bill, and if any abuses arise in the future the Congress can act to make any changes that may be necessary.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in regard to this bill that after hearing the pros and cons in the last Congress and this one, I have decided to support H.R. 5883. I believe this language will adequately protect union members, and the faults of carelessness and ignorance should be a problem which union members can find remedy within their own organization. Fraud and dishonesty are really the evils for which legal recourse is necessary.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 5883. I am convinced that there is no reason to continue any distinction between the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act insofar as their bonding provisions, particularly in view of the great additional cost to the unions under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act provisions.

The words "faithful performance of duties" are vague and indefinite in character. The evidence is uncontradicted that the bonding companies will bond under those words only at a very high rate of premium. Moreover, and what to me is most important, this high premium rate fails to provide for any increase in protective coverage. Therefore I submit that this inequity should not be permitted to continue.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5883. I have read the report of the committee on this bill and I have carefully followed the views that all my distinguished colleagues have presented.

Nowhere, in my study of this legislation, did I find any evidence that the fraud or dishonesty bond provided under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act has, in any way failed to protect those funds nor have I seen any evidence that would support a conclusion that such a bond will not provide the same protection for union funds other than welfare and pension plan funds.

It is most significant to me that the total amounts of moneys included in welfare and pension plan funds far exceeds any of the accumulated union funds. Certainly, if the "fraud or dishonesty" bond provides adequate protection under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, how then can it be said that such will provide inadequate protection under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the experience of the last several years has indicated a clear and definite need to amend the bonding provisions of existing Federal labor law. As one who has long advocated this position, and the amendments included in this bill, I rise in its support.

These amendments in no way imply that there is no further need for bonding. They in no way diminish present coverage or requirements.

Rather, Mr. Chairman, these amendments we are considering today—amendments which would substitute a fraud or dishonesty bond for the presently required faithful discharge bond—correct certain deficiencies which have been pointed out by those charged with the administration of the law. Attorney General Katzenbach, Labor Secretary Wirtz, Solicitor of Labor Donahue, and former Labor Secretaries Mitchell and Goldberg have all testified, at one time or another, that these amendments are needed and that they are in order.

Very briefly, this bill would eliminate the discriminatory treatment presently imposed on labor unions in respect to the bonding of officers charged with the responsibility of handling union funds. By providing greater flexibility, it would make bonding provisions more realistic, more effective, and more workable.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments deserve our support and I urge that this bill be passed today.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5883

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by striking out "for the faithful discharge of his duties" and substituting therefor the following: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others", and by inserting before the period at the end of such subsection the following: "Provided, That when in the opinion of the Secretary a labor organization has made other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required by this section at comparable cost or less, he may exempt such labor organization from placing a bond through a surety company holding such grant of authority".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 205 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act is amended by striking out "and 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, and 211".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "or 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, or 211".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "or 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, or 211".

(d) Subsection (b) of section 207 of such Act is amended by striking out "or the second sentence of section 203(b)" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the second sentence of section 203(b), or section 211".

SEC. 3. Title II of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SURETY COMPANY REPORTS"

"SEC. 211. Each surety company which issues any bond required by this Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act shall file annually with the Secretary, with respect to each fiscal year during which any such bond was in force, a report, in such form and detail as he may prescribe by regulation, filed by the president and treasurer or corresponding principal officers of the surety company, describing its bond experience under each such Act, including information as to the premiums received, total claims paid, amounts recovered by way of subrogation, administrative and legal expenses and such related data and information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and to carry out the policy of the Act. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Secretary finds that any such specific information cannot be practicably ascertained or would be uninformative, the Secretary may modify or waive the requirement for such information."

Mr. ROOSEVELT (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 1, lines 7, 8, and 9, strike out all of line 7 following the word "loss," all of

line 8, and the word "others" in line 9, and insert "of any funds or property entrusted to his care".

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as we said before, in my opinion, the only reason for a bond is to insure against loss of funds. It is very hard to get a conviction for fraud and dishonesty, particularly where sympathy and a few other things enter into the picture. I have had some experience with municipal bonds, and I know whereof I speak. I think if we will simplify this to the nth degree and say we want to provide protection against the loss of any funds or property entrusted to his care, I think that gets the job done. We do not get into a lawsuit, we do not bring about a lot of scandal into the union. If the money is not there, the bonding company pays off.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Let us say that a man is entrusted with \$10,000 of union dues and he is bonded. Somebody takes the money.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was going to bring that up. Let us say this man collects the money. He is on his way home with the money. He is held up and the money is lost. The bond will cover that. If he takes the money home and it is stolen out of his safe, the bond covers that.

Mr. DENT. Not under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Oh, yes; it says against loss of any funds or property entrusted to his care. That covers the waterfront. If the money is burned up it is still covered by the bond. All I am trying to do is to protect the funds of the people who pay their good money into the union treasuries. And some of them pay for the reason that they are forced to belong to the union, and that is the only reason.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I can appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do, but I think perhaps the gentleman from Michigan would agree with me that the gentleman from Missouri is not right. The gentleman is really weakening the guarantees that we are trying to put into this bill.

Let me call your attention to what we say in the bill: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others."

We have already covered the part that the gentleman wants to cover by the language which we do not disturb. We say "who handles funds or other property thereof."

I congratulate the gentleman for his effort, but what I fear is that to limit this bond as the gentleman proposes only "to any funds or property entrusted to his care" would be wrong, because you could have a tremendous number of cases where this man would not be responsible.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Every member who handles money is bonded, is he not?

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have already covered that; "who handles funds or other property thereof." What you are doing now is limiting his responsibility and limiting it only to the "funds or property entrusted to his care."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. He has broader responsibilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All I am trying to do is to protect the funds. I do not care about the discharge of his other duties, if he does something else. I am looking after the money. That is the only thing I am looking after. The only way you are going to hold him on any bond is if you can prove that there is fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Or collusion or connivance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Or connivance. You have to prove that. All I am saying is that for prima facie evidence, if the money is not there, it should be replaced. That is why we have a bond. That is my only point. I think that is the simplest way to do it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You already have that in the bill now.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you already have it, you do not have to pass the bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have it in the bill—"who handles funds or other property."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What do you do in that case?

Mr. PUCINSKI. We bond them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The only way you can protect him is if he loses the money by acts of fraud or dishonesty or collusion or connivance—

Mr. PUCINSKI. Or conspiracy.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right. But the funds are not protected except in those instances. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me make very clear what this amendment would do. This amendment does not ask in any way for insurance. It asks for a flat guarantee across the board. If you want to write a flat guarantee then you had better set up a special deposit insurance type of organization and get the whole of the U.S. Government behind it. What the gentleman's amendment does is to say that no matter how it disappears, no matter if it is a loss because of bad judgment, no matter what the circumstances may be, if the money is not there any more, there is a guarantee that the money will be replaced. That is not insurance. And I do not even know of a compilation of insurance companies which could take on that kind of a risk. Certainly, the premium for that kind of protection would be just out of the question. I think it falls on its face just by looking at it and examining it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

It seems to me that when we had the Landrum-Griffin bill before us our purpose was to assure that there would not be pilferage of the money of labor organizations. This language "for the faithful discharge of his duties" seems to be so broad, I am wondering how they ever got a bond from a bonding company at any price. And to require not only bonding but insurance against robberies and loss and fire, I know of no area in which that is required in the banking laws or anywhere else of a particular bank officer.

Mr. Chairman, while I certainly do not wish to do anything to weaken the investigatory powers and the control over the handling of the funds of these organizations, it seems to me that this language "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others" is a fairly adequate coverage to require.

I know that there are many of us here who would not desire some person to come back 3 years after we had made some little investment and look over our shoulder and say, "Well, you were mighty careless." We very seldom exercise 20/20 prevision. Usually we have excellent hindsight.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that if this act as it is now written is unduly burdensome it can be corrected. The new language seems to have been subscribed to by each of the Secretaries of Labor we have had since Secretary Mitchell. We should amend the act in the spirit of fairplay.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and I think he has stated the case very clearly for everyone to understand.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that what we are trying to do is to save that extra 25-percent premium because of the vagueness, because we do not know what the coverage is, and we want to make it something that we do know about. We want to protect against fraud and dishonesty and we want to protect against conspiracy. That was the purpose in the beginning. That is all we are now proposing to do, and we want to do it in the interest of orderliness and bringing it in line with existing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of the proposed amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it might be a clever maneuver for those who oppose the pending bill to support the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], because if it were adopted, I am sure most, if not all, of the people who are for this bill as it came from the committee would then vote against it. However, in all honesty I must oppose the gentleman's amendment even though I know he offers it with the best of intentions and the utmost good faith. I would

have to agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] in saying that if the bond were written as the gentleman from Missouri has suggested, we have no idea what the premium would be. I can assure you that it would be a lot more than the premium now charged for a faithful-discharge-of-duty bond. The proposed amendment would provide an absolute guarantee against any loss for any reason, and that could be very expensive.

It is well to keep in mind that in the insurance industry, the surety industry, there are certain words and terms of art that have established meaning in the industry insofar as the courts are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, "the faithful discharge of duties" is an established term of art which has meaning in the industry. Bonds using these words have been written for many years for local public officials and for the officers of fraternal organizations. The rates for a faithful-discharge-of-duties bond are established; we know what such a bond costs. And, clearly, it would provide union members considerably more protection than they would have under the bill reported by the committee, covering only simple acts of fraud and dishonesty.

I was rather surprised to hear the remarks of my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] who spoke earlier, and who is such a good lawyer. Surely, he could not have been on the floor earlier when I talked about some of the coverage provided by faithful-discharge-of-duty bonds that would not be provided in the situation of a simple dishonesty bond.

For example, the Federal court has held that union funds cannot be properly used to pay certain legal defense costs of high officials of the Teamsters Union in connection with civil or criminal actions brought against them. The court has found this is not a proper use of funds.

A New York Times story dated May 12, 1964, says:

Some sources have given estimates ranging from several thousand dollars up to a million dollars.

If this bill is passed there may be a legal right on the part of union members to recover funds used for such purposes, but will the union members be able to collect? If the bond covers such a loss, they can go to the bonding company and the bonding company will pay off.

What if fraud is interwoven and you end up with a judgment against them under another section, but action has not been taken, and apparently under this bill the union members would not be able to collect.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WHITENER. I may say to the gentleman as far as the particular case he mentioned is concerned—and he mentioned what he read in the newspaper—I also read in the newspaper that there

is litigation pending which was brought by members of the organization to recoup those funds for the union. The gentleman, I think, in his statement is missing the entire point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is pointing to the fact that the union members have a suit pending. I believe that in some cases the courts have held they are entitled to recover. But, who are they going to recover from? That is what I would like to ask the gentleman, if we pass this bill.

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will read the language proposed, and I am not an advocate of the Committee on Education and Labor, or any other interested group, the amendment clearly says that if there is connivance with others, and if there is connivance the recovery will be from those who received the funds. It seems to me that the bonding companies are writing a blanket coverage so broad that even their most astute counsel could not possibly anticipate what they have obligated the sureties to do under existing law.

I realize the gentleman has pride of authorship in the legislation being amended, and I commend him for the fine work he has done on that matter. At the same time, I think the record shows that we do have a situation which needs correcting, and this bill will correct it by eliminating an inequitable condition which results from the failure of the existing act to define the bonding requirements. The proposed amendment will do that and no more.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to answer a few of the things that have been mentioned.

First of all, the gentleman from Missouri said that in order to collect under this proposed law there would have to be a conviction for fraud or dishonesty, and the jury might not convict. The fact is you do not need a criminal conviction. The law books are replete with cases where there have been no civil actions, although bonding or insurance companies are required to make good.

It is as a result of a civil action that you get recovery against the bonding company or insurance company. We even have arson cases where after a defendant is acquitted of arson, there is a civil case for arson and the insurance company is stuck. So that I think you are mistaken when you feel there has to be a criminal conviction before there can be recovery against the bonding company.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can you tell me of any insurance company that would pay off unless you could prove fraud or dishonesty?

Mr. JOELSON. Of course, you might have to sue them civilly but you do not have to get a criminal conviction.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But you have to go into court to prove the fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. JOELSON. You have to go into court even under your amendment if the insurance company wants to contest it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Under my amendment you would only have to prove the loss and you would not have to prove any fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. JOELSON. With regard to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] about union officials using union funds for their own personal expenses, I think this too would be covered under the pending change in the law because that would amount to fraud and dishonesty. If a union official uses union money to build himself a home or to pay his own bills, that is fraud and dishonesty and would be covered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Would the gentleman agree that it is covered now under the faithful discharge of duty bond?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; and it will continue to be covered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. You are speculating and hoping that it will be covered after we amend the bill.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not speculating at all. As a fairly competent attorney, I am sure that what you referred to is taken care of. The law books are replete with cases and instances like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. UDALL, 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. 5883) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, pursuant to House Resolution 393, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Thirty Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and noes were refused.

The question was taken.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 20a(12) OF THE INTERSTATE ACT RE INTERLOCKING DIRECTORATES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5241) to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

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 consideration of the bill H.R. 5241, with Mr. NEDZI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act having to do with interlocking directorates in the railroad industry.

This bill is one merely to clarify the present law to make it unnecessary for any company, under such circumstances, to have to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission to obtain approval, when a member of the board of directors may be serving on the board of one railroad and at the same time serving on the board of another, when both are under one common control and management. That is all the provision would do.

Under the present law it is necessary, when a person serves on the board of railroad A and at the same time serves on the board of railroad B, as an example, when both railroads are under a common control and under single management, as a matter of law, to go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and obtain authority or permission.

As an example, the experience has been, for about 4 years, if we can go back, that there were some 851 interlocking directorship applications. Experience has proved that as a matter of course they are approved, but this requires processing and requires the time of the Commission and its personnel. In order to save time and money involved in processing the applications, when they are

uniformly granted, the bill would merely amend the law to eliminate this requirement.

There is no opposition to this proposal. As a matter of fact, it is recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is one of their proposals that has been recommended in a series of bills by the Commission. The committee held hearings. They were brief, but we did develop it there and we found that it is a desirable proposal. We feel it is a good procedure. So the committee, after consideration of the proposal, unanimously reported the bill.

There is a second proviso in the bill that has some differences of opinion on it. That would be the proviso which would require a director serving on one board of directors of a railroad and a member of the same organization or firm—for example, a law firm—serving on another railroad where there is not the common control and management, it would require him to go to the Commission and obtain the authority to serve under this circumstance.

Being perfectly candid about it, some of the railroad industry do not like this. They think it is an unnecessary requirement. They would prefer not to have to do it, and they asked that it not be required. The committee considered this second proviso in the bill. An amendment was offered by one of the members to delete that provision, but the committee, by a rather substantial vote, refused to adopt the amendment. The committee felt, after hearing the Interstate Commerce Commission and the other information which was presented to it, that this proviso should be required. Consequently, we have adopted the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in this respect and bring it to the attention of the House. There is not a lot of opposition to it but it is just that some of the railroads would rather not and would prefer not to do it. Actually, most of them, as I understand it, would be willing to accept the second proviso, although they are not in wholehearted accord with it, in order to get relief from the first proviso contained in the bill. That is, simply, the understanding I have of the proposal.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Does the gentleman know what the definition of "control" is?

Mr. HARRIS. Do you mean as far as the Interstate Commerce Commission is concerned?

Mr. FARBSTEN. Yes. Or the general definition of "control"? What I have particular reference to here is this: I am not trying to be difficult but just trying to have this situation clarified. Suppose that there were a pending merger and apparently this merger were completed and there was apparent control but nevertheless there was objection to this control such as in the case of the

control of the New York Central Railroad at the time of the desired merger with the Pennsylvania Railroad. Suppose the question of the completion of the merger is still up in the air in the sense that although there may be apparent control, nevertheless there may still be a lawsuit as to whether or not there is sufficient ownership to amount to control. Do I make myself clear, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HARRIS. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind, but this certainly could not in any way affect that kind of a situation. There could be no common control in a situation like that until the merger had been completed and became effective.

Now, we can give you another type of example which would explain what we are talking about. As an example, let us take in my own part of the country the Missouri Pacific. The Missouri Pacific has for many years had the majority control, that is, most of the control, of the Texas Pacific. It is all under one management and it has been for all these years. The Texas Pacific is one of these roads which was chartered by the Federal Government, if I recall it correctly. The combined roads have been for many years under one ownership and under the control of the same group of directors. This is the kind of a situation we have in mind. The Texas Pacific does have a board of directors. It always maintained it over the years. It has consisted of some of the same people who were members of the board of directors of the Missouri Pacific. But each time, each year, they have to go to the ICC and get permission to do it. Generally it is automatic, but you have to process the papers, it requires a lot of man-hours and a good deal of expense and it is all unnecessary. That is the kind of situation we have in mind.

But where there is a merger of two companies, the situation is different. We can take as an example of what the gentleman perhaps has in mind, the case a few years ago when the C. & O. purchased controlling stock in the Baltimore & Ohio. That was before the ICC for a number of years. After that merger was permitted under the regulations of the ICC and with ICC approval, then everything was regular and in order.

This does not in any way affect any merger nor interfere in any way with a pending merger.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a very simple proposal. We obtained the rule primarily on the basis that there was this difference of opinion in railroad thinking on the question of two members of one organization or firm or association serving two different railroads that were completely separate and apart from each other. The committee thought that the Commission ought to pass on that kind of case, and therefore we bring the bill to you with a unanimous report of the committee and recommend it for your approval.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there was some disagreement in the committee over how far this bill should go. However, as it finally came from the committee this bill would amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to, first, eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control; and, second, to make it clear that the prohibition against the holding by "any person" of the position of officer or director of more than one carrier, without prior approval of the Commission, applies to the holding of such positions by different members, officers, employees, or directors of the same firm, copartnership, corporation, association, or joint stock association, or to the representation of a person on the board of directors of more than one carrier through an agent or nominee.

The committee felt that there was a justification for this. The first sentence of the section that I have read requires persons desiring to serve as officer, director of more than one carrier to file an application and obtain approval from the Commission. This is true, even though the carriers involved are affiliated members of the same system of carriers. Where railroads are under lawful common control, they form essentially a single system. In this circumstance, the holding of intrasystem interlocking officer positions and directorships is a natural aid to coordination of operations, and the Commission has long approved such applications as a matter of course. And in this instance the Interstate Commerce Commission has requested and approved the course which the committee has taken on this bill. Nevertheless, the filing and processing of formal applications for such authority entail considerable time and expense both for the applicant and the Commission which could be saved without adversely affecting the public interest. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to give the members of the committee some idea as to how large this is, a total of 851 interlocking directorship applications were filed during the period covered by the Commission's annual reports from the 74th through the 77th of such reports to Congress, July 1960 through July 1963. Since only about 2 percent of these applications involve positions in unaffiliated carriers, the time and money consumed in filing and processing approximately 98 percent of these applications could have been saved if the section were revised as recommended. Moreover, a considerable reduction in recordkeeping expenses would have been realized.

Mr. Chairman, this is the testimony of the Interstate Commerce Commission which is by law looking after the public interest and they have indicated that this bill is in the public interest. That is the

reason the committee has brought this bill to the floor of the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a great number of our colleagues have expressed some concern, rather deep feelings, and other people whom I have noted here and throughout the country and through the press, over the debauchery in the boxing profession as a result of what happened the other evening. There have been a good many who have approved and have requested that this matter receive attention.

Mr. Chairman, I have thought a great deal about it. I am one of those who believes that there should be some way of restoring integrity to this great national pastime in which our people have throughout the years expressed some interest and in the days when there were such eventful occasions which occurred, and there was so much interest in this national type of entertainment and which stood so high in the minds of our people. It is a very popular sport. I have decided that there is a way to do it.

About 15 years ago we had another problem affecting interstate commerce and communications; so, by direction of the committee there was developed an approach to it. Going back and recalling that experience I have asked the staff to provide what I believe is an approach to it, and I am today introducing a bill which proposes to establish and describe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false and fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests.

This proposal is very simple. It is not lengthy. It would provide, first, for a Federal Commission on Boxing, the members of which to be appointed by the President of the United States. It would add a staff under civil service laws that would help it to carry out its functions. It would arm the Commission with powers to make recommendations to carry out the purposes of the act. For the purposes of investigation the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act would be applicable. In order that the Commission may carry out its duties, it would provide for the Commission to exercise continuing surveillance over the field of professional boxing; but it would then give the Commission the authority and the power to determine that in such circumstances it may investigate and find that if anything questionable is about to occur, as apparently must have been when the Massachusetts commission learned there was something apparently wrong and

cancelled the professional bout causing them to move into another State. In such a case, and in the event there might be effected collusion or bribery, and so forth, and there would result national racketeering or even terrorism, extortion, threat, coercion, intimidation, and so forth, the Commission could prevent the event being carried by television or radio or wire services in interstate commerce.

I believe this would provide the vehicle by which, if we were faced again with a situation that has been presented to this country in the last few days, we would have a regulatory agent or body set up with legal authority to act. Therefore, I am dropping this in the hopper today and I announce to the Members of the House that if it is referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it is my purpose to schedule hearings at a very early date and go into this matter thoroughly to determine, No. 1, if this is the right approach and, No. 2, if there is a better way to do it, or there might be some modification of this proposal.

I may say that early in the session our colleague from Illinois, the ranking Republican member of the committee, was interested in this subject, and he approached me about going into it and making some study of it. The gentleman was visionary, he evidently had some intuition or something, and I probably should have acceded to his request or suggestion, but did not do so.

But this will give us an opportunity to do something about it and I, for one, intend to see what can be done about it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has mentioned that I had a conversation with him some 2 months ago. At that time I gave my considered opinion that a great part of professional boxing was a national disgrace and I told him so in his office. I believed it then and I believe it more this afternoon.

I believe that our committee has jurisdiction in the area of sports. This is interstate commerce. That fact has already been adjudicated on a number of occasions by the Parliamentarians of both bodies.

The great Committee on the Judiciary has taken jurisdiction at times where the question of monopoly was involved and that is a very, very limited part of the whole field of sports.

In the conversation I had with the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in his office some 2 months ago, I referred not only to boxing but I referred to several other problems of sports generally that I felt this committee ought to go into before something developed that would be harmful generally to the whole area of sports.

I would like to talk in these few minutes about only two of these. I know of no subject on the sports pages of the last year that has been given more space than the discussion that has been given to the question of baseball franchises and the moving from one city to another of a baseball club. This is just one part of it. We are now on the verge of watching one great team move from one city on Lake Michigan to a city in the South. All of this may be perfectly all right. But I believe it would be helpful for us to go into this question of baseball franchises. Has the time come when this country is big enough and affluent enough and powerful enough and economically sufficient so that every city of any consequence in the country can have a major league baseball franchise?

This is another and a second question to be considered.

May I say I do not have any preconceived notions about this. I just believe it is important. What is happening on this question of franchises now? They are trying to form, as I understand it, a third league if this can be done.

There is a third problem, I think, in the field of baseball that is all important. Historically, and probably for the good of baseball, it has been owned by people. It has been owned by persons who were personally responsible for the activities and the economics of baseball in the particular community. Now what has happened in the last year? Well, we have had one of the great baseball teams of this country passing out of the ownership of individuals into a corporation. One large corporation, CBS, owns this team. I repeat: I have no preconceived notion about this but I think we ought to know: Is this for the good of baseball? Is this what baseball ought to do and to be? Should a baseball team be owned by a private corporation whose primary business is something else other than baseball?

Just yesterday I read in the newspapers, in an adjoining city only 40 miles away, the controlling interest in the Baltimore baseball team has passed over to a beer company; 27 percent of the stock, as I understand it, has passed into the hands of this company.

I have nothing against the beer companies. I only ask: Is this for the good of baseball, to have a beer company own a baseball franchise?

I am not familiar with the situation in St. Louis. Perhaps Mr. August Busch owns the franchise entirely separate from his beer company. That is a different problem, if he does. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the facts to know whether Anheuser Busch owns the St. Louis Cardinals. If they do, is this good for baseball? Is this the direction in which baseball should be going?

One team is owned by a television company, which undoubtedly is going to get an exclusive right to the television programming of that particular team. Is it right that a beer company should own a team, or perhaps a second beer company should own a franchise in one of the big

leagues, in order that it may have advertising outlets on TV and radio for that particular city? Is this for the good of baseball? That is the question, in my opinion.

Let me go on to football for a moment, if I may. There are two leagues. As I understand it, they are trying to form a third league, the Continental League.

We come back to the problem of whether every big city in the country should have a major league football franchise. Perhaps they all should.

It seems to me, if our committee has jurisdiction over these particular problems, at least once in awhile we ought to have a hearing to look into them, to see what is good for boxing, baseball, and football. If that is our job, we ought to be doing something about finding out the direction in which boxing, baseball, and football are going.

This is something about which I feel strongly. As I said to the chairman in his office some 2 months ago, I feel this is something we ought to do before something happens—like what happened at Lewiston, Maine, the other night.

I am happy the chairman has introduced a bill, so that our committee can at least consider the field of boxing and can go into these problems to determine what is in the best interests of these sports.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5241

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 20a(12)), is amended to read as follows: "After December 31, 1965, it shall be unlawful for any person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier subject to this part, except carriers which are lawfully operated under common control or management, or for any director, officer, or partner of any firm, corporation, or partnership to hold the position of officer or director of any such carrier when any other director, officer, or partner of such firm, corporation, or partnership holds the position of officer or director of another such carrier except where the carriers are lawfully operated under common control or management, unless such holdings have been authorized by order of the Commission, upon due showing, in form and manner prescribed by the Commission, that neither public nor private interests will be adversely affected thereby."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on January 1, 1966.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no authority from my chairman for what I am about to say.

I have listened with delight and with a real thrill to the discussion of boxing, baseball, and other sports by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and the distinguished and learned ranking minority member, the gentleman from my own State of Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

In respect to all these sports, that which they seek to determine is not a local or a national but a world's championship. Hence if we are to have an investigation, it would seem to me that is in the field of foreign affairs.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the very wise statement the gentleman has made, and certainly the spirit in which he has made it.

This event, if we can call it an event, which was perpetrated on the American people went far beyond the bounds of this country. It was a rather amazing thing that the wonderful and fine media we have in this country, which we have made available for our people, were taken advantage of by closed circuit television on a commercial basis—commercial meaning \$5 and \$7 tickets for everyone—for the people of the United States.

But they went far beyond that—and I am sure this is what the gentleman had in mind—they went far beyond that and used the facilities of this wonderful instrument which is called the Early Bird, the communications satellite, and beamed from there the program all over the world in order to make it free to all the people in all the other countries of the world whereas our people in this Nation had to pay \$5 to \$7 to see it on closed circuit television. I think the gentleman has a pretty good idea with his suggestion.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do congratulate the gentleman and his committee. I can assure him of the full cooperation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As a people we Americans are proud of our reputation as good sportsmen, and certainly this week's fiasco has hurt our image.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to congratulate the senior member of our delegation from Illinois, whom we all love very dearly, for this great idea. I wonder if we can carry it just a step further. With regard to this fiasco which occurred the other night, I do not know whether the country can stand another crack at it, but perhaps these two men ought to meet in some gymnasium, with no money charged for it. They owe it to the boxing fans to put on a legitimate fight and see what happens. Perhaps then we might beam it to the world again but without charge. I think we ought to have this in some gymnasium which would only be open to television and radio and with not a penny charged to anybody. They certainly owe that much, if they want to save the boxing profession. In the event they do not do that, I think the gentleman's suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It might be that we should return to the era of the bare-knuckle gladiators. They did not

use boxing gloves in the glorious days of Figg, the first of the champions, but fought with bare knuckles and occasionally with clubs. Maybe we ought return to that. If my good friend and colleague from Illinois would permit me slightly to amend his splendid idea we might have the principals in this week's fiasco attempt to square themselves with the American sporting public by fighting as did the early gladiators with bare fists and cudgels, all of course, free of any charge of admission.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, the only thing I wonder about in this regard is whether the country and the world would ever want to see these two men in a ring together again.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman with his usual sense of penetration has something there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NEZBI, 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. 5241) to amend section 20a(12) of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate the necessity for prior approval of the Commission for a person to hold the position of officer or director of more than one carrier when such carriers are in a single integrated system of carriers lawfully operated under common control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 5883, which was passed by the House today.

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

There was no objection.

BARTER PROJECT BETWEEN AEC AND SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an announcement by the Department of Agriculture and a news article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon I received notice from the Department of Agriculture that the Department was withdrawing the barter project which involved a uranium contract between the AEC and the South African Government, surplus commodities under Public Law 480 and barter of industrial diamonds from the Congo. Several Members of Congress, including myself, and members of the press had previously raised some question about this proposed barter. As a part of the response to my inquiries, I received a letter from the Department of Agriculture marked "Administratively Confidential." One of the facets of this proposed barter that I could not understand, and still cannot understand, is why the names of the firms involved in this proposed barter should be classified as "Administratively Confidential." I am pleased that the Department of Justice has intervened and that a revision of procedures will be initiated. I hope that one of the revised procedures will be the furnishing of information to Members of Congress and to the general public. Under unanimous consent, I include the announcement from the Department of Agriculture on May 6, 1965, as a part of the Record; and also include a news article by Marshall McNeil under date of May 9, 1965:

USDA WITHDRAWS BARTER PROJECT, INITIATES PROCEDURES REVIEW
(Announcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, May 26, 1965)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that, as a result of objections on the part of the Department of Justice, it was withdrawing the barter project set forth in announcement No. 122 of April 12, 1965, and initiating review of procedures to be followed in this type of barter in the future.

Such a review is necessary, USDA said, because the features to which the Department of Justice objects are similar to those that have been found practicable in other barter projects involving strategic materials for stockpiles that are obtainable from very limited foreign sources and frequently under legalized foreign monopoly control. The Department of Justice objections were primarily based on its concern that USDA barter acquisition procedures have undesirable exclusionary features that preclude full and free competition. The Department of Justice had not reviewed earlier projects of this nature.

The proposed barter project would have converted an existing Atomic Energy Commission contract for the cash purchase of uranium from the South African Atomic Energy Board to an arrangement whereby surplus agricultural commodities instead of dollars would have been used in order to pay for the remainder of the contract. To provide incentive for the contractors to convert the balance of the uranium contract the arrangement provided for the barter of industrial diamonds, originating in the Republic of the Congo, for surplus agricultural commodities. Since both the uranium and the diamonds are controlled by monopolies, and since the barter contractors had to be ones that would be acceptable to those foreign entities that had control of these materials,

the USDA was limited in the extent to which it could provide for bidding on a truly competitive basis. USDA's requirement that contracts should be made with at least six companies was not considered adequate by the Department of Justice.

A review of the barter procedures is therefore necessary, particularly relating to provisions for competition among U.S. firms, since many of the materials for which surplus agricultural commodities might be exchanged, like diamonds and uranium, are also obtainable only from limited or monopolistic foreign sources. Competitive bidding is therefore often impractical, and, while competitive bidding is not required by law under the barter program, USDA said it would seem to be one way to meet the view of the Department of Justice. No other method has been suggested.

Secretary Orville L. Freeman plans to name a review group to consider present and past barter procedures with particular reference to methods of obtaining the maximum possible degree of competition while still carrying out the mandate of Congress and the objectives of the program. The review group will make a comprehensive study in this area, obtaining views of private firms, Members of Congress, other interested U.S. agencies such as State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, General Services Administration, Office of Emergency Planning, Treasury, and Justice, and Government officials responsible for the operation of the program. Pending the completion of this review no new barter arrangements involving strategic materials for stockpiles will be initiated. This will not affect barter arrangements to meet the overseas needs of the Department of Defense and the Agency for International Development.

The authority for barter in general lies in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act as amended, and in a number of other statutory authorities and budget programs. The Congress, with the passage of Public Law 480 and subsequent amendments, clarified and provided impetus and direction for the Secretary to barter or exchange surplus agricultural commodities to the maximum extent practicable for strategic materials for stockpiling and for materials, goods, and equipment to meet requirements of Government agencies.

[From the Fort Worth Press, May 9, 1965]
FORT WORTH REQUEST UPS BARTER DEADLINE
(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department has extended for a second time its deadline for accepting offers to barter surplus farm products for both uranium and diamonds.

The barter is proposed for two reasons: So the United States can acquire from the Republic of South Africa, under an old contract but without expenditure of dollars abroad, uranium valued at about \$55 million; and

So the Congo can dispose of more of its industrial diamonds, thus helping its economy.

Extension of the deadline is the result, at least, in part, of a request from Representative JIM WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas, in behalf of Fort Worth and other Texas businessmen who hold a Congo concession in the name of Congo-Texas Co. Reportedly there are diamonds on the concession.

WRIGHT contends that the proposed barter in its original form—not yet changed—gives a monopoly on supplying the diamonds for the barter to a Belgian concern. He feels it does our Government no good to abet what he regards as a monopoly, and doesn't help the Congo, either.

The delay would appear to open the way for Congo-Texas to make an offer of its own in the uranium-diamond barter deal. But WRIGHT said he did not know for sure if such a proposal would be made.

He favors the barter basically because it would conserve American dollars.

Among others in the Congo-Texas Co., WRIGHT said, are Amon Carter, Jr., Fort Worth publisher and businessman, and Bedford Wynne, another wealthy and prominent Texan.

In its simplest form, the deal could work this way:

The Government would allocate a quantity of surplus farm products to a barter dealer who would undertake to sell them abroad in places where normal U.S. markets would not be disturbed. He would use the money he received to pay South Africa for the \$55 million worth of uranium, making the payment in South African currency. The uranium then would be shipped to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Having made this deal, the dealer would be eligible to get another quantity of surplus farm products, also for sale abroad, and with the money he received from this sale he would purchase diamonds from the Congo, and turn \$27.5 million worth over to the U.S. supplemental stockpile.

Prospects are that several dealers, maybe as many as six, finally would be in on the barter. The deal could involve several countries.

The original contract proposed by Commodity Credit Corporation requires that the dealer proposing to take part in the barter must—

Secure authorization from the South African Atomic Energy Board that he is approved by it to participate in the conversion of the uranium contract into the barter deal; and

Get an authorization from MIBA (Societe Miniere de Bakwanga), a diamond and bort-producing company in the Congo, saying it will supply diamonds and bort originating in and legally exported from the Congo.

Thus, apparently, only MIBA diamonds, or those approved by it, could figure in the deal.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. DULSKI. 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. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful and thank the chairman of the subcommittee for restoring the \$100 million to the food stamp program. The county of Erie shares in this program and has been most helpful in aiding people who are in dire need of assistance at this present time.

I am glad that the amendment was adopted.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include testimony concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act before the General Labor Subcommittee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 the Secretary of Labor appeared before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. He presented excellent testimony in support of the proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In view of the widespread interest in this legislation, I am including the full text of Secretary Wirtz' remarks for the benefit of my colleagues and others who may wish to read this testimony in full:

STATEMENT OF W. WILLARD WIRTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1965, MAY 25, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the business before the subcommittee this morning is the consideration of H.R. 8259, introduced by Mr. POWELL, H.R. 8260, introduced by Mr. ROOSEVELT, and H.R. 8261, introduced by Mr. DENT. These identical bills extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to some 4,600,000 additional workers, and change the overtime hours provision of that act in an important respect.

I appear in support of these bills, to develop in further detail President Johnson's recommendation of them to the Congress.

It is appropriate to take a moment to put today's hearing in its broader context.

Thirty-two years ago this spring, Mr. Chairman, your father, engaged in organizing his Cabinet, called upon Miss Frances Perkins to serve as his Secretary of Labor. By her report of that conversation, she demurred at first with the statement, as she later recalled it, that "If I accept the position of Secretary of Labor I shall want to do a very great deal." And then she listed her proposals:

"Immediate Federal aid to the States for direct unemployment relief, an extensive program of public works, a study and an approach to the establishment by Federal law of minimum wages, maximum hours, true unemployment and old-age insurance, abolition of child labor, and the creation of a Federal employment service."

Miss Perkins' account is that President-elect Roosevelt only smiled assuringly, told her that her plans were his own, and proceeded with the conversation on the basis that she had accepted his appointment. If she hadn't, she did.

I retell this story this morning partly as a little, inadequate payment of our respects to Miss Perkins, fourth Secretary of Labor, whose death came 10 days ago, in New York.

But it is even more that H.R. 8259, 8260, and 8261 represent a carrying on of the plans that were laid in that conversation 33 years ago.

It took 5 years for those plans to develop into the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. That was landmark legislation. It marked the winning of one of the great battles of war on poverty I.

But that was only one battle and that war was only partly won. The introduction of these bills marks another battle now in war on poverty II. For the Fair Labor Standards Act, as it now stands, leaves too many people out of this Nation's fabulous prosperity.

This hearing comes in the 51st month of the longest, uninterrupted record of peacetime economic growth in our history. Almost every economic record is being broken every month. Never have so many done so well or had so much.

These are the makings of satisfaction, of contentment and complacency. Yet what is manifest, instead, is a still stronger forward thrust—not just toward what is better by

the measure of previous achievement but what is good by the higher standards of our full potential. The new prosperity for most of us is only making us more critical of ourselves because others are left out.

The pressures behind the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 were the pressures of economic desperation. The force behind its enlargement now is the force of hard-headed idealism. In the thirties it was a matter of getting up off our backs; in the sixties it is a matter of standing straighter and taller.

I put this testimony in these broader terms purposefully. The original Fair Labor Standards Act was bold legislation. But the process of its occasional amendment, to keep it up to date with the times, has been timid and tardy. The changes proposed now mark a return to the earlier tradition of boldness. Any small approach to them will result inevitably in renewed small-gage attempts to assert special interests against the public good. Only a full appreciation of the larger obligations prosperity creates to eliminate poverty will support the full thrust of this legislation.

In urging wage protection for the disadvantaged, President Johnson pointed out in his recent economic report that—

"Even in prosperous times, some receive wages below our standards. And the poverty of one-fifth of our families traps too many of our children in lives without opportunity or aspiration."

So we face squarely the facts and dimensions of the job that remains, the inequities and the anomalies of poverty amid plenty:

That unprecedented prosperity leaves, in this country, 30 to 35 million people living below even a spare and spartan standard of economic sufficiency;

That for many of these people the problem is not unemployment, but employment with inadequate pay; so that of the 15 million children in "poverty" families, a full third—over 5 million—are in families headed by a man or woman who works the year around;

That in a typical week, 4 million people who are looking for work are unemployed, while almost 8 million others work a total of 62½ million hours overtime.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was a commitment to improve living standards by eliminating substandard working conditions in employment subject to Federal authority over interstate commerce. That commitment, incomplete when it was made, has become less complete with the passage of time. The law has not been kept in line with the advancing economy; and some of its guarantees mean less, comparatively, than they did 27 years ago.

The remainder of my testimony will be confined to the specific terms of these bills, for the subject matter is familiar to the committee and my views are already a matter of record before it.

EXTENDED COVERAGE

The present wage and hour law (the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended) covers only 29½ million of the 60 million wage and salary workers in the United States. A large number of these 60 million are outside the possible coverage of the act. But of the total number of 47 million workers who could be brought within the coverage of the wage and hour guarantees, 17½ million are not in fact covered. (See table 1.)

There is good reason for the noncoverage of some of the groups of workers who have not been brought within the Fair Labor Standards Act protection. Some are in occupations where virtually all rates are already higher than any practicable guarantees. Others are employed in enterprises too small to make coverage practicable.

There is every reason, however, for extension of the present coverage to large groups of workers whose earnings today are disproportionately low.

There is a significant correlation between poverty earnings and exclusion from the protective provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Among family heads employed in industries generally covered by the act, only 5 to 10 percent had annual incomes under \$3,000 in 1963. The proportion was 8 to 14 percent in industries where there is partial Fair Labor Standards Act coverage. But in industries where there is little or no coverage—the proportions jumped to 33 and 49 percent respectively.

Changing times and needs create opportunities for greater advances toward the ultimate of full wage and hour protection, within the reach of the commerce powers of Congress.

These three companion bills incorporate the proposal of the administration to extend the wage and hour coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to approximately 4,600,000 individuals.

The bill applies particularly to workers employed primarily in retail trade, laundries, hotels, restaurants, hospitals, taxicab companies, construction, and farm processing and logging operations.

The bill provides this additional coverage by—

Broadening the enterprise basis of coverage in section 3(s) of the act to include all enterprises (i) engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and (ii) having annual sales of at least \$250,000; and

Repealing or restricting minimum wage and overtime exemptions in section 13(a).

The proposal will also—

Clarify and consolidate present exemptions for handling and processing farm commodities;

Apply the overtime pay standards of the act to employees of transit companies and gasoline service stations;

Remove inequities in the computation of overtime pay for salaried workers; and

Extend the act to employees in the Eniwetok and Kwajalein Atolls and Johnston Island.

Recommendations for amending the Fair Labor Standards Act have always been made with a double awareness—the degree of need and the feasibility of satisfying this need. There is no question that a large segment of the workers whom this bill would bring under the Fair Labor Standards Act need and would benefit from its protection.

The wages of workers not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act generally do not rise with increases in the cost of living, and as a result they suffer a continuing decline in real earnings. These workers who are denied the modest benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act comprise a chronically depressed class.

Thirty-one percent of the workers who would be extended minimum wage protection by the bill now receive less than \$1.25 an hour. Their plight is evident when one considers that even at this wage, if a worker were employed steadily—40 hours a week for an entire year—his annual income would amount to only \$2,500. Although poverty has been defined in many ways, a family income of less than \$3,000 is generally regarded as falling below the line marking the poverty level. While the assurance of a wage of \$1.25 an hour to workers now receiving less than that amount would still fall short of this dividing line, it would provide some measure of improvement in the unhealthful and dispiriting conditions to which they are now subjected by their intolerably low wages.

In extending the act's protection to the categories of workers dealt with in this bill, a selective approach is followed so that those needing it the most will be benefited.

For example, laundry workers have long been among the lowest paid in the country. Earnings data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that the spread between wages in laundries and wages in low-wage manufacturing industries steadily widened between 1947 and 1960. A comparison of wages in laundries and in the fertilizer industry (which is a low-wage industry but is covered by the act) illustrates this fact. Average hourly earnings in the fertilizer industry were 15 cents higher than those in the laundry industry in 1947. By 1960, the spread between the two industries had increased to 63 cents. Today, 41 percent of the laundry workers who would be covered by this bill receive less than \$1.25 an hour.

Similarly, average hourly earnings in the fertilizer industry were 28 cents higher in 1947 than the average hourly wage in year-round hotels. By 1960, this differential had increased to 63 cents. It is estimated that 36 percent of the hotel and motel workers who would be extended the act's protection under this bill now receive less than \$1.25 an hour in cash wages plus tips.

The estimated number of other categories of workers who will be extended the act's protection, now receiving less than \$1.25 an hour, is as follows:

	Percent
Retail trade (secs. 3(s) and 13(a)(2))	30
Agricultural processing within the area of production (sec. 13(a)(10))	64
Local transit (sec. 3(s))	10
Cotton ginning (sec. 13(a)(18))	67
Taxicabs (sec. 13(a)(12))	25
Small logging (sec. 13(a)(15))	6
Motion picture theaters (secs. 3(s) and 13(a)(2))	60
Construction (sec. 3(s))	6
Restaurants (secs. 3(s) and 13(a)(2))	29
All other industries (sec. 3(s))	28

The proposed clarification and consolidation of provisions in the act relating to the handling and processing of farm products is long past due. The exemptions covering these agricultural operations have proved over the years to be complex, overlapping, and difficult to apply. In enacting the 1961 Fair Labor Standards Act amendments, Congress directed the Secretary of Labor to "study the complicated system of exemptions now available for the handling and processing of agricultural products under the act and particularly sections 7(b), 7(c), and 13(a)(10)." The Department made a detailed study of these exemptions, and the amendments in the attached bill reflect the information compiled in this study.

The provision extending the geographical application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the Eniwetok and Kwajalein Atolls and Johnston Island accords the same protection to employees in these trust territories as is accorded to employees in other areas under our jurisdiction, such as the Canal Zone. The bill does provide, however, with respect to these newly covered territories, that the Secretary may issue rules and regulations allowing reasonable variations and tolerances from the act's requirements if, after hearing, he finds that economic conditions warrant such action.

As has been indicated, about one-third the 4½ million workers who would be brought under the act are now earning less than \$1.25 an hour in cash wages. The proportions, however, range from 10 percent or less in construction, small logging, and local transit, to 50 percent or more in hotels, restaurants, motion picture theaters, and in agricultural processing activities.

In several of the activities in which the proportions are 50 percent or more, employees

receive tips. The Fair Labor Standards Act does permit now, and will continue to allow, the counting of tips toward the minimum wage if such tips are accounted for by the employee to the employer. If a rough estimate is made of the value of tips in restaurants, the proportion of employees who would be required to receive wage increases would be 29 percent rather than 53 percent. The proportion in hotels would drop from 50 percent to 36 percent (table 2).

Studies conducted by the Wage and Hour Division on the effects of the 1961 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act indicate that the economy adjusted easily to the required increases in the minimum wage. Even in the lowest wage nonmetropolitan areas the increase in wages for workers at the low end of the wage scale was accompanied by a net increase in employment. Also, studies to measure the effects of extending the minimum wage to a group of workers not previously covered indicate that the amendments succeeded in raising the wages of workers earning less than the minimum wage, and that employment in these newly covered segments did in fact go up.

There is ample evidence that the benefits which have accrued to low-wage workers as a result of the act and its changes have far outweighed the spotty adverse effects on employment in individual establishments and individual localities. The present minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour is still less than half the average hourly earnings in manufacturing, mining, and construction—the industries in which all or many workers have been covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act since 1938.

The ease with which the economy can adjust to a change in the minimum wage law depends on general business activity at the time of the change. There could be no better time than the present period of unprecedented business prosperity to broaden the base of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This is a vital part of our war on poverty. Our concern is not alone for the jobless; the working poor live in poverty too. For far too many Americans, the conditions deplored by the 75th Congress when it enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act still remain a grim reality.

Many families living in poverty today do not need the services of welfare workers. They do not need public assistance. They do not need charity. They are quite capable of running their own affairs. What they need is a living wage for the head of the family. One of the reasons they are not getting it is that a great many of these workers are employed in industries that have not yet been covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The revision in section 7(e) of the act relating to the computation of overtime for employees (except where their work necessitates irregular hours) eliminates an inequitable situation in which the rate on which overtime pay is computed decreases as the number of hours worked in a work-week increases. Thus, the longer an employee works, the less are his earnings per hour.

The lengthening of the statute of limitations to 3 years will allow workers more time to familiarize themselves with their legal right to back wages and thus improve enforcement of the act. The short statute of limitations gives competitive advantage to violators and penalizes many workers in the collection of wages legally due. The Federal criminal statute runs for 5 years and many other statutes run for 3 years or more. The existing 2-year period under the Fair Labor Standards Act is also shorter than that allowed creditors of employees to collect money owed food and rent bills.

OVERTIME STANDARD

These bills will require the payment of double time for work in excess of 48 hours a week, with this figure being reduced 1 hour each year for 3 years so that it will eventually mean double time after 45 hours a week. This double-time requirement will apply only to employees who are now covered by the act's overtime provisions.

The purpose of this change is not to increase individual earnings. It is to reduce unemployment. This was the original purpose of the time-and-a-half provision. But that provision is no longer an effective deterrent to excessively long hours of work. In many instances overtime work at time and a half is less costly to an employer than the hiring of additional workers. The growth of supplementary benefit costs continues to reduce the effectiveness of the time-and-one-half provision, as the premium rate for overtime is generally computed on cash wages, not on cash wages plus fringe benefit costs.

In 1963, an average of 2.8 hours of overtime were worked per week for each production worker in manufacturing industries. In 1964, the average was 3.1 hours. In each month of 1965, the average number of overtime hours worked in manufacturing has been higher than the corresponding month in 1964. In the first quarter of 1965 the seasonally adjusted average number of overtime hours was 3.7 hours a week as compared with 3 hours in 1964.

Two nationwide surveys conducted in 1964 indicate not only the extent to which overtime was worked but also the number of overtime hours actually worked by employees working overtime. The surveys covered manufacturing industries and wholesale trade.¹

These studies along with data from secondary sources on other industries, indicate that 62½ million overtime hours—hours over 40 in a week—are being worked each week by almost 8 million employees subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Approximately 16.8 million of the hours are hours over 48 in a week. (See table 3.)

Flexibility is maintained in the present bill by continuing the time and one-half requirement for at least 5 hours of overtime. In addition, the bill permits regulations to be issued which would in effect waive the double-time requirement in periods of extraordinary emergency or where other compelling needs exist.

A double-time penalty will reduce overtime work and will create jobs for the unemployed. The 62½ million overtime hours worked per week in March 1964 are the equivalent of more than 1½ million full-time jobs. The 16.8 million hours over 48 in a week are the equivalent of some 400,000 full-time jobs. A double-time provision will not create that many jobs. But it will have a significant effect in terms of increased employment.

Much of the work over 48 hours per week is done on a recurring basis.

¹ These reports relate to a single week in March 1964, but are reasonably reliable as an indicator of overtime hours worked throughout the year in manufacturing industries—the only group for which such data are regularly available. In every year for which these data are available, the variation between the average overtime hours in March and the average for the entire year was 0.4 of an hour or less. In most years, the variation was 0.1 or 0.2 of an hour. In fact, for the 9 years for which these data are now available, the average for March is 2.4 overtime hours per employee in manufacturing and the 9-year average of the annual figures is 2.6 hours.

Many of the long hours are worked by workers at the lower end of the wage scale in jobs which the unemployed could fill with little or no training.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was a major social achievement in 1938. But its stated objective was to eliminate substandard conditions "as rapidly as possible." The

proposed changes are necessary to restore the original pace.

I urge early and favorable consideration of this proposal.

TABLE 1.—Estimated number of nonsupervisory employees covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, and under State minimum wage laws or orders, by industry, 1964¹

[In thousands]

Industry	Total number of employees	Number of employees covered by Fair Labor Standards Act	Number of employees not covered or exempt from Fair Labor Standards Act	Number of employees covered by State laws only	Number of employees not covered by Fair Labor Standards Act or State laws
Total.....	47,260	29,593	17,667	4,937	12,730
Agriculture and fisheries.....	1,882	554	1,882	56	1,826
Mining.....	3,029	2,413	5	1	4
Contract construction.....	15,851	15,207	616	168	443
Manufacturing.....	3,664	3,474	644	106	538
Transportation, communications, utilities.....	3,015	2,092	190	34	156
Wholesale trade.....	7,988	2,593	923	105	818
Retail trade.....	2,515	1,869	5,395	2,256	3,139
Finance, insurance, real estate.....	6,253	1,891	646	94	552
Services (excluding domestic service).....	2,504		4,862	2,117	2,745
Domestic service ²			2,504	(?)	2,504

¹ Estimates represent employment in September 1964 except for retail trade, which relates to June 1964. Estimates are for the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Estimates for employees covered only under State minimum wage laws or orders reflect only such laws or orders enacted or revised from 1955 and through Jan. 1, 1965. All employees are included except executive, administrative, and professional employees and government workers.

² Coverage of domestic workers is provided by very few State laws, and the language of these laws is such that virtually all domestic workers are excluded from the coverage provisions.

Source: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Office of Research and Legislative Analysis.

TABLE 2.—Estimated number of nonsupervisory employees who would be brought under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act by H.R. 8259 and the estimated number paid less than \$1.25 an hour

Industry	Employees added to minimum wage coverage by the proposed extension				
	Total number	Number paid less than \$1.25			
		Based on cash wages		With an allowance for tips	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All industries.....	Thousands 4,561	Thousands 1,572	34	Thousands 1,406	31
Retail trade.....	1,500	456	30	456	30
Food service.....	100	72	72	72	72
Auto and farm equipment dealers.....	600	96	16	96	16
All other retail trade.....	800	288	36	288	36
Hotels.....	275	138	50	99	36
Restaurants.....	425	225	53	123	29
Laundries.....	175	72	41	72	41
Hospitals and nursing homes.....	890	303	34	303	34
Motion-picture theaters.....	75	45	60	45	60
Local transit.....	10	1	10	1	10
Construction.....	250	15	6	15	6
All other industries (3(s)).....	650	201	31	181	28
Agricultural processing within area of production.....	90	58	64	58	64
Cotton ginning.....	34	23	67	23	67
Small logging.....	87	5	6	5	6
Taxis.....	100	30	30	25	25

NOTE.—Retail, retail service, and laundry establishments with less than \$250,000 in annual receipts would remain exempt.

Source: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Office of Research and Legislative Analysis.

TABLE 3.—Estimated number of weekly over-time hours and estimated number of over-time hours over 48 a week worked in covered industries by major industry group, March 1964

[In millions of hours]

Industry group	Number of over-time hours	
	Total number	Number over 48 in a week
Total.....	62.6	16.8
Industries covered prior to 1961.....	59.4	16.0
Manufacturing.....	42.4	12.7
Wholesale trade.....	5.6	1.3
All other.....	11.4	2.0
Industries covered since 1961.....	3.2	.8
Retail trade.....	3.0	.8
All other.....	.2	

Source: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Office of Research and Legislative Analysis.

GEN. THOMAS HOLCOMB

Mr. CORMAN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House share a deep sense of loss with the passing last Monday of Gen. Thomas Holcomb, 17th Commandant of the Marine Corps.

During his more than 44 years of active service, he saw foreign duty in China, the Philippines, Cuba, and France.

As a battalion commander in France during World War I, he fought at Chateau-Thierry, Soissons, St. Mihiel, and the Meuse Argonne. He was awarded the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal with three oak leaf clusters, a Meritorious Service Citation, the Purple Heart, the French Cross of the Legion

of Honor, and three decorations of the Croix de Guerre with Palm.

From June 1932 until January 1935, prior to his appointment to brigadier general, he served in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. He then served as Commandant of Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va., until November 1936, when he was ordered to Headquarters Marine Corps.

In December 1936, General Holcomb assumed the office of Major General Commandant. With his advancement to lieutenant general on January 20, 1942, by an act of Congress, he became the highest ranking officer in the history of the Marine Corps.

When Lieutenant General Holcomb reached normal retirement age in August 1943, the President announced he was continuing General Holcomb as Commandant of the Marine Corps in recognition of his outstanding service. Many of us here remember him as our

first Commandant when we joined the corps.

With his retirement on January 1, 1944, General Holcomb was advanced to the rank of general, thus becoming the first marine ever to hold four-star rank.

During his 7 years as Commandant, General Holcomb saw the corps expand from 16,000 men to 300,000 men and women. He is considered one of the Marine Corps' great commandants.

In March 1944 General Holcomb was appointed U.S. Minister to the Union of South Africa, a position he held until June 1948. Following his resignation, he managed the family farm at Rose Croft, St. Mary's City, Md., until 1956, when he moved to Chevy Chase, Md. Following a serious illness in the spring of 1964, he returned to his native New Castle.

History has assigned a unique duty and purpose to our country—the preservation and extension of human dignity both at home and abroad. In the performance of that mission the United States has expended thousands of precious lives, often in remote and lonely corners of the earth. No one was more deeply aware of the burdens and responsibilities of that mission than was General Holcomb. His integrity, courage, and humaneness epitomized those values for which we committed the full measure of our national devotion. We shall miss him. Yet, we can be comforted by the knowledge that his leadership has assured that future generations can be free and his personal example will be an eternal standard to which they can aspire.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF PROFESSIONAL BOXING

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, I have today introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of all aspects of professional boxing by the House Judiciary Committee.

I believe that a full review is necessary to "save boxing from itself." The square circle has now become a stage, and boxing fights face the ignominious role of becoming exhibitions rather than contests.

I suggest that the former heavyweight champs, Jack Dempsey, Gene Tunney, Joe Louis, Rocky Marciano, publishers of ring and boxing magazines, some of the promoters and managers who have protested the operation of bigtime boxing, veteran boxing writers and some State boxing officials be brought before the committee.

I am reluctant to impose Federal controls on boxing. But it is apparent that boxing cannot, or is unwilling to exert the effort, to police itself. Let us face it—this is a big industry, and it has just perpetrated what many believe is one of

the biggest frauds on the sport fan in history.

The public should be protected against unethical promotions that bill themselves as major, upstanding sports events. There is a mixed-up situation in the heavyweight ranks, with different organizations claiming to have the only bona fide world champion. We have one champ who is recognized west of the Catskills, and one who reigns on television.

I surely do not believe any thought should be given to a Patterson-Clay fight until boxing has had a thorough investigation by the Congress; and if legal action is necessary, possibly an injunction would be in order.

My resolution gives the House Judiciary Committee full power to conduct a wide-ranging probe of boxing and come up with suggested legislative remedies.

NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSION

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing and to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner.

I do not claim to be the author of the bill. It is patterned after similar bills that have been introduced in the past.

But I do know that boxing, once a national sport, has now become a national disgrace. It is time that the U.S. Government step into this situation to put a stop to what I consider to be a fraud perpetrated on the American people.

The bill calls for the appointment of a Boxing Commissioner. Frankly, I think one of two men with very little assistance and without establishing a large bureaucracy could bring order out of chaos in the boxing world. I am sure that either Jack Dempsey or Gene Tunney would be willing to serve as Boxing Commissioner, at least long enough to restore this sport to the prestige it once enjoyed. I am confident that the American people will not pay to see any more closed circuit television boxing matches, the likes of which we have watched recently. I am also confident that the art of self-defense with the use of one's hands has now reached a new low in the minds of the people because of the manner in which these so-called championship matches have been fought—if one can use the expression "fought."

I hope the appropriate committees of the Congress will take action on this matter before this once great manly sport becomes extinct.

I am introducing this bill which ordinarily would go to the Judiciary Committee, I assume. But I am going to draft one that will go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If these two bodies do not act—although

I am sure they will—I am going to file a discharge petition.

The American people are asking one thing: What are you fellows in Congress going to do to protect us against such as that which happened the other night? This bill will be a good vehicle. We do not need any investigation; we need action. This bill will give us the opportunity to get that action.

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

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. There was one winner in connection with that fight, and that was the State of Massachusetts that refused to allow them to hold it there.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. To their eternal credit. They knew what was going to happen and they put a stop to it. It is to the eternal credit of the State whence comes our distinguished Speaker, than whom no greater Speaker ever occupied that chair.

RAY HENLE AND "THREE-STAR EXTRA" DESERVE PRAISE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the last day of broadcasting for NBC's "Three-Star Extra," the "newspaper of the air."

Ray Henle, editor in chief of this distinguished news program, will continue his service to the public on various consulting assignments, and spend some time each year in Naples, Fla., as a constituent of mine. We in Florida look forward to Ray and his lovely wife Marion becoming Floridians.

The Congress and leaders in other branches of Government, along with his many listeners throughout America, will certainly miss this superb program of news coverage.

"Three-Star Extra" enjoys the reputation of having the longest continuous sponsorship in radio history. Organized by Ray Henle, it has been on the air for 18 years. Unique in format, its reporting staff has contributed to "Three-Star Extra" broadcasts exclusively, and thus has the show established an enviable record.

Ray Henle and "Three-Star Extra" have contributed greatly to the American press and the public. Among the many awards which the program has received are the Du Pont Award and five Freedoms Foundation's George Washington Medals of Honor.

I am sure other Members of Congress and Government officials will join me in wishing Ray Henle and the staff of "Three-Star Extra" every good wish for continued success.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the gentleman from Florida in paying tribute to Ray Henle and "Three-Star Extra" which is leaving NBC's broadcasting network. This has been one of the outstanding news programs in the United States. As I say, I join the gentleman in paying tribute to this outstanding program and the fine staff that has run this program for so many years.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Wisconsin in paying tribute to Ray Henle. Through his long, long years of service on "Three-Star Extra" he has epitomized integrity and straightforward factual reporting. For all his career Ray Henle has been in the forefront for the best traditions in his profession. It seems to me all of us owe a debt of gratitude to him and to his fine staff who have done so well for so long. I am sure we will miss him. We certainly wish him the best in his new endeavors.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Florida in his commendatory remarks about Ray Henle, Ned Brooks, and others who have made this program such an outstanding success.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for taking this time to pay tribute to Ray Henle and desire wholeheartedly to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the majority leader.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the gentleman in what he has said about one of the great newspapermen and one of the great radio broadcasters of our time. It so happens that Ray Henle and his wife Marion and my wife Blanche and I have been very, very close personal friends for many, many years. I have gloried in his accomplishments.

Sorry as we are that he is leaving the broadcasting field, I wish for him every happiness and continued success in the future.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida and the remarks of my other colleagues who have paid tribute to Ray Henle and to "Three-Star Extra."

Mr. Speaker, everyone has mentioned the staff of "Three-Star Extra," but I want to express special appreciation to my good friend Bill Cardin who has contributed substantially and materially to the great success of "Three-Star Extra" and Ray Henle, and wish Ray and the entire staff well.

Mr. ARENDS. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in all my years of service in the Congress I have not had a finer, truer friend than Ray Henle. Time and again, in countless ways, he has been of assistance to me. On many occasions I have turned to him for advice, and he never hesitated to express his opinion, whether it was in accord with mine or not. And he never betrayed a confidence.

Ray has spent his life in newspaper work and in radio broadcasting. He is one of those individuals who is blessed with a natural facility for getting at the facts and a unique ability to evaluate them objectively. This accounts for his successful career as a writer and a broadcaster.

When Ray told me that he planned to retire at the end of this month and terminate his "Three-Star Extra" program, he said that he felt the time had come when he should relieve himself of the tension of meeting deadlines and be able to work more leisurely. We shall miss his broadcasts, but I am glad he has decided upon the less hectic pace he has led for so many years and begin to enjoy the many things life has to offer him. And I believe that working in a less demanding area Ray himself will contribute even more to the dissemination of knowledge and formulation of public opinion.

I join untold numbers in wishing Ray the very best in whatever he undertakes. I shall always cherish his friendship.

HORTON AMENDMENT TO TARIFF ACT OF 1930 AFFECTING BUTTON BLANKS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to limit but-

ton blanks to crude forms suitable for manufacture into buttons. I have asked unanimous consent to have the bill inserted in full at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of my bill is the closing of a loophole in the tariff schedules of the United States—TSUS—by which buttons of acrylic or polyester resin, fully finished except for the holes, avoid the duty on finished or unfinished buttons under tariff schedule item 745.32 and are admitted at the far lower rate of duty for button blanks under tariff schedule item 745.40.

The process of making buttons starts with the use of blanks. Imported blanks are subject to an average equivalent ad valorem duty of 36 percent. These blanks are then processed into buttons by being faced, polished, drilled, classified by thickness and inspected for imperfections. Such finished buttons, when imported are subject to an average equivalent ad valorem duty of 140 percent. However, since 1962 there has been a phenomenal increase in imports of buttons, completely finished except for the holes. As such they are admitted under the lower rate of 36 percent as blanks. The Tariff Commission has stigmatized this practice "a rate avoidance device," which is creating undue competitive hardship on domestic manufacturers. Imports of buttons without holes increased from 50,000 gross in 1962 to 1,800,000 gross in 1963 and to 4,320,000 gross in 1964. Importers of such finished blanks simply drill holes in them and thereby gain a competitive price advantage which domestic makers of such buttons cannot meet. The cost advantage is as follows: a U.S. producer processing U.S.-made blanks can make 1 gross of totally finished buttons for 20.25 cents. By using an imported blank the cost sinks to 18.41 cents. However, by using an imported and finished blank and merely drilling holes in them, the cost drops to 13.88 cents. In this latter instance the cost advantage amounts to 31.4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is intended to preserve our button manufacturing industry, which constitutes a significant sector of the economy of the 36th District of New York, which I am privileged to represent in Congress. In the early 1940's we had 125 button and button blank manufacturers in the United States. Today, we have 50. In 1964, nine companies went out of business in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. Employment has dropped from 10,500 to 5,500. Unless this tariff relief is granted by classifying these finished blanks as buttons, subject to the 140 ad valorem rate, our domestic button industry and its employment will disappear, leaving only hole drilling operations.

I appreciate this opportunity to emphasize my interest in ridding our tariff schedules of this avoidance device and to urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the hardship this legislation seeks to overcome. By supporting this interpretation, Congress will clearly show its intent that the new statute should have the effect of making

buttons without holes dutiable as buttons at the 140 percent rate and not as blanks at the 36 percent rate.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8623

A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That headnote 2 of subpart A of part 7 of schedule 7 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States, 28 F.R., part II, page 379, August 17, 1963) is amended to read as follows:

"2. For the purposes of this subpart—

"(a) the term 'line' in the rates of duty columns (items 745.20, 745.22, and 745.32) means the line button measure of one-fortieth of one inch.

"(b) the term 'button blanks' (item 745.40) is limited to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

RUSK DEFENDS UNITED STATES ON STEPS IN OAS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and me, read into the RECORD a statement on the "Dominican Crisis and the Inter-American System."

That statement included our view that "the failure to inform the OAS of U.S. intervention before it was underway was an insensitive oversight." We suggested that while OAS agreement before the landing of U.S. forces would not have been practical in view of the shortness of time, the Organization could at least have been told that the landing was going to be undertaken. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I had personally given the full text of our statement to top State Department officials 24 hours before delivery on the floor.

This morning's New York Times carries a story by John Finney about yesterday's press conference by Secretary Rusk. Finney reports that Rusk said that the administration had begun to call OAS ambassadors to inform them of U.S. intervention immediately after the decision was made. But, Finney reports, when the official transcript of the press conference was released the words "OAS ambassadors" had been changed to read "Latin American ambassadors," many of whom do not represent their governments before the OAS.

The article goes on to describe how the Secretary had claimed that the United States had called meetings of the Inter-American Peace Committee on April 27 and the OAS Council on April 28 to discuss the Dominican situation. While both of these meetings did occur before the landing of U.S. forces, we do not believe that the United States gave any indication at either session that it was about to land troops. Furthermore, as Finney writes, despite what Secretary Rusk has said, neither meeting was called by the United States.

I can only wonder whether the administration's efforts to deny any breach of responsible diplomatic practice in the failure to notify the OAS of U.S. intervention before the fact may not compound the error.

Mr. Finney's story is reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

RUSK DEFENDS UNITED STATES ON STEPS IN ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—HIS REPORT OF CRISIS ACTION IS AT VARIANCE WITH MINUTES

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in the face of diplomatic and political criticism, defended the administration today against charges that it had bypassed the Organization of American States in the Dominican crisis.

In making his defense, the Secretary cited a chronology of U.S. dealings with the OAS that was at variance with the official record of the inter-American organization. He also took the unusual step of amending the transcript of his news conference to correct an overstatement about the degree of U.S. cooperation with the Organization.

The administration has come under considerable diplomatic criticism for sending Marines into the Dominican Republic on the evening of April 28 without having consulted or informed the OAS. Domestic political criticism was added today to the diplomatic complaints.

Five Republican Congressmen led by Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, charged in a statement that the administration had severely jeopardized the future of collective security in the Western Hemisphere by its actions in the Dominican crisis.

One of the specific Republican complaints was that the administration, in an "insensitive oversight," had failed to inform the Organization of American States of the U.S. military intervention before it was underway.

WASHINGTON'S REBUTTAL

The administration has maintained that the situation in the Dominican Republic was deteriorating too quickly to permit consultation with the Organization. This point was made today by Mr. Rusk, who said it was "one of those situations where events themselves made it necessary that some action be taken before the formal machinery could be convoked and could act upon it on a multilateral basis."

But starting with the President's statement of April 28 announcing the dispatch of the troops, the administration has also sought to give the impression that OAS members were kept fully informed.

Today, for example, Mr. Rusk said that immediately after the White House decision in the evening of April 28 to intervene, the State Department began calling "OAS ambassadors" to inform them of the action.

In the transcript finally issued by the State Department, this was amended to "Latin American Ambassadors," after it was

called to the Department's attention that many of the representatives in the Inter-American Organization had complained privately they had not been informed of the administration's action.

While seemingly minor, the distinction between Latin American Ambassadors and Organization of American States representatives has assumed troublesome proportions to the administration. Many of the Latin American countries are represented in the Inter-American Organization by someone other than their Ambassador to the United States. The administration's failure to notify the OAS representatives, apparently through lack of coordination and oversight, explains much of the criticism of the U.S. actions within the Organization.

EFFORTS TO INVOLVE OAS

Asked why the United States had not consulted or informed the Inter-American Organization before sending in troops, Mr. Rusk gave a lengthy reply. On April 27, he noted, "we did call together the Peace Committee of the OAS, for a discussion of the situation in the Dominican Republic." The following day, he said, the United States asked for a meeting of the Organization's Council "for a further discussion."

Later that day, after the Marine landings, the United States asked for an emergency meeting of the Council, which was held April 29. In retrospect, Mr. Rusk said, "it might have looked better" if the United States had insisted upon a meeting the evening of April 28—a point also made privately by many of the Organization's diplomats.

Mr. Rusk's account of the sequence of events was at some variance with official minutes of the Organization of American States. These minutes show that the initiative to involve the Organization in the Dominican situation, both before and after the marine landings, did not come primarily from the United States.

According to the minutes, for example, the April 27 meeting of the Inter-American Peace Committee was called at the request of the Chairman, Alfredo Vazquez Carrizosa, of Colombia, and was limited largely to a report by the Dominican representative. State Department officials said, however, that the United States had privately urged the Chairman to call the meeting and that some supplementary information had been supplied by the American representatives.

Contrary to the suggestion of Mr. Rusk, the April 28 meeting of the Organization's Council was not called at the request of the United States to discuss the Dominican situation. The meeting had already been scheduled to discuss routine OAS matters, and the discussion of the Dominican situation was limited to a further report by the Dominican representative.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 28, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Armenian people from Soviet and Turkish domination. On May 28, 1918, the Armenians united their forces in an attempt to maintain a free Armenia. However, they were prevented from achieving this goal by the fortunes of

war, the indifference of World War I allied powers, and their statesmen.

The nationwide commemoration of the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenian people 50 years ago was also the subject of House debate recently.

It is important to note the vigorous support which Americans of Armenian extraction have been giving to the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. They have recognized the practical contribution which such a committee would make to exposing Soviet colonialism over Armenia and the neighboring countries under Soviet domination.

I join in saluting the brave Armenian people on this anniversary of their independence and encourage them to maintain their faith and hope in the legitimate restoration of independence and freedom to Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, Armenian-Americans have made tremendous contributions to our national political, economic, educational, and artistic successes. As loyal Americans they have maintained a very proper and steadfast interest in the restoration of freedom to the brave Armenian people still held in bondage. On this anniversary of Armenian independence, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of Armenia and all other peoples who are still deprived of the right of self-determination.

DESPITE COMPUTERS BOMBERS PROVE WORTH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, time and again over the past several years our Committee on Armed Services has taken exception to Defense Secretary McNamara's overemphasis of missiles in lieu of manned bombers. We have repeatedly pointed out that to have a balanced national defense, capable of dealing effectively with any emergency—a little war, a big war, a brush war, a guerrilla war—whenever and wherever it may arise, it is essential that we have bombers in our arsenal and replacement bombers in production.

Such a program we do not have. This is not the fault of some of our professional military leaders, such as retired Air Force Chief of Staff LeMay, who have called attention to this need and deficiency in our defense planning. Nor is it entirely the fault of the Congress. Secretary McNamara has refused to follow the advice of the military professionals and abide by the wishes of the Congress.

What has been taking place in South Vietnam points up the importance of and need for bombers. In this connection I call attention to the following editorial entitled "Despite Computers, Bombers

Prove Worth" which appeared in the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., last Monday, May 24:

DESPITE COMPUTERS, BOMBERS PROVE WORTH

An unfortunate and tragic accident in South Vietnam resulted in the loss of American lives and the destruction of 40 U.S. aircraft including 10 B-57 bombers.

Ordinarily the loss of 10 aircraft from the defense arsenal would be a cause for concern, but not a cause for alarm. This is under ordinary circumstances when professional military men and Congress make the defense hardware decisions.

Today, when the computers veto Congress and the military professionals, the loss of 10 types of a particular aircraft is extremely serious.

Congress, following professional military advice, insists the manned bomber is a vital element in a balanced national defense force. It has backed its opinions with appropriations for development of new manned bombers.

The Defense Department refuses to provide the bombers.

The transistors and tubes of the electronic banks in the Defense Department insist instead that missiles are replacing the manned bomber. Their human spokesman is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who arbitrarily follows the robots' commands.

Isn't it strange that the computers always reflect the judgment of the Secretary of Defense?

Despite the computers' statistics, ground-to-ground missiles with the payload of a single bomber have not been used to date in the Vietnam conflict.

On the other hand, the bombers have been flying missions almost daily with proved results. At the time of their destruction the B-57's were being readied for service.

Military men know the value of manned bombers with intelligent humans at the controls to exercise judgment. As Lt. Gen. Ira C. Baker, an illustrious name in military aviation and a columnist for Copley News Service, said:

"The final irrevocable answer to bomber effectiveness came in the Pacific (during World War II), when Japan surrendered before any hostile soldier set foot on her soil."

The opinion is unanimous among the men who have studied the problem, including such professionals as Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, retired Air Force Chief of Staff; Gen. Thomas S. Power, retired Strategic Air Command Chief; Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

These are men of experience whose opinion should carry more weight in defense matters than all the computers in the Defense Department. They are aware that defense requirements are more than a consideration of money alone. Overall capability, human factors and the nature of the war also have a bearing.

The computers are not to be blamed. They do not make independent assessments, but collate the figures spoon-fed to them.

The blame for the serious national defense problem caused by the accidental loss of the 10 bombers in South Vietnam rests squarely on the Defense Department. It is urgent that Congress overrule the computers once and for all and assume its constitutional obligation to raise and support armies.

PRESIDENT NEEDS AND DESERVES SUPPORT OF ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Flor-

ida [Mr. FUQUA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, no nation in the history of the world has spent more of its resources in the quest for peace and no nation in the world has suffered indignities and humiliation with more compassion and understanding than has the United States.

We seek not world domination; we seek neither to conquer nor possess our neighbors nor any additional parcel of land on the face of the globe.

Today, in a sense, we are engaged in armed conflict on two sides of the earth: South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. This Nation that seeks world peace, this Nation that gives freely of its substance to raise the living standards of all human beings, this Nation that believes in the inherent rights of the individual man and individual nations, finds itself denounced because it dares to stand up for freedom and for peace.

This is not the world of 100 years ago; it is not even the world of a decade ago. Scientific advances so startling that they would have stunned the imagination only 25 years ago today are accepted matter of fact.

Remember, if you will, the period only 10 years ago when talk of placing a man on the moon and travel throughout the universe would have been considered almost lunacy. Today it is not a question of whether man will go to the moon, only when.

Advances in medicine, in technology, and all phases of science have brought the dawn of a day when we shall wipe out diseases and sickness that strike down millions. We have the technological know-how to solve the age-old problem of the world, how to feed people. Scientific application of agricultural principles and mechanization such as are practiced in the United States, would certainly lead to a day when hunger throughout the length and breadth of the globe would be banished.

Yet in spite of these advances, we see man on the brink of another war. Today the decisions are not quite so easy to make. The nuclear power of the nations of the world can literally wipe out all human existence.

It is this type of world in which Lyndon B. Johnson must lead. When we consider the record of service which he has made in the cause of world peace, it is heartrending to see a segment of the population denounce so unreasonably the course of action he has embarked upon in carrying out the commitments we have to world peace; for, my colleagues, this is the only course of action open to us, if we are ever to see a world at peace.

We seek not to dominate South Vietnam nor to subjugate its people. We seek not to impose colonialism upon the Dominican Republic. But, we do seek self-determination for the peoples of the world, and sometimes it becomes necessary for a nation that seeks only peace to use arms to attain that goal.

It was President Theodore Roosevelt who espoused a policy of walking softly

but carrying a big stick. It is my considered judgment that Lyndon B. Johnson's philosophy is that of seeking every honorable means for a just and lasting peace but with a willingness to fight to protect freedom and the cause of peace when no other course is open.

As I told the people in my district on my television report last week, I support without reservation the decisions of the President in his actions to preserve world peace.

In making these statements, I am not unmindful of the toll of human life, of the sacrifice made by the more than 400 brave American young men who have given that last full measure of devotion in South Vietnam. I know full well that these sacrifices are understood better by no one than they are by President Johnson.

Each loss of life for a man who has dedicated so much of his life seeking world peace, economic progress, and freedom is a heavy burden to bear.

Sometimes there are those who must die in order that others might live. From Valley Forge to the Argonne, from Iwo Jima to Saigon, the thousands of crosses marking the graves of American servicemen bear mute testimony that others were willing to give their lives that we might live in peace and freedom.

And as much as it hurts, this is the world in which we live in the sixties.

The situation may well worsen before it gets better. I expect that it will.

The plague of communism seeks to infiltrate into every area of the world. Subversion, deceit, lies, barbaric disregard for human life and dignity are the calling card of these men who hold human life so cheaply. Their leaders seek not peace, but power. They follow a godless doctrine that has as its announced purpose, economic progress for all, but actually masks a power-mad drive to enslave in dictatorship all of mankind.

We have sought to negotiate with these power-mad despots, only to find that their solemn word was no more than a lie. In Communist Cuba today they have a continual and effective program of training subversives who seek to infiltrate all of South America, to turn that poverty-stricken area of the world into another Communist satellite.

The unstable situation in the Dominican Republic gave rise to a revolution, which had as its announced purpose free elections and democracy. In short order the trained masters of deceit, Communist agents, gained control of the fighting, and it appeared as if they would be successful in overthrowing yet another land.

Many have been saying since the Communists were allowed to take over Cuba, that the Monroe Doctrine was dead after 141 years. The determined and forceful action of Lyndon B. Johnson revived our belief in this doctrine pronounced so ably many years ago and served notice of our new and determined attitude.

For the President then to be roundly denounced and criticized by certain elements of our society is a strange paradox indeed.

The President is criticized bitterly, even by certain Members of the Congress, for the armed intervention of the United States. They cannot point, however, to a single foot of territory in another country in this hemisphere which we have annexed. How can they ignore the violence, murder, pillage, and loss of freedom which has followed every Communist takeover?

Did they not learn anything from Hungary?

The people of the United States have made many, many sacrifices and even fought a major war a half century ago to liberate Cuba from oppression by a European power. Wherever we have occupied a country to protect American lives and/or to save the people of that land from ever greater danger, the end result has always been that we have withdrawn when peaceful conditions have been achieved.

But has this been the case in Hungary? No. The hopeless fight for freedom by the Hungarian people was ruthlessly crushed. Russian tanks and troops battled freedom-loving Hungarians, who fought with bottles and bricks to have the right to self-determination, and who were crushed into submission by the Russians for their effort.

Their blood serves as a living example of the true intent of the Communist conspiracy. From this we should have learned a lesson.

President Johnson had a difficult decision to make. He knew that the Dominican Republic concerned not just that tiny island nation, but the future of all nations in the Caribbean.

Turning to the other side of the globe, the American effort in South Vietnam has been stepped up. While many of our allies, who should know the folly of appeasement, sit idly by, critical and insulting, we fight on to honor our pledges.

We have negotiated in good faith in every opportunity we have been given. The President has stated time and again, with particular emphasis on Vietnam, that he would go anywhere at anytime to discuss peace without preconditions if there were any sign of good faith on the part of the Communists. He has drawn nothing but abuse from the Reds for his offer to negotiate and for a billion dollar contribution to a peaceful development of southeast Asia. And to my sorrow, he has also drawn unjust abuse from many in this land, including national leaders, for his stand.

College students stage a huge march on Washington. The White House is picketed. The President is vilified not only by our sworn and deadly enemies, but by many of his own people, who should know better.

Have we learned nothing from history? As George Santayana once wrote:

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

To appease aggression is to pour gasoline on a burning fire. Did we not see appeasement and the sacrifice of thousands upon thousands to the Nazis end in World War II? Did appeasement halt their aggression?

The answer is obvious—it only made them bolder, more sure of their course, and thousands of brave American young men lie buried over the four corners of the globe for that folly.

I have read that American attacks in South Vietnam may be carried even deeper in Communist territory if Red China throws more forces into the war.

I suggest this as our course of action, for the United States has determined to stand up to this aggression as never before. We have tried every other means.

I would point out that President Johnson has proven himself to be a man of the hour. He is determined that the commitments of the United States are not hollow promises. He knows full well if the Communists win in South Vietnam, then Communists will fight similar actions in Thailand, the Philippines, in the Congo, in Venezuela—step by step. Sooner or later such Communist tactics must be met by force.

We have warned and we have pleaded. We have negotiated in good faith. We have spent billions—not for subversion, but for economic progress and freedom for impoverished lands throughout the globe.

It is idiotic to consider the Vietnamese situation civil war. It is calculated aggression, directed by Hanoi and Peiping, to take over another nation by murder and ruin, and we have determined that here they shall stop; they shall go no further.

It is a fearful decision that the President has had to make. He has far more knowledge of the dangers we face in these hours than any of us.

He has made it known that we will honor our commitments, that we will use force if necessary to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime in this hemisphere.

The latter is the 20th century version of the Monroe Doctrine, much more difficult and dangerous to fulfill than was ever visualized in the original version.

In this Nation, a number of circumstances have brought an unrest to college campuses which are a tragedy in a sense. While doubtless Communist influence, plus the unreasoning bearded beatniks and excitement-happy minority have caused a great deal of comment in the press media, it does not take into account many thousands of youngsters who realize the problems of their day.

I suggest that we have always had a minority of this type. If this were the days immediately preceding World War II, they would be pleading that we leave Hitler alone while he raped England, for what we needed to do was to negotiate. In some instances we have called this "isolation." My own term would be "idiocy."

The pattern on the college campuses is approximately the same. A minority element on the faculty has stirred a minority element of the student body to oppose our determined policy. I have been informed that, as far as can be learned, a heavy majority of the students and faculty in every place are either behind the Government or unconcerned by the issue.

In these heavy decisions which the President has had to make, I very quickly voiced my support for his course. My own acts have been criticized by some of my own people who do not understand that appeasement would only bring more aggression.

Be that as it may, I want to make my own position crystal clear. I say that this Nation must not bow to aggression, that this Nation must honor its commitments, that the time has passed when we can huff and puff about our military might while our flag is trampled in the dirt, our embassies bombed, our people murdered.

We have gone an extra mile, the extra 2 miles. In fact, we have taken the 50-mile hike in the search for peace. The only course which honorable men can take is that which is being bravely and resolutely followed by President Johnson.

A search of the records proves time and again this is a man who loves peace, not as a political gimmick, but with a deep and abiding conviction and desire for peace for all mankind. Here is a man who would gladly have his name placed in a tiny corner of the history books as one who helped to bring about lasting peace, than to have chapters written about his having led a nation to victory in a great war.

President Johnson and I may disagree on some issues, just as he disagreed with other Presidents in his long and distinguished service in the Congress. But on the course of action he follows today in meeting aggression with the only thing the Communists understand, armed might, he has whatever support I can render him.

I seek not global conflict. I have two small children myself. I want my children to grow up in a world of peace. I do not want my son, John, to have to fight and die in some foreign land any more than the brave mothers and fathers who have given their sons in the present struggle.

In my lifetime I have seen friends and relatives march off to three conflicts, many never to return. My heart is heavy in their loss, and in the realization that others must follow.

But I know full well that the vast majority of the young men of America today will give that last full measure of devotion with the same spirit that this Nation has had since Valley Forge.

To the President, I would remind him that the greatest man of peace who ever lived, our Lord Jesus Christ, had to resort to force to throw the moneychangers out of the temple. And that he was betrayed by those who should have understood him best, and he was crucified.

No great man in history has been able to escape unreasoning and blind vilification and opposition. No matter how much we progress in so many areas, there seems that there will always be those who cannot or will not understand the lessons of history. When you appease the bully in high school, he only becomes more demanding and belligerent. When you appease the criminal, his acts of violence only become more pronounced. And when you appease naked

aggression, history teaches time and again without pause that you only encourage further aggression.

The Members of this Congress, regardless of party or region, need to support the President in this difficult hour. The decisions which he must make in this hour, and in this time, are as difficult as any that Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, or Kennedy ever had to face.

The man and the hour have met. On the shoulders of this one man rests the future of the world. His decisions not only affect the Nation he serves today, but the course of mankind.

I believe he has chosen the right path. This conflict was inevitable. It is far better that we make our stand today than that time in the future, and it might not have been far off, when it would have been in South America, not to mention all of the other parts of the globe where this would more than likely have come about.

I do not know how history will rank Lyndon B. Johnson. We are too close on the moment to know the full consequences of that which we do. But I believe that we have seen a turning point in history.

The Communists can appreciate force. The Communists will learn that this Nation means what it says; and I say categorically that we should never make a statement, never sign a treaty, never make a commitment, that we do not intend to honor.

I am not a warmonger. To the contrary, I want peace as devoutly as any man that has the privilege to serve in this Congress. But as one who wants peace, but not at any cost, the proper course for this Nation to follow is the one which Lyndon B. Johnson has charted. It is a dangerous course, the path will not be easy, and too many lives will be snuffed out in the bloom of youth in this struggle.

But to the line of names of Nathan Hale, Alvin York, and Colin P. Kelly will be added other Americans who knew the challenge which history placed before them, and they were willing to meet that challenge.

Mr. President, I support you in your determination that the world shall someday know peace. Your detractors in this regard could learn a lesson from history, but they have had able predecessors that history disdains.

History has a special contempt for those who seek to hide their heads in the sand when the great challenges of the time require courage and sacrifice. You are meeting this challenge; your actions have been forthright in carrying out the pledges which we have made.

History will not regard you lightly.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I believe I shall not object—will the gentleman from New York tell me if this involves a change in the schedule, as just announced by the majority leader, for next week?

Mr. SCHEUER. Absolutely not, to my knowledge. The delay was caused by me personally, because of my lateness in filing a supplementary statement of views. I know of no other reason for the late filing of the majority report.

Mr. HALL. I am sure the gentleman understands that this is most unusual, after special orders have started. I merely wished to clear that up. Do I correctly understand that there will be additional views or supplementary views to the report on the Economic Opportunity Act?

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I only wish to identify this for the RECORD. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

ITEM VETO LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Joint Resolution 477 which is designed to amend the Constitution to give the President authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills. I urge my colleagues to support this measure because I firmly believe that its adoption would put an end to a lot of unnecessary spending and could mean a saving of hundreds of millions a year to the taxpayer.

As we know only too well, the present system is one of the most ridiculous practices in government. The President, in acting on appropriation bills passed by Congress, must take all or nothing—the bad with the good. This means that he must accept a lot of unnecessary “pork barrel” projects in order to approve other projects that are vital to our national development, economy, and security.

Former President Eisenhower and the late President Kennedy strongly recommended changing this reprehensible practice. They had complained that their hands had been tied and that they had been powerless to eliminate obviously unsound programs without destroying many vitally needed projects.

I introduced similar legislation in the 88th Congress in an effort to secure this constitutional amendment, and I now urge the House Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on this resolution as soon as possible, so that we can have full congressional action on it during the 89th Congress. Unless this action is forthcoming, the Congress must assume full responsibility for the continuance of the present procedure because of its failure to act heretofore on the problem.

I know that I am not the first critic of this "all or nothing" system which governs our appropriation legislation. The history of opposition dates back to the 19th century, when President Arthur roundly denounced the abuses inherent in requiring a President to accept or reject an appropriation bill in its entirety. In 1882, President Arthur explained the problem by relating:

As citizens of one State find that money, to raise which they in common with the whole country are taxed, is to be expended for local improvements in another State, they demand similar benefits for themselves.

Well, that problem is still with us today, and I say that it is time we resolved it, once and for all.

This bargaining and bickering on appropriation bills can reach the ridiculous. As a hypothetical Congressman Tubbs said to Congressman Nubbs, "If you don't vote for digging out Catfish Creek, I'll oppose your item on flood control for the Mississippi River." And, so that the lives and property of thousands of people may be safeguarded, Catfish Creek must be dug out, and the bill goes through with all its "pork" to be put before the President. Well, this is patently wrong, and I believe the President must be given the authority to exercise some selectivity in passing on appropriation matters.

I am convinced that the item-veto bill will save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually and will eliminate a lot of this ridiculous give-and-take technique of voting appropriation bills. I am sure that most of my colleagues agree with me on this matter, and I sincerely hope that I can count on their bipartisan support for this important measure.

COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON ARE TO BE EXPECTED BECAUSE HIS POLICIES ARE PAYING OFF FOR THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the wire services are carrying a story out of Warsaw, Poland, which quotes the Polish Minister of Defense, Marshal Marian Spychalski, as follows:

Poland's Minister of Defense, Marshal Marian Spychalski, suggested at an election rally last night that President Johnson willfully cheated American voters with his policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

He also said U.S. military strategy was based on exploiting the Moscow-Peking split but was actually having the reverse effect.

Both Johnson and British Prime Minister Harold Wilson are helping to prove that voters in the West have no real choice, Spychalski declared in a Poznan speech quoted by the Polish press agency.

"Events of the past few months prove once more that a citizen in a capitalist country has no possibility to choose the policy more or less agreeable to him," Spychalski said. "Really, what choice did the citizens of the United States make in electing Lyndon Johnson as President?"

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall ever before seeing a statement by a responsible official that is more untrue and deceptive than the statement made by the Polish Minister of Defense. Indeed, it is rather ironic that this accusation against the President of the United States should be made at an election rally at Poznan, Poland, when the whole world knows the viciousness with which the Communists in Poland crushed, in the very city of Poznan, the efforts of the Polish people to liberate themselves from Communist rule. Why, the whole world knows what a mockery the Defense Minister of Poland is making of truth when he even suggests that there is any semblance of free elections under the Communist domination of this gallant nation of Poland.

Fortunately, the Polish people see through this hypocrisy of their Communist oppressors. I am delighted to say that, to my personal knowledge, if the 35 million people of Poland, who will never be Communists, indeed had the opportunity to participate in a free election in Poland, there would not be a Marshal Marian Spychalski as Defense Minister of Poland and there would not be a Gomulka as Premier of Poland. The Polish people have a history going back 1,000 years demonstrating their respect for freedom and dignity. Many pages of history have been written about their exploits going back to the beginning of time and running up through World War II and even to today, when the Polish people, after 20 years of illegal Communist rule, are still standing up heroically against Communist oppression. Poland's Defense Minister says President Johnson cheated the American voters with his policies in Vietnam. We are not surprised that Communist leaders throughout the whole world are attacking President Johnson today. This is because for the first time in 20 years the tide is starting to turn against them and we see the hope of victory in Vietnam. Yes; we stopped the Communist conspiracy in the Dominican Republic. I am not surprised that this Communist marshal is denouncing our great President, because our great President has shown the world, that the American people, both Democrats and Republicans, stand firmly behind him. We stand firmly behind Mr. Johnson in his determination that the retreat from communism has come to an end. There is a new order in this world today, a new order of hope. The Polish Defense Minister knows that better than anyone else. Yes; the stirrings of freedom are being detected among millions of people; 180 million oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain, oppressed by the Communists in these heroic captive nations, are beginning to feel it. So we can easily understand why Marshal Spychalski would today be denouncing President Johnson. It is because he sees the handwriting on the wall and sees that the spirit of freedom is becoming infectious.

The bold and daring policies of President Johnson are finally starting to pay off all over the world. I think we can look forward to the day when under the

heroic and bold leadership of President Johnson, who in my judgment will go down in history as one of the greatest leaders this world has ever seen, I think we have a right to expect and believe that the enslaved and chained people, enslaved and chained by the Communist conspiracy for more than 20 years, are going to join the family of free nations at last.

Mr. Speaker, I could not let this arrogant attack upon our President go without mention here. We are going to see a great many more similar attacks by the Communists against our President. Yes indeed, his policies are paying off. We are going to see the revival and survival of freedom. We are going to see an expansion of freedom. The whole world is waiting for that today, I believe. If we were to go into Poland today and ask the 35 million people there what they think, if they had a choice between President Johnson and this Communist puppet, Marshal Spychalski, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of the Polish people would side with President Johnson.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KREBS. I am very happy for this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his excellent and timely remarks. I also would be pleased for the RECORD to show my association with the statement made by him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

DR. JAMES W. TURPIN AND PROJECT CONCERN

Mr. BRADEMAMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection?

Mr. BRADEMAMAS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman ROBERT WILSON, and I were privileged to host a luncheon in honor of a remarkable young American, Dr. James W. Turpin, the founder of Project Concern.

I take this time today to tell Members of the House of Representatives about Dr. Turpin and Project Concern because I think it is a story worth telling and one which must inspire us all.

Project Concern is a nonprofit medical aid group without religious and political affiliations, which operates hospitals and clinics, under the direction of Dr. Turpin, in South Vietnam and Hong Kong.

More than 20 nationalities are represented on the Project Concern staff of 100 people, many of them serving on a volunteer basis.

Both Congressman Wilson and I know Jim Turpin personally, have great admiration for him and his work, and count ourselves honored to serve as members of the board of directors of Project Concern.

Dr. Turpin, 37 years old, was reared in Ashland, Ky., where his family has lived for several generations. He grew up in a tradition of service to man for as a boy he followed his grandfather, Dr. James Wesley Duke, through the hills of eastern Kentucky.

Following a period of service in the U.S. Navy, Jim Turpin enrolled at Emory University in Atlanta, Ga., where he completed his undergraduate work and continued his studies in the School of Theology. While studying theology, Jim Turpin completed the requirements for entrance to medical school, and then went on successfully to complete medical school. Following his internship and residency, he went into general practice in Coronado, Calif.

MEDICAL CLINICS IN HONG KONG

In Coronado, Jim Turpin and his wife, Martha, became active in community life. Jim served on the city council and taught a Sunday school class. This may well have been the launching pad for Project Concern, for Jim invited his adult group to "join me and let us do something about service instead of sitting here talking about it." As a result of an on-the-spot inspection of conditions, Jim and the Sunday school class members volunteered their time and services to help with a medical clinic and school at Casa de Todos in Tijuana, Mexico.

In November 1961, Project Concern was incorporated in the State of California as a nonprofit organization. It took less than a year to raise the support necessary to begin the first Project Concern medical clinics in the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong. An ever increasing circle of friends agreed to give financial support. In September 1962, Project Concern was at work in Hong Kong. Three outpatient clinics have now been established in Hong Kong. One serves the walled city of Kowloon, the second aids the squatters of Jordan Valley, while the third center floats on two junks in the center of the Yaumati typhoon shelter. These three centers have brought medical assistance and food to the masses of poor Chinese who have crowded into Hong Kong in recent years and for whom no other medical aid is available.

In 1963 I had the great privilege of visiting Dr. and Mrs. Turpin and their four children in Hong Kong and personally observed them in action in the walled city of Kowloon and rendering medical service to refugees on the floating clinic in the harbor. It was one of the most moving experiences of my life.

PROJECT CONCERN IN SOUTH VIETNAM

More recently, Dr. Turpin and Project Concern have gone into South Vietnam and have established a small hospital in the village of DaMpaio, some 150 miles northeast of Saigon. Inpatients num-

ber over 50 per month and outpatients over 700 per month. In addition, a village medical officer—VMO—program has been established. This cooperative program between Project Concern and the Government of South Vietnam trains local young men and women in the fundamentals of medical assistance. Graduates return to their villages as medical officers certified by the Government. A Project Concern team, with a doctor, nurse, and laboratory technician, visits each of the villages periodically, and with the assistance of the village medical officer conducts clinic sessions with full medical services. In addition, the village medical officer, as well as the Project Concern personnel, are actively engaged in improving the living conditions of the villages in the region where they are located, seeking to prevent disease and to improve the standard of living.

DR. TURPIN ON TOUR IN THE UNITED STATES

Dr. Turpin is now in the United States on a 10-week tour on behalf of Project Concern. He must raise funds so that the work of Project Concern can be continued and, hopefully, expanded. Since Project Concern is a nonprofit organization and not connected with any religious, welfare, or governmental group, its entire support must come from interested individuals who know about the project and realize what a valuable program it is.

Here is what even small amounts of money contributed to Project Concern can do: \$1 provides 7 days of treatment for removal of parasitic intestinal worms; \$5 provides 21 days of treatment for severe fungus disease in a child; \$10 provides 3 months of medicine and food necessary to overcome malnutrition in a child; \$25 provides salary and support for a native village medical officer and basic medical care for an entire village for 1 month; \$50 provides necessary daily medical treatment for tuberculosis for 1 year.

So, Mr. Speaker, even a modest contribution can mean a great deal to some individual or village in South Vietnam or Hong Kong. Anyone who wishes to learn more about this imaginative venture in bettering the lives of people in other countries can write for more information to: Project Concern, Inc., Postmaster, San Diego, Calif.

DR. TURPIN'S VISIT TO SOUTH BEND

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD several newspaper accounts of Dr. Turpin's current tour across the United States, including a report in the South Bend Tribune following his visit to my own home city of South Bend:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, May 6, 1965]

VIET JUNGLE DOCTOR BATTLES IGNORANCE (By Thomas Serge)

Intestinal parasites and witch doctors are two of the major medical problems in South Vietnam, Dr. James W. Turpin, a 37-year-old American physician who operates a hospital in the Vietnam jungle, said Wednesday night at St. Mary's College.

Dr. Turpin, who organized Project Concern, a nonprofit medical aid group, said that in the southeast Asian countries modern medical science often is scorned by the natives until traditional forms of sorcery have been tried and failed.

Dr. Turpin captivated an audience of 200 as he spoke in the new dining hall on the college campus. He is on a \$250,000 fund drive for Project Concern, which he and his wife, Martha, founded 3½ years ago. The project is active in South Vietnam and Hong Kong. The doctor spoke at noon, Wednesday, to the South Bend Rotary Club.

His staff, which now numbers 99, originally worked among Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, but has also established a one-story 25-bed hospital in the village of DaMpaio in South Vietnam, about 200 miles northeast of Saigon.

The former Navy doctor, who served an internship at Crawford Long Hospital, Atlanta, Ga., and established residency in Santa Rosa, Calif., also operates thatched-roof clinics for tribesmen in 25 surrounding villages.

TRIBESMEN TRAINED

The clinics are serviced by 35 young Koho tribesmen trained by the Turpin team, who are certified by the South Vietnam Government, to dispense first aid, medication for tuberculosis and malaria, and provide other assistances.

Dr. Turpin found deep personal pleasure in aiding starving and disease-afflicted persons when he and his wife, Martha, visited Tijuana, infamous Mexico border town, during days off from his general practice in southern California.

He said he experienced an emotional change while crossing the Mexico border one summer night almost 4 years ago, after laboring nearly 12 hours to save the lives of a young Mexican girl and her sister who were suffering from bronchial pneumonia.

That night he realized he needed these people as much as they needed him, the doctor stated.

While working with the Chinese and South Vietnamese, Dr. Turpin witnessed things he considered to be pathetic beyond imagination.

He cited the spectacle of a starving baby sucking at a mother's breast and screaming pitifully because its mother's body was so racked with malnutrition she could not give the child nourishment. And seeing thousands of children so undernourished their digestive systems were feeding on muscle fiber.

The greatest medical problem among these people other than malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera, is intestinal parasites, he said.

BOY IS AIDED

A nonmedical problem his staff must contend with is superstition in Hong Kong and Vietnam.

Dr. Turpin told of a Vietnamese woman who came to the clinic with her child who was suffering from large facial abscesses. Convinced her son was possessed by evil spirits, she brought the boy to him as a last resort after a village sorcerer's methods of cure had failed.

The witch doctor sacrificed a water buffalo and a chicken, paid for by the mother, and also dotted a piece of paper with dyes and made the boy swallow it.

The doctor lanced the abscesses and the boy showed immediate improvement. He tactfully told the woman her son had been in the spirit-separating room and she was so impressed she brought many other patients to him.

Project Concern has worked with such a variety of races that it has been called a "Little United Nations," and sometimes, "Little Hope."

Dr. Turpin left Vietnam convinced that the war is being won there and that the war is a necessary evil.

RAIDS BOOST MORALE

He said recent American air raids on North Vietnam are a tremendous morale booster for the South Vietnamese, and he noted a greater

interest has been shown by people who previously cared little for their own welfare.

He warned that these persons are starving, want jobs, education and security, and will take these things from the first country to offer it, but he pointed out that they are not particularly interested in communism but are only seeking a means to these ends.

The young doctor predicted the village of Mpao would go Communist within a week if the United States were to withdraw from the war.

"The battle in Vietnam cannot be termed a civil war, there are too many other countries involved in the fight," he said.

WILL WALK FOR DAYS

The South Vietnamese are suffering horrible indignities and will walk for 2 or 3 days to reach medical clinics, according to Dr. Turpin.

In one of the colored slides a chief of a mountain tribe was depicted in underclothing—the only garments he possessed.

A man came to the clinic garbed in a woman's dress for lack of anything else to wear, Dr. Turpin said.

Presently, wells and sanitary ditches are being dug, and when screening is available dwellings are secured with it to improve existing conditions.

Turning to field activities in the colony of Hong Kong, Dr. Turpin said more than 40,000 boat people in the Yaumati typhoon shelter receive medical aid from two floating 65-foot junks equipped with modern medical facilities.

CLINIC AT CEMETERY

The boat dwellers live their lives and die afloat, and many of them are too superstitious to even go ashore for medical care.

On the mainland nearby, a clinic was established in an abandoned cemetery building given to them by the Government, Dr. Turpin said.

Project Concern has no specific religious or political affiliations. "The project wants only to bring the best American medical aid possible to those who need it the most," the doctor said.

Dr. Turpin's wife and children, Keith, 14, Payton, 12, Scott, 7, and Jan, 6, returned to California after spending the summer with him in Vietnam.

PREMEDICAL COURSE

Martha has enrolled in a premedical course since returning, he said.

Dr. Turpin was introduced by Miss Geraldine Hatt, a social studies teacher at Central High School who worked as a volunteer for Project Concern in Hong Kong in 1963.

Sister Maria Renata, C.S.C., president of St. Mary's College, and Miss Lillian Chard, Grayslake, Ill., senior class president, were hostesses. College seniors, alumni, and staff attended.

Mrs. Arthur Schenck, president of the South Bend branch of the AAUW; Mrs. Eugene Anderson, and Mrs. Ralph Emlong, co-chairmen of the recent graduates committee, were in charge of arrangements.

Refreshments were served before the program.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Apr. 24, 1965]

DOCTOR SEEKS VIETNAM FUND—WANTS \$250,000 TO HELP TREAT TRIBESMEN

SAN FRANCISCO.—An American doctor who has spent the past year treating mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam launched a nationwide drive today to raise \$250,000 to help them.

"After living and working with these people, I can say that they deserve the best help we can supply," declares Dr. James W. Turpin. "They are making a genuine effort to help themselves."

Turpin, 37, has set up a 25-bed hospital in the village of DaMpao about 150 miles north-

east of Saigon. He and an international staff also operate out-patient clinics for mountain tribesmen in 25 surrounding villages.

NO TROUBLE FROM REDS

"Vietcong guerrillas have given us no significant trouble," says Turpin. "And I'm sure we've treated some of them."

Turpin, who wears a brass bracelet signifying honorary membership in the Koho tribe, says morale has soared among the Vietnamese and U.S. soldier-advisers since the war against the Communist Vietcong was stepped up.

"Nobody likes to fight a war he can't win," he says.

The Turpin team has trained 35 young Koho tribesmen as village medical officers, certified by the South Vietnam Government, to dispense emergency first aid, tuberculosis and malaria medication, and other assistance to their fellow tribesmen.

"They are our most important contribution," Turpin says.

Turpin said the training toward self-sufficiency is a cooperative effort of the Government and Project Concern, an independent, nonprofit relief organization the physician and his wife, Martha, founded 3½ years ago at Coronado, Calif.

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 23, 1965]
JUNGLE DOCTOR BATTLES AGONY, DISEASE IN VIET

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. James W. Turpin looks like a movie director's dream of what he really is—a jungle doctor.

And last week, thanks to Representatives JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, and BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, Dr. Turpin shared some of his extremely practical knowledge with a few Congressmen—too few, unfortunately. BRADEMAS and WILSON are directors of Dr. Turpin's mercy operation called, "Concern Inc."

The strikingly handsome young Kentucky-born physician, moved by the suffering of people in underdeveloped nations, left his practice in Coronado, Calif., to seek a new career in medicine out of the mass of agony in southeast Asia.

There, in an abandoned U.S. Special Services compound, he treats 3,500 Vietnamese a month. And he weeps over their poverty, their hunger, and their suffering.

His wife is studying medicine with the hope of joining his work. Dr. Turpin is in the United States now trying to raise \$250,000 to carry forward the work of his "Concern, Inc."

The Vietnamese call him Bacsi Hakkah, the "Doctor Who Remembers (Us)," and in Hong Kong, he is known as Kai Yeh, meaning "Godfather."

He has won the devotion of the natives because he gives them help without question. He serves under the little blue-and-white banner of "Concern Inc.," which is wholly international, with compassion.

Dr. Turpin has high praise for the American Special Service Corps in Vietnam. But he is critical of the petty Americans who sit in Saigon. "Get them out in the villages," he pleads, noting that if America withdraws from Vietnam, then the Communists will take over.

In his medical compound, he has trained bright young Vietnamese to be village medical officers, outfitted them with white jackets and stethoscopes. They can dispense medicine for common ailments, refer seriously ill patients to Dr. Turpin and his associates.

Children with stomachs bloated from hunger, mothers weeping over children that nurse starvation-dried breasts, men who come with their bony nakedness covered by tattered dresses or scanty short underwear—all these affect Dr. Turpin deeply.

"To think that somehow generations of poverty have injured these people to suffer-

ing is red-white-and-blue naïveté," he says. "The truth is, each generation discovers hunger, privation, and suffering anew."

The stepped-up American battle against the Communists has lifted the enthusiasm even of the formerly indifferent Vietnamese, Dr. Turpin said.

The tiny effort of Concern, Inc., is but a speck of mercy in an ocean of sorrows, but it works, and Dr. Turpin thinks it could work everywhere.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1965]
DOCTOR TELLS OF PROGRESS IN SOUTH VIETNAM—TROOPS' MORALE IMPROVING, HE SAYS
(By Thomas Powers)

The contention that the United States is making no progress in South Vietnam is "absolutely false," a 36-year-old medical missionary told 600 members of the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce yesterday.

Dr. James W. Turpin, who has set up hospitals in South Vietnam and in Hong Kong, said that "for every atrocity, there are 1,000 acts of compassion in South Vietnam."

SEES ADDED STABILITY

Speaking in the Sherman House, he said there has been a marked increase in morale in our military forces, mainly because of the training and support being given by U.S. special forces which the doctor labeled, "the best of our manhood."

He said the South Vietnam Government has become considerably more stable, particularly since the recent reverses suffered by the Communist Vietcong forces.

He said the U.S. aid program which is costing \$2 million a day can "justifiably be criticized not because of its lack of effectiveness but because so much of it is involved in noninvolvement."

He explained that Vietnamese farmers thumb their noses at trucks bearing fertilizer and farm equipment to them "because the sacks are dumped at their feet. We need to have more of those distributing the aid to move out of the large villages and move in where the really poor people are, to know emotionally and spiritually what it means to starve to death."

He told the Jaycees:

"I do not want your charity for them. Come off of your sanctimonious high horse. These people do need you. They are suffering indescribable physical privation. But you must also understand that you need them."

Dr. Turpin was a general practitioner in a suburb of San Diego until he paid a visit to a Tijuana, Mexico, slum and was appalled by what he saw. He organized Project Concern, Inc., a not-for-profit organization that provided hospitals and clinics, including two floating hospitals, for water dwellers in Hong Kong.

Turpin, a Methodist, is a graduate of the Emory University College of Theology in Atlanta.

[From the Chicago's American, May 2, 1965]
VIET MORALE UP, MEDIC HERE SAYS

U.S. bombing of Vietcong supply lines has brought a 100-percent increase in South Vietnamese morale, according to an American medical volunteer in that country.

Nevertheless, Dr. James W. Turpin, founder and president of Project Concern, sees a 20-year involvement of U.S. forces in South Vietnam as necessary to keep it free of Communist domination.

Declaring that the Vietnamese, like other oriental people, are "not ready for democracy yet," he said U.S. intervention will be required until they become self-sufficient. Should the United States pull out now South Vietnam would become a "Communist colony in a matter of days," he said.

ADDRESSED PRESS LUNCHEON

He made the remarks at a press luncheon in the Chicago Athletic Club given by Mrs. Harry D. Thorsen, Jr., president of the project's North Shore women's auxiliary, which is also sponsoring a special awards dinner for benefactors tomorrow evening in the Orrington Hotel, Evanston.

Named in 1963 as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Turpin was the keynote speaker yesterday at the Jaycee's State convention in the Sherman House.

Project Concern got its start in 1962, when the physician-minister left his medical practice in Coronado, Calif., set up two medical clinics in Hong Kong with the aid of four volunteers.

RUNS FLOATING CLINIC

One, known as a "floating clinic," is housed on two Chinese junks and serves some 200,000 boat families who live on sampans in the typhoon shelters of the bay. The other is located in the walled city of Kowloon, where some 250,000 people live in a 10-block area.

The work has since been extended to South Vietnam, where the project maintains a 25-bed hospital in the hill country 150 miles north of Saigon.

Among those to be honored at tomorrow's dinner are Mr. and Mrs. W. Clement Stone, who recently gave the project \$16,000 to double the \$8,000 raised by the women's auxiliary.

[From the Rochester Post-Bulletin, May 8, 1965]

DEMOCRACY IN VIETNAM NOT THE ANSWER NOW

(By Thomas Furth)

Democracy is not the answer right now in Vietnam. However, some strong form of government must be established in the grief-stricken southeast Asian country.

This is the opinion of Dr. James Turpin, who will be the featured speaker tonight at the annual Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce State convention banquet in the Mayo Civic Auditorium Arena.

Dr. Turpin, who heads the Jaycee-sponsored Project Concern in Asia, met briefly today with three national vice presidents of the junior chamber of commerce. A former Outstanding Young Man in America in 1962, Dr. Turpin gave indications on the progress of the program.

"We need them (the Vietnamese) as much as they need us," Dr. Turpin confided. "The fulfillment of spiritual and emotional needs we receive from them helps compensate for the material welfare we provide them."

Born in Ashland, Ky., Dr. Turpin, 37, feels the strongest trump card for communism in Vietnam is dedication. "The Communist cadre will do anything to become one of them (Vietnamese)."

However, regardless how poor and sick some Vietnamese are, Dr. Turpin continued, they strive to maintain dignity. And "Project Concern," has received a good amount of support from the Jaycees in Vietnam, he added.

What Americans must sell in this region, Dr. Turpin said, is democracy and Christianity. Through Project Concern steps can be taken in that direction, he said.

Project Concern is an independent, nonprofit relief organization, in which clinics and hospitals are established overseas. Self-sufficiency is the anticipated end result of Project Concern's efforts.

Jaycees national vice presidents visiting here are G. Merritt Martin of Saline, Mich., James Skidmore of Breck Township in New Jersey, and Dr. Fred Rainey of Elizabethtown, Ky.

Skidmore, national Jaycees public relations chairman, announced that St. Paul will be host in January to the congress for the selec-

tion of the 10 outstanding young men of America.

Promoted by the Jaycees, nominees for the national honor do not have to be Jaycee members, Skidmore said. The 10 finalists are picked from approximately 20,000 solicitations across the Nation. Some past winners include J. Edgar Hoover, Walt Disney, Richard Nixon, and John F. Kennedy.

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Saturday Evening Independent, Apr. 24, 1965]

ASHLANDER LAUNCHES DRIVE TO AID SOUTH VIET TRIBES—DR. JAMES TURPIN SEEKS \$250,000 FOR "PEOPLE WHO DESERVE BEST"

(By William C. Harrison)

SAN FRANCISCO.—An American doctor who has spent the past year treating mountain tribesmen in South Vietnam launched a nationwide drive today to raise \$250,000 to help them.

"After living and working with these people, I can say that they deserve the best help we can supply," declared Dr. James W. Turpin. "They are making a genuine effort to help themselves."

Turpin, 37, has set up a 25-bed hospital in a village about 150 miles northeast of Saigon. He and an international staff also operate outpatient clinics for mountain tribesmen in 25 surrounding villages.

"Vietcong guerrillas have given us no significant trouble," says Turpin. "And I'm sure we've treated some of them."

The Turpin team has trained 25 young Koho tribesmen as village medical officers, certified by the South Vietnam Government, to dispense emergency first aid, tuberculosis and malaria medication and other assistance to their fellow tribesmen.

"They are our most important contribution," Turpin says.

The training toward self-sufficiency is a cooperative effort of the Government and Project Concern, an independent, nonprofit relief organization the physician and his wife, Martha, founded 3½ years ago at Coronado, Calif.

Turpin had conducted a general practice in Coronado for 5 years when the couple set out in 1962 to open the first Project Concern medical clinic—on a Chinese junk for the boat dwellers of Hong Kong Harbor. It has grown to three clinics treating nearly 500 patients a day in the British crown colony.

Some 20 nationalities are represented on the staff of more than 100 doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, teachers and others presently working in the program. They expanded into South Vietnam last year.

Turpin said Project Concern is independent of any government, church or other affiliation, and is registered with the State Department's Agency for International Development.

A cross-country, 2-month tour will take Turpin to many major cities and his hometown of Ashland, Ky.

Mrs. Turpin and their four children, ranging in age from 6 to 14, have returned to Coronado. She has decided she wants to be a doctor, too, and is getting her premed education at Western University, San Diego.

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 1, 1965]

PROJECT CONCERN CLINICS—U.S. DOCTOR FIGHTING REDS IN VIETNAM WITH MEDICINE

(By Charles Cleveland)

A childhood dream is helping to win the war in Vietnam.

As a youngster in Ashland, Ky., Jim Turpin drove in a model T through the mountains with his grandfather-doctor and dreamed some day of becoming a medical missionary in China.

Today he is operating four clinics in Hong Kong, one in South Vietnam and still

dreaming—this time about clinics to aid 1 million hill people in north Thailand.

Politics and wars, however, aren't his concern—he's a doctor treating patients, including the Vietcong Communists, but the work of his clinic has already converted at least one village from communism.

Dr. Turpin is a tall, handsome man with obvious dedication. He is in Chicago on a 2-month tour to rekindle interest in his "Project Concern," and to raise funds for his work.

He was a doctor in Coronado, Calif., successful financially but dissatisfied—"I was only doing what any other of the 1,200 doctors in San Diego could do."

Through his Sunday school class he learned of a clinic in the slums of Tijuana, Mexico, and he began devoting his off-hours to it. This, in turn, reawakened his childhood dream.

With the aid of friends he raised \$10,000 and moved his wife, four children, and another couple to Hong Kong. There he set up a floating clinic to bring medical care to the thousands of refugees who live on the waters.

"I believe we have to take medical care to the people," Dr. Turpin said. "It isn't enough to set up fancy hospitals in town."

A tour of Australia, and word-of-mouth attention, brought additional volunteers. Now there are 12 doctors and 33 staff members with 16 nationalities represented and 3 additional clinics in operation that treat 500 patients a day.

A New Zealand doctor told Dr. Turpin about the central highlands of South Vietnam and he started a clinic there. Patients come from as far away as Saigon, a distance of 200 miles.

"You've got to get out your book on tropical medicine," Dr. Turpin said. "We treat everything—leprosy, TB, cholera, malaria."

"With oral medicine we cure skin fungus in a week that the sorcerers (witch doctors) tried vainly to cure for years. We even have one sorcerer on our staff now."

Are we losing the war in Vietnam?

"Absolutely not," Dr. Turpin said. "We need more military aid, I suppose, but more than anything we need those who are concerned about the people as individuals."

Dr. Turpin's own philosophy is a guideline: "I try to let the patients know I'm as happy they came to our clinic as they are to be treated."

Saturday, Dr. Turpin was honored by the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce at the Sherman House; Sunday night he will speak to North Shore volunteers of Project Concern at the Orrington Hotel, Evanston.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert Dr. Turpin's latest newsletter about Project Concern and an article by George A. Kellogg:

PROJECT CONCERN—A MONTHLY NEWSLETTER
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 1965.

DEAR FRIENDS: How much are you worth? Courts have awarded more than \$250,000 on occasion in determining the monetary value of a human life. Sometimes we feel worth that much or more. Sometimes we feel worth nothing much at all.

In Hong Kong and South Vietnam we are encountering regularly situations where human dignity, individual worth, and personal freedom are considered as insignificant. In Hong Kong life is very cheap to many of the refugees. In Vietnam, we have had to stress to our village medical officers the importance of tender, patient and loving care for the sick individual. They are learning with amazement the extent to which we will go in time and effort to cure just one person.

I brought Nguyen Van Khanh, a 3-year-old refugee boy from North Vietnam, back with me to California recently. In San

Francisco's Children's Hospital, Dr. Victor Richards and his dedicated staff operated on this frail "blue baby." The hospital donated thousands of dollars' worth of the most modern diagnostic studies. The surgeons, nurses, blood bank and scores of others said, "Yes, this Vietnamese refugee child is worthy of the best we can offer."

It was discovered at surgery that the heart deformity was too extensive to be repaired. Our disappointment was keen, but our staffs in Vietnam and Hong Kong, as well as the 6,000 fellow refugees from communism in Tung Nghia know that we are willing to go all the way with Nguyen and with each one of them. This fact expressed believably scores of times daily is having a profound effect on the lives of those who are turning to us in ever increasing numbers.

How much are you worth? The answer may be directly proportional to the courage you have to love believably the people who desperately require your concern.

"To be loved, and to love, need courage, the courage to judge certain values as of ultimate concern—and to take the jump and stake everything on these values."¹ The East and West are meeting today in the atmosphere of respect, understanding, and compassion. In Yaumati, the Walled City, Jordan Valley and DaMpaio the tens of thousands know we are involved with them in active concern.

Yours in dedicated concern,

JIM TURPIN, M.D.

"IT'S MY SHOUT, MATES," SAYS MR. VAIR

In celebration of his birthday which he spent in Hong Kong, Mr. Howard Vair decided to foot the bill for the entire Project Concern program in Hong Kong for 1 full day. For 1 day he paid the salaries of all the doctors, nurses, lab technicians, pharmacists, drivers, clerks, boatmen, and registrars. In short, he furnished the Hong Kong payroll for April 22, 1965. For that day he paid for the drugs, the fuel that runs the personnel and baggage vans. He paid for the telephones, the electricity, the water. He paid the rent and for the medicine bottles, the bandages, the injection fluids, the cough syrups. He paid one three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth of the annual fee for the auditors who now are busy seeing that donations are properly spent and meticulously accounted for. On his birthday, Mr. Howard Vair of Detroit, Mich., known the world over as one of the foremost candy men in the United States, is "Mr. Project Concern, H.K."

Mr. Howard Vair is an American—with the American's typical sympathetic interest in his fellow man and the equally typical urge to do something practical about it, when he finds real need. And when Mr. Vair said, "It's my shout, mates," he was using the phraseology of another generous, warm-hearted people—the Australians whose expression this is.

On the Italian cruise ship *Flavia* which brought Mr. Vair to Hong Kong, he was the only American among 700 Australians and during his almost 4 weeks with them, he learned that when an Aussie decides to foot the bill, he says, "It's my shout, mates."

"I figured that it costs about \$10 an hour to run the three Hong Kong clinics," said Mr. Vair after seeing the work being carried on in these charity medical facilities and asking for the annual budget figure. Ten dollars American that would be, let's see now. I got quite good at this Australian pound stuff on the *Flavia* that would be just almost exactly £4 Australian. Anyone wanting to pay for running the whole shebang for an hour, could do it for £4 Australian—or for \$10 American."

Mr. Vair's check to Project Concern is for 24 hours: Two hundred and forty lovely American dollars. Thank you, Mr. Vair. And a very happy birthday. You've made it a happy day for about 500 sick people and 1,000 hungry children.

REABURNS ARE REUNITED

The apartment below decks on the *Yauh Oi* is ringing again with the shouts of little children. On the roof the swings are flying after hanging idly since the Turpins moved away. And Pung Yauh, the *Yauh Oi's* dog, has five instead of four small fry to play with him, for the Reaburns of Collie, West Australia, have come to stay.

Mrs. Reaburn (Noela, a trained nurse) arrived with her children several weeks before her doctor husband was able to get away. Now all are reunited as Dr. Bob Reaburn joins the staff of Project Concern, bringing his medical skills, his dedication and his wonderful personality to the people served in Hong Kong by the three clinics.

This is not Dr. Reaburn's first introduction to Project Concern. In the early summer of 1964, Dr. Reaburn came as a volunteer for several weeks to find out whether or not the work was as he had envisioned it. Satisfied that it was what he wants, he returned to Collie to dispose of his very successful practice so that he could return on a permanent basis. Welcome aboard.

DR. TURPIN TOURS UNITED STATES

A brief visit with his family in Coronado, Calif., preceded a 10-week cross-country trip began with 6 days in San Francisco, including 3 days as a guest-in-residence at Stanford University. Also on the April itinerary were Seattle and Vancouver, B.C.

On the schedule for May and June:

May 1-4, 6, and 7	Chicago.
May 5	South Bend.
May 8	Rochester.
May 9-10-11	Minneapolis.
May 12-15, 17-21	New York City.
May 16	Jersey City.
May 22	Asbury Park, N.J.
May 23-24-25	Washington, D.C.
May 26-29	Atlanta.
May 29-30	Tampa.
May 31	Miami Beach.
June 1-2	Jacksonville.
June 3-4-5	Dallas.
June 6	Manhattan, Kans.
June 7	Topeka.
June 8	Lincoln-Omaha.
June 9-10	Kansas City.
June 11	Tulsa.
June 12	Wichita.
June 13	Greensburg.
June 14-16	Los Angeles.
June 17-20	San Diego.
June 22	Buffalo.
June 23-24	New York City.
June 25-28	Ashland, Ky.
June 29	Cincinnati.
June 30	Phoenix.
July 1	Oakland.
July 2-3	Coronado.

[From Hospital Topics magazine, October 1963]

PROJECT CONCERN: MODERN MEDICAL CARE FOR HONG KONG'S DESTITUTE

(The author is a retired vice president of Ethicon, Inc., and a consultant to Johnson & Johnson. When he submitted this special report after his visit to Project Concern in August, he called the project "as worthy a medical cause as I ever became acquainted with," and described its founder as "one of the finest young doctors I've ever met.")

(By George A. Kellogg)

A day with James Turpin, M.D., is something like a day with Dr. Tom Dooley and Dr. Albert Schweitzer rolled into one.

After being ordained as a Methodist minister, Dr. Turpin decided to fulfill his child-

hood resolve to become a physician. He obtained his M.D. degree from the Emory University School of Medicine, and practiced for 5 years in Coronado, Calif., devoting a day a week to charity medical practice in Tijuana, Mexico. Then he and his young wife decided to give their full time to rendering medical care to the Chinese poor of Hong Kong.

On their own, without the backing of any religious or other charitable organization, they organized Project Concern. Just 2 years later, they have a staff of 16 paid and voluntary doctors, nurses, and pharmacists. They operate two outpatient medical clinics—one in the old Kowloon Walled City and the other aboard a beautifully rebuilt Chinese junk, in the Yaumati typhoon shelter in Hong Kong.

Here are 8,000 junks on which live some 35,000 people. Families range from 3 to 17 persons—some living on sampans measuring from 12 to 20 feet.

The floating clinic, *Yauh Oi* (Brotherly Love), has been in the water about 7 months. An average of 150 patients come each day. Unless penniless, they are charged 50 cents Hong Kong money (8½ cents United States). "With no charge," says Dr. Turpin, "they would be apt to think the drugs of no value and not take them." Little do they realize that they frequently are given drugs with a value of \$2 to \$10 in U.S. money.

In the 2 clinics, Dr. Turpin and his staff treat over 4,000 patients each month. In the Walled City, a filthy, squalor-ridden area of some 10 square blocks, Project Concern has teamed with a group of British nurses and other volunteer workers to provide modern medical care.

There are many health clinics in Hong Kong, but Project Concern and Dr. Turpin reach the most destitute of this great city and prove to them that modern medical care can better their health and their lives.

The most common diseases encountered on the floating clinic are: tuberculosis—pulmonary, skin, and bone; parasitic diseases of the skin and intestinal tract; trachoma; bronchial diseases; iron deficiency anemia, due primarily to a diet consisting almost exclusively of rice and fish; opium addiction, and scabies.

One elderly Chinese gentleman, calling at the ship on his own little sampan, was examined and given drugs and vitamins galore. He did not improve. When a more thorough investigation was made some time later, the staff found that while he took his drugs, he was starving to death. Since then his little sampan has been named hospital bed No. 1—for Project Concern now feeds him.

The project is nonsectarian. The staff includes a Buddhist, a Catholic, a Jew, a Presbyterian, and representatives of other faiths. Support comes from everywhere—mostly from individuals who are amazed at its accomplishments toward good health and moral improvement among the poorest of all Chinese. Contributions are tax deductible.

Last year, Dr. Turpin was chosen as one of the 10 outstanding young men of 1962 by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce. After receiving his award in Little Rock, Ark., he went on to New York City. His lecturing on Project Concern (which, by the way, helped bring in the money that made the floating clinic possible) aroused the interest of Hazel E. Hunt, a public school principal in Jersey City, N.J., who served in his clinics during the summer on a volunteer basis, paying all her own expenses. The volunteers—from New Jersey, New York, California, Kansas, and other areas—include two college students paying their own way.

I was accompanied to the Walled City clinic and to the ship by my 11-year-old daughter, who said that day was the best day of our trip to the Orient. While we were on the ship, an officer and crew from the Navy carrier U.S.S. *Hancock*, stationed in

¹ Erich Fromm, "The Art of Loving," World Perspectives.

Hong Kong harbor, came aboard with a load of surplus drug and surgical supplies from the carrier's stores. Similar gifts went to a Catholic hospital and other institutions in Hong Kong.

The meeting between Dr. Turpin and Lt. D. A. Pedersen of the *Hancock* was especially moving, for the last time they had met was when Dr. Turpin delivered Lieutenant Pedersen's first child, in Coronado, Calif., 3 years ago.

Project Concern, Inc., has its U.S. headquarters at Post Office Box 536, Coronado, Calif.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT PROJECT CONCERN

Mr. Speaker, I further include at this point in the RECORD a series of questions and answers about Project Concern:

Most people know in a general way of Project Concern and the work of its founder, Dr. James W. Turpin, among the refugees from communism in Hong Kong and—more recently—among the distressed people of South Vietnam. But many questions are being asked about the details of the program, its development to date, and its aims and hopes for the future. This is an attempt to answer some of these questions.

Question. What do the words "Project Concern" mean in connection with the activities of Dr. Turpin?

Answer. The simplest answer is to say that they represent a program of activities arising from the concern that Dr. Turpin, his associates, and supporters have for those multitudes critically ill from diseases stemming from malnutrition, exposure, and other hardships, and whose offspring are being ushered into a world of uncertain survival. Dr. Turpin is concerned about these people. His project is his plan to help them.

Question. It is my understanding that Dr. Turpin's program has been underway for some time. When was Project Concern launched?

Answer. Dr. Turpin had always been interested in helping the underprivileged. During the time he practiced medicine in Coronado, Calif., he—with his wife, Martha—used to spend his day off in the children's clinic in the canyons of Tijuana, finding in work among these people an inner sense of fulfillment that made him long to devote all his time in service to the very poor.

It was the urgency of the need in Hong Kong that made him decide in the summer of 1961 to organize Project Concern. He began immediately to present his plans to friends, colleagues, and the public through correspondence, speaking engagements, radio, TV etc. in an effort to enlist interest and support. The high point of these activities was the meeting in the ballroom of the Hotel del Coronado on September 11, 1961, at which the formal announcement of the launching of Project Concern was made. This was followed by the filing of its articles of incorporation in Sacramento, Calif., on November 1, 1961.

A few weeks later Dr. Turpin was on his way to Hong Kong to make a brief survey of the refugee situation for himself. He returned to continue his fundraising at an ever-accelerating pace for some months—meanwhile still finding it necessary to carry on his medical practice.

It was on August 10, 1962, that Dr. Turpin took his wife and four children to Hong Kong to devote his life to those whose tragic need had so overwhelmed him. They sailed from Long Beach, Calif., on the *SS Arcadia* at midnight. Paul and Shirley Fleener, friends who had worked with Jim and Martha during the period of preparation, sailed with them, to become a part of the Hong Kong staff of Project Concern.

Question. How is the doctor carrying out his program in Hong Kong—specifically?

Answer. As of today, January 25, 1965, Project Concern has established three clinics in Hong Kong. The first was on the mainland of Hong Kong, in the squalid, overcrowded 10-square-block area of Kowloon, known as the Walled City.¹ Here, in a 16-by 26-foot schoolroom, Project Concern treats 125 or more patients each morning. In addition, approximately 400 children come each day to receive a glass of milk, a chewable vitamin tablet, and 2 high-protein wafers. Malnutrition is the most common disease condition in the Walled City. Evidence of the confidence Dr. Turpin has won may easily be seen in the way little ones whose parents are working at their meager jobs come to the clinic alone, some bringing still smaller ones in their arms or tied on their backs.

A second—floating—clinic is anchored in Yaumati Typhoon Shelter. It is comprised of two boats: *Yau Oi* (Brotherly Love), launched March 9, 1963, and alongside it *Ming Ling* (Love One Another), launched November 29 the same year. Together they offer medical, minor surgical, eye, ear, nose, throat, dental, and X-ray facilities to the boat people, of whom it is estimated there are about 45,000 in this harbor.² The lower deck of *Yau Oi* has been made into living quarters for the director's family.

The third clinic, the Jordan Valley, was dedicated March 9, 1964. It serves an area of squatters' shacks, of which it is estimated a total of 300,000 cling precariously to the hillsides of Hong Kong and Kowloon. Put together from any available scraps, they are the homes of the colony's very poor and shelters for many refugees. The clinic is housed in an old cemetery office building, loaned to Project Concern by the British Government. Repaired, remodeled, and painted, the old but adequate building emerged as a modern, spacious clinic, with facilities for carrying out a feeding program. In addition, there is a house for the custodian and a playground for the children.

As of January 1965, the professional staff of the 3 clinics in Hong Kong numbers 42, of whom 11 are doctors. Each day they see about 500 patients. In addition, there is a daily distribution of milk, vitamins, and proteins to about 900 children.

Question. What type of patients does Project Concern serve?

Answer. Many of them are children with tuberculosis and other diseases caused by malnutrition. Of the adults who come, many are aged. The doctor not only prescribes, but, aided by his staff, administers medicines and vitamins. Many of the conditions are the same as here in the United States: colds, constipation, ulcers, and arthritis. But hideous impetigo, leprosy, and nutritional deficiencies of serious magnitude are common.

Question. Is there any resistance on the part of these people, who suddenly find a Western doctor in their midst?

Answer. Since nearly half the people in Hong Kong are refugees, one would expect

¹ Through a technical error left out of the lease to Great Britain and therefore not under its jurisdiction. British attempts to rehabilitate the area have so far been unsuccessful. The Chinese authorities have objected to a new British housing scheme which would resettle much of the population of this old city; now they claim Chinese sovereignty in the area. (Cf. Illustrated London News, Feb. 2, 1963.) The present population of the Walled City is estimated at about 25,000.

² The boat people (estimated to total over 150,000 in Hong Kong) are a fascinating segment of the nearly 4 million people in the British Crown Colony. They form a separate community, with their own language and customs. Their strange craft fill Hong Kong waters. Many never go ashore.

that many would be shy and somewhat fearful, and that their confidence would have to be won. But Dr. Jim Turpin found that for love and concern there were no language or cultural barriers. Today he is loved by all, and a hero to the children. Visitors tell us that when he goes ashore in his little sampan, it is thrilling to watch them waving with both hands and to hear them call out to him excitedly all along the waterlanes: "Kai yeh, Kai yeh" (godfather).

Question. Just how does Project Concern function?

Answer. Project Concern is an independent, individual, nonprofit medical relief organization, founded by Dr. Jim Turpin on the principle of love for humanity expressed in the practical terms of medical care, food, and clothing for those in need. It is incorporated under the laws of the State of California. Its national headquarters in Coronado, Calif., and chapters in various parts of the United States, Australia, and New Zealand seek to publicize the project and make its needs known through various media: the press, radio, television, slide presentations, and by a 16-millimeter movie film. The Coronado office publishes a monthly newsletter with the feature article written by Dr. Turpin from the field. Project Concern is entirely dependent upon public support. Most of it comes from those who receive the newsletter.

Question. What has been the response of people to this unique activity?

Answer. It has been generous. Starting with an initial nest egg contributed by some of the doctor's friends, which was soon augmented by additional gifts from individuals, organizations, and churches, the response continues to grow as more and more people come to see the practicality of Project Concern's concept of independent person-to-person assistance. However, as suffering and need in the world increases daily, so do Project Concern's opportunities to serve. And the urgency of an increase in funds is at present a very real problem.

Question. While the whole project seems praiseworthy, isn't it rather frustrating in view of the countless thousands who are potential patients?

Answer. This is true, particularly when the staggering needs are balanced by finances at low ebb. But we take courage when we remember the role free people have always played in the alleviation of suffering. Moreover, our confidence is further strengthened by the interest and enthusiasm developing today in many foreign countries.

Question. How did Dr. Turpin happen to start a medical work in Vietnam?

Answer. Dr. Turpin had hoped to have a clinic in South Vietnam, when in March 1964 a small hospital-clinic building was made available by the Vietnamese Government, and today in the little mountain village of Dampau—about 180 miles northeast of Saigon—medical service is being offered to tribes of Montagnards of that area. These people are some of the real casualties of the guerrilla fighting, since they have no real affiliation with either side. Natural wanderers, now living behind palisades of bamboo spikes and barbed wire, and lacking all but the barest elements of existence, they are tragic enough to move the most insensitive to compassion.

Project Concern's professional staff in Vietnam is small, consisting of Dr. Turpin as the only doctor, a laboratory technician from Vancouver, British Columbia, and two registered nurses from the United States. However, well underway—and to continue indefinitely—is a program of training qualified native young people to become medical assistants. As of January 1965 42 graduates have demonstrated they can correctly change dressings, distribute medicines, and give injections, according to written orders. Each group is in training for 3 months; the second

month, in residence in the provincial hospital in Dalat, under the direction of the Vietnamese Dr. Phan. The students are sponsored by the Vietnamese Government, and upon completion of their training are recognized by the officials to qualify as village medical officers. Five of the graduates are currently assigned to the clinic. The others work in the villages as medical officers, reporting critical cases to the hospital for professional care. Dr. Turpin himself makes afternoon sick calls in the villages—by helicopter to the more remote ones.

In a letter of September 17, 1964, Dr. Turpin wrote: "I saw nearly 200 patients one day . . . they come in droves . . . a fascinating people. Medical and surgical situation here is intriguing. . . . I need doctors and nurses—long term, short term, whatever is possible. Please get out the word."

In another letter: "Some day we hope there may be a truly proper hospital here, a nursing school, elementary schools, playgrounds, adequate food production. Peace will come when people's elementary needs are met, their children are sent to school, they have adequate medical care, and they worship God with bodies and hearts strong and confident in themselves and in their brothers afar."

In the same mood Martha Turpin wrote from DaMpaui during her recent visit: "So far I haven't seen any real play among the Montagnards—not even among the children. They are hollow-eyed and tragic, pawns in the struggle here, where people neither know nor care about the difference between freedom and communism. It's a long, long way up . . . it's going to take an immeasurable amount of generosity on the part of the fortunate ones of the world who are free . . . so much needs to be done, and done fast. Should we fail, the Communists will do it for us—they are pushing to do it."

Question. How can interested persons share in supporting Project Concern's humanitarian service?

Answer. It is very simple. Anyone wishing to help may slip a bill or a check into an envelope and send it to Project Concern, Inc. in care of Postmaster, San Diego, Calif.

PROJECT CONCERN

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the career of a remarkably young American physician, Dr. James W. Turpin of Coronado, Calif., in whose debt all of us stand.

Entirely without Government subsidy of any sort, Dr. Turpin has been operating hospitals and clinics in both South Vietnam and Hong Kong. Through his Project Concern, he has brought healing to thousands in the southeastern Asian jungles, victims of all manner of hideous disease, and whose only care came literally from witch doctors.

To these unfortunates, many of whose lives he saved, Dr. Turpin brought not only healing but a deep personal love. He was truly a mission of mercy in the great tradition of man's brotherhood with his fellows. Because they respected and trusted him, Dr. Turpin was able to serve as a kind of medical ambassador

to villagers in the remotest outposts of South Vietnam, people our official diplomats never see.

To these people he taught the greatness of America by example. In this capacity he has done his country a vast amount of good.

Currently, Dr. Turpin is in this country on a fundraising campaign to support his Project Concern, which, I should add, has no religious or political affiliation. He has been honored this year as one of America's 10 outstanding young men.

Some of his views on southeast Asia I believe should be of interest to this honorable body. He reports the American air raids on North Vietnam are a tremendous morale booster for the South Vietnamese. Many of these people had previously cared little for their own welfare and had no hope for the future. Their outlook now is brighter.

He notes that these people are hungry, need jobs and education as well as security. They will take things from the first country to offer them. But they are not particularly interested in communism. They seek only a means to an end.

I submit that Project Concern and young men of Dr. Turpin's stature offer humanity everywhere a clear and obvious alternative to the evil of communism. He deserves a salute from all Americans.

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

Mr. BRADEMAs. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for what he has done in the well of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged as a guest of the gentleman from Indiana and his cohort to be present at Dr. Turpin's demonstration, his lecture, and his very fine plea for more consideration of the care of these people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, while I know of his work and what he does, and being one of the professionals and a physician in the Congress, I was deeply impressed and only today we have had the opportunity to visit off the floor of the House with another physician who is working in another continent of the world in a similar but not identical manner but which is the essence of American know-how and of people who want to care for people regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, source or any other reason, when they are in travail and when they are ill and when they need reconstructive surgery or medicine or what we have available.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people who are empowered with the God-given decree to go among the world and help be their brother's keepers and share the knowledge and be angelical in dispensing that which they have.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAs] upon what he has done in bringing Dr. Turpin to us and I commend all of these gentlemen, including those who work for CARE, on Project Hope, Moral Re-Arma-

ment, Medico, to say nothing of our military forces around the world who serve in medical capacities in order that others may live and enjoy good health. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I thank the gentleman, himself a distinguished physician and a Member of this House, for his gracious remarks. I am sure that the gentleman would not mind if in addition to the other splendid organizations which he cited we included another which is headed by the distinguished physician Dr. Peter Comanduras, known as Medico.

HUDSON RIVER—NEW CONSERVATION CHALLENGE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was privileged to present to the House the first section of a paper prepared by Mr. Irving Like for the Citizens Committee for the Hudson River. In this section, Mr. Like reviewed some of the history of the river and analyzed various official attitudes and actions for the river in past years.

In the next section, Mr. Like discusses current efforts to save the Hudson and analyzes the potential growth and development of the riverway under Federal programs such as that proposed in my Hudson Highlands national scenic riverway bill (H.R. 3012):

HUDSON RIVER—NEW CONSERVATION CHALLENGE: PART II

The Citizens' Committee for the Hudson River, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization of citizens of the Hudson River Valley, has been formed with the purpose of pressing for legislation which would create a national park and riverway or similar reservation to protect in perpetuity the unique scenic and historical resources of the Hudson River Valley.

This citizens' committee has undertaken to present the facts to the public regarding the Hudson River. In its first fact sheet, it stated the following: "The enormous outdoor recreation potential of the Hudson is virtually untapped. Due to neglect and pollution, natural values have been grossly underutilized and fisheries have been destroyed. The creation of a national riverway would signal the beginning of an imaginative effort to recapture these pleasures, to restore the ecology of the river and its environs and to rejuvenate its fishery and wildlife resources. It would lay the foundation for effective efforts to abate pollution and to assure clean water. It would pave the way for redevelopment of the blighted river shoreline, replacing eyesores with waterfront parks and marinas. The national riverway would link up beautifully with State and local parks, providing a continuous contiguous green belt of permanent open spaces and an efficiently administrable unit."

The citizens' committee has urged the following as the reason why legislation was necessary to protect the Hudson River Valley's natural and economic resources for the public use and benefit:

(A) To prevent:

1. The increasing and criminal abuse of the Hudson River Valley's natural resources by:

- (a) Water pollution by raw sewage and industrial wastes.
- (b) Air pollution from industrial parks.
- (c) Destruction of fish and wildlife due to neglect and pollution.

(d) Deterioration of shorelines and banks by junkyards, garbage dumps, debris, car graveyards, industrial waste, decaying structures, docks, and piers.

2. The private exploitation or abuse of lands, shores, and water by:

(a) Haphazard, unzoned establishment of industries, powerplants, housing developments, shopping centers, amusement parks, and piers.

(b) Unscrupulous land speculation on present large estates.

(B) To provide:

1. Planned and maintained recreational facilities—waterfront parks, marinas, fishing stations, excursion ports—with adequate access and transportation to such facilities. The rapidly growing population of metropolitan area with a projected increase of 21 million in 1980 creates an increasing demand for such facilities. (In Rockland County the projected increase by 1985 will be 350,000—a 155-percent increase from 1960). Creation of such facilities traditionally stimulates economy of nearby areas through increased tourism and its supporting activities, thus raising wages, business incomes and property values, increasing new community services, construction and local labor employment. The recently established Fire Island National Seashore will generate \$60 million for Long Island.

2. Adequately planned and zoned housing and industrial areas in order to attract new industries and homeowners.

3. The renovation and revitalization of old towns and communities, and the establishment of new towns.

4. The preservation and rehabilitation of historical sites of national significance.

5. The creation of a clean water supply not only for recreational purposes but as a source of potable urban water.

The recommendations of the citizens committee are feasible and are historically strongly rooted in the national policy.

As early as January 30, 1961, the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources issued a report (Rept. No. 29, Committee Print No. 17) in which it recommended: "The Federal Government, in co-operation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States. Such plans would take into account prospective demands for all purposes served through water development giving full recognition to non-revenue-yielding purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and keeping in mind the ultimate need for optimum development of all water resources."

On January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted its report, "Outdoor Recreation for America" to the President. The report surveyed the U.S. outdoor recreation resources, measured present and likely demands upon them for the next 40 years, and recommended actions to insure their availability to all Americans of present and future generations.

The following were a few of its major conclusions:

1. Outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas, where most of the people are.

2. The problem of meeting recreation need is not one of total acres but of effective acres.

3. Water is a focal point of outdoor recreation, most people engaging in water oriented activities.

4. Outdoor recreation brings about economic benefits, enhancing community values by creating a better place to live, increasing land values, and often acting as a mainstay of the local economy. It is a basis for big business as the millions seeking the outdoors generate an estimated \$20 million a year market for goods and services.

These were among its recommendations:

1. Immediate action should be taken by the Federal Government where necessary to reserve or acquire additional water and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population.

2. Certain rivers of unusual, esthetic, and recreation value should be allowed to remain in their free-flowing state and natural setting without manmade alterations.

3. Public agencies should assure adequate access to water-based recreation opportunities by acquisition of access areas, easements, zoning of shorelines, and consideration of water access in road design and construction.

4. Where feasible, concessioners should be encouraged to provide facilities and visitor services on Federal lands under appropriate supervision. Where this is not feasible, the Federal Government should build facilities and lease them to private business for operation.

5. Recreation areas should be strongly defended against encroachments from nonconforming uses both public and private.

6. In programs and projects for pollution control, recreation should be recognized as a motivating purpose and as a necessary objective in the allocation of funds therefor.

In its conclusions and recommendations, the Commission recognized water as a key element of recreation, thus following the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources (S. Rept. 29, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 30, 1961).

President Kennedy also recognized the cardinal importance of water resources. In his budget message, published in the New York Times, of January 19, 1962, the President called for increased emphasis to coordinated planning based on entire river basin areas and recommended legislation to combat water pollution and to provide water based recreational opportunity.

President Kennedy's conservation message, following soon after (New York Times, Mar. 2, 1962) noted that there were 341 million visitors to Federal land and water areas recorded in 1960, and that was expected to double by 1970, and to increase fivefold by 1980. He said (almost as if referring to the Hudson): "Our Nation's progress is reflected in the history of our great river systems. The water that courses through our rivers and streams holds the key to full national development."

The President urged legislation to develop a Federal-State shoreline preservation program.

The conservation policies of President Kennedy have been carried forth by President Johnson's administration. Pursuant to the ORRRC recommendations a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has started functioning within the Department of Interior. The first great river shoreline preservation legislation became history with the enactment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverway bill. A sound financial base for future acquisition of recreation opportunities was provided by the creation of the land and water conservation fund legislation.

The ORRRC report (pp. 75-80) traces and documents the economic value and benefits of outdoor recreation projects. It reports that city after city cite the experience—parks enhance the value of surrounding property. Minneapolis says that increased values in the

city amounted to several times the cost of the entire park system. Essex County, N.J., found that land adjacent to parks increased in value three times as fast as other property.

Following completion of seven large reservoirs in the Arkansas White-Red River Basins in the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Missouri, a comparative study was made of those counties with and those without significant reservoir shoreline. Those counties with shoreline exceeded the others in per capita income, annual wages, retail sales, bank deposits, taxes, and capital investment. Every economic sign indicates that the reservoir counties are better off.

Satisfying the demand for outdoor recreation is big business. According to ORRRC data, leisure time spending was estimated at \$30 billion in 1954, and is probably as much as \$40 billion today. Tourist expenditures have been estimated at about \$25 billion annually. In 1957, tourists were estimated to be spending at least a billion dollars a year visiting each of the States of New York, Florida, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. In 1959, \$1.5 billion was spent on outdoor recreation sporting goods. An estimated \$2.1 billion was spent at the retail level during 1958 for boats, engines, accessories, and other related items. Fishermen spend \$3 billion annually on their sport. Direct expenditures by Government for providing outdoor recreation were over a billion dollars in 1960. Visitors to Federal and State parks, forests, and reservoirs spend over \$11 billion annually. On the basis of these indicators and from general consideration of the field, consumer spending for outdoor recreation is now estimated to be about \$20 billion annually. The bulk of recreation expenditures go for food, lodging, transportation, boats, and other equipment. The expenditures of recreation seekers provide a significant element in the economic life of the community. In Teton County, Wyo., which contains the Grand Teton National Park and is adjacent to Yellowstone, in 1958, tourist expenditures of \$7 million produced a business of over \$12 million. In 1956, some 2.5 million persons visited the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and spent about \$28 million within an area extending 30 miles beyond the park boundaries. As the volume of recreation expands, it brings about additional capital investment. The desire of recreation seekers for a summer cabin or a second home near the attraction induces long-term capital investment, and provides a market for real estate, building and other materials and labor. The summer residents increase the population and bring that many more customers to local business.

In the case of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, according to data recorded over a 6-year period, tourist trade rose from 150 to 200 percent in the vicinity adjacent to the national seashore; taxable property increased in value 50 to 100 times as the park expanded the general economic activity of the region.

PROBABLE EFFECT OF SCENIC RIVERWAY ON HUDSON RIVER REGION

Based on past performances, there is every reason to believe that creation of a Hudson National Scenic Riverway would bring benefits to this region. The greatly increased number of visitors to the area would increase the demand for hotels, restaurants, motels, service stations, food stores and a multitude of other service establishments outside the proposed area. It would provide investment opportunities for local business and employment opportunities for local labor. With such development, land and building values in areas contiguous to the proposed riverway would appreciate, broadening the tax bases of local communities. Aside from tourist dollars and the income generated therefrom, there would be Federal expenditures

for capital improvements, with the possibility that a substantial portion of the contracts would be awarded locally. In the construction of buildings and other facilities, local materials and supplies would be used when practicable, thus creating a strong demand for local labor. National Park Service payrolls would amount to several hundred thousand dollars yearly and additional thousands would be spent each year locally for supplies and equipment needed to operate the proposed area.

Besides the economic benefits to the region generated by increased tourist expenditures and Federal Government expenditures, the presence of a national park would provide more people with a greater knowledge of the region's superior recreation advantages. Firms engaged in research and development activities tend to feature such advantages in their attempts to recruit key scientific and professional personnel. Thus an area of national significance might provide the stimulus for future development, of a nontourist type, that would aid in the diversification and stabilization of the regional economy.

The Hudson River region meets Federal criteria as an ideal recreation opportunity qualifying for favorable Federal financial consideration as a national riverway. A national park, as experience shows, is economically feasible and will be of great benefit to the Hudson River region in particular.

The State of New York has recognized that the Hudson River is a major river basin and a prime recreational resource.

On April 1, 1965, the Hudson Highlands Committee recommended to the State council of parks the acquisition for public park and recreational purposes of 17 sites on the west side of the Hudson River from Newburgh, N.Y., south to Edgewater, N.J., and 9 sites on the east side of the Hudson from Beacon to the Bronx. The magnitude of this committee's recommendations was indicated in the news accounts which reported that the cost of such acquisition would be about \$40 million.

In May of 1965, the State of New York adopted a far-reaching \$1.7 billion program to purify its polluted rivers including the Hudson.

BREAKTHROUGH TO THE HUDSON

The urgency for acquiring the remaining conservation opportunities available along the Hudson is inseparable from the desperate need for redevelopment and restoration of blighted areas along the river.

A dramatic account of what awaits the visitor to the Hudson Valley is contained in an editorial appearing on May 5, 1965, in the *Record*, a newspaper published in Hackensack, N.J., which editorial described Senator KENNEDY's May 2, 1965, tour of the Hudson Valley, in the following words:

"In the veritable Kennedy tradition, which is lavish, Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, served up food for thought during his weekend tour of the Hudson Valley."

"Item: He talked to a Haverstraw fisherman about the havoc done by pollution to the Hudson shad run, and if broiled shad isn't one of the great universals one cannot at this time of year imagine what would be."

"Item: He walked the banks of the river and found them a hideous succession of automobile graveyards."

"Item: He examined a sample of Hudson water, filthy with suspended pollution."

"Item: He talked with members of the Citizens Committee for the Hudson River about his and Senator JAVITS', Republican, of New York, bill to establish a Hudson riverway within whose 1-mile domain on each side of the river Federal agencies would impose stringent controls on industrial and commercial land use."

"Item: He ran up the steep hill to the lighthouse over the Stony Point battlefield."

"And, finally, item: At 10:40 p.m. he fell ill—'nauseous' was the word his press officer employed—and had to beg off a speech at a \$50-a-plate dinner for Representative JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York. He had to go back to his hotel. The 250 diners were unhappy."

"But there's food for thought. The newspapermen he left winded in the dash up the Stony Point steeps were in shape for the dinner. The Senator wasn't. Perhaps these data are insufficient as a footing for any conclusions as to the Kennedy cult of fitness. Perhaps the evidence indicates no more than that the condition of the Hudson Valley, so much of it majestic, so much of it a desert of junk and gunk and festering slum, is enough to turn the stomach of a fastidious man."

"It is trusted he's convinced something drastic must be done. Shad would be reason enough all by itself."

A more academic, but equally dramatic description of the deterioration of the opposite side of the Hudson River is given in a report prepared by Columbia University Professors Goodman and Kouzmanoff, entitled "Breakthrough to the Hudson." The Columbia report, however, contains a hopeful note. It gives a preview of what the Hudson River area could be like if imaginatively planned and redeveloped. It is this need for redevelopment which makes the Hudson River opportunity so challenging but yet so promising.

The problem of redevelopment immediately raises the question of what level of government or combination can best undertake the goal of preservation and restoration. Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, on January 26, 1965, said: "I am not convinced as yet as to the best device for carrying out this goal, or whether it should be local, State, or Federal Government, or a combination of these. This is a problem which will require enlightened and imaginative study."

Congressman JOHN G. DOW, who represents the districts in which Orange and Rockland Counties are located, on the west side of the river, has also addressed himself to the problem of what type of governmental authority could best undertake the solution of the Hudson River problem. On February 9, 1965, he said:

"Of all the types of authority available for our consideration, I like the Delaware River Basin compact best. It places the authority at one stage removed from either one State or Federal, since all are represented."

"It seems to me that the States of New York and New Jersey and the Federal could be partners in a Hudson Riverway Authority."

And on March 14, 1965, Mr. Dow said:

"A vast and comprehensive reclamation program is urgently needed. A program to create a park, with spacious beaches and other necessities for recreation is a first step of a long series of steps that must follow. Such a program will enlist the thinking of planners, industrialists, historians, conservationists and politicians."

Mr. Dow then raised the specific question of who should administer such a program. He said:

"A scenic Hudson can be achieved if arrangement is made to plan in all these other directions that are needed. Authority for this, under the master legislation, will be better accepted all-around, if the several political entities which are involved formed a compact. Such was done upon the Delaware River through the Delaware River Basin Compact. There the several States involved have signed a compact with the Federal Government. The Federal authority is equal to the others, but not paramount."

"Recognition of the State of New York at least on an equal footing with Federal is desirable not only in the composition of a Hudson River authority, but even more so

in the present initial stages of the whole endeavor. This is the stage for securing passage of the legislation. State of New York legislators want a State commission to protect the Hudson. The congressional bills offer a Federal authority. The Palisades Interstate Park Commission has shown that it will uphold responsibilities in this area. Perhaps the Taconic Park Commission is interested. Local communities have a stake. When all of these can be brought together in some official or unofficial concord, the problem will be solved. People like to be consulted in advance."

"We should make approaches to these several agencies. Unofficial links should be woven if official ones do not succeed. I suggest that the U.S. Department of the Interior, to which the National Park Service reports, the Department of Conservation of the State of New York, the Palisades Interstate and other Commissions, also legislators at the Federal and State levels from the Hudson shores, be brought together for discussion."

"Certainly let's proceed with hearings on the bills now offered. Out of these hearings the same consensus may emerge as we'd expect from a meeting of interested parties as I suggest. However, much may be gained from now, at once, approaching those parties that I have indicated. This would be additional to hearings on the bills. We can ask the parties for their suggestions on ways to proceed. We can ask them to join a planning group. No time need be wasted. We can begin at once."

McFADDEN DUFFY, COLUMNIST FOR THE TIMES-PICAYUNE IN NEW ORLEANS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, McFadden Duffy is a columnist for the Times-Picayune in New Orleans, which is the largest newspaper in Louisiana.

For years Mr. Duffy has kept the reading public aware and up to date on the many developments of interest to sportsmen and others who maintain an interest in the preservation of our natural resources.

In a recent column, which was one of a series of articles concerning the so-called Dodd bill—gun legislation—Mr. Duffy quotes from a statement by our colleague, Congressman T. A. THOMPSON from the Seventh District of Louisiana, in this regard.

I wish to commend this article to the attention of the membership of this body:

[From the Times Picayune, May 1965]

BASIC REASON OF FIREARM LAW SHOULD BE FOR PUBLIC SAFETY

(By McFadden Duffy)

Congressman T. A. THOMPSON, Seventh Congressional District, Louisiana, was the first Louisiana Member of Congress to react publicly to the threat of the proposed sweeping legislation.

"The so-called Dodd bill, which places severe restrictions on the purchase and use of firearms of all types, is currently pending before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and will, if acted upon favor-

ably, be referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. If passed by the Senate, it would be referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I wish this legislation could be referred to my subcommittee," Representative THOMPSON said. "I would do my best to kill the legislation in committee before it would even reach the floor of the House for consideration."

"In my opinion . . . our Constitution clearly establishes the right of citizens to bear arms. If citizens should be required to register every gun, regardless of the purpose for which it is used, it would provide the Government with a national inventory of privately owned firearms," THOMPSON continued.

"Not only would we have to establish, in essence, a firearm registration agency, to maintain such an inventory, but this could possibly be very dangerous. History has shown in some areas that it was partially through such registration and control of all weapons by a very small percentage of the populace that the democratic form of government was lost."

"For these reasons, and countless others, it is my intention to employ every means at my command to defeat this unrealistic and objectionable legislation. I believe that the authors of this legislation planned it as a deterrent to crime; but it can be reasonably predicted that anyone with criminal intent could, in spite of such legislation and controls, avail himself of a gun either through blackmarket maneuvers or by theft—defeating the purpose of the legislation."

"It is my opinion," he concluded, "that if effective control over certain firearms is to be had, this authority should rest within the jurisdiction of the duly constituted officials of cities, counties, and States."

The statement by Representative T. A. THOMPSON is similar to a welling up of public statements by Members of Congress, local, State, and National groups deeply interested in all aspects of firearms possession, collection, and use.

UNITED STATES DISCOVERING TRUE FRIENDS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the May 10 Houston Post wholeheartedly expresses more adequately than I my appraisal of President Johnson's policy in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic.

President Johnson's display of courage in these two disturbed portions of the world deserves the strong support of us all. This courage has been displayed in the face of so-called world opinion, as well as a dissident section of our own citizens. But by the same token, he has again solidified the strength of this Nation in a resolve such as it has not been strengthened since World War II.

President Johnson has shown that we will no longer be the patsy or the door-mat for every rabble rouser who feels that he can tear the peace of this world asunder without being called to account.

I heartily recommend the reading of this editorial by my colleagues of the

House, which I have the pleasure to insert at this point:

UNITED STATES DISCOVERING TRUE FRIENDS

One thing that can be said with certainty about recent events in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic is that the United States is finding out who its real friends are and who is really dedicated to defending freedom against Communist tyranny.

President Johnson, in a long series of speeches and statements, has made it crystal clear that so long as he is in the White House this country's government will not hesitate or flinch for a moment in doing whatever in his judgment has to be done, which is to say whatever the Communists make it necessary for the United States to do in order to protect its own security and interests, resist Communist aggression, defend freedom, keep its commitments and help those countries that want to be helped in defending their own independence.

He has made it just as clear that he is not going to be deterred by that nebulous and fickle thing known as world opinion, which is subject to Communist influence and manipulation, and which Communist leaders long have tried to use as a form of pressure against this country.

It is not that President Johnson is oblivious to world opinion. In fact, there probably never has been an American President who is more sensitive to what others think of his actions and policies or who has gone to greater lengths to try to win approval. But he has shown and said that he will not let disapproval keep him from doing what he believes is both right and necessary.

Moreover, he has stated very candidly that, since this country must bear the main burden for the defense of the free world whether it likes the responsibility or not, he feels that it has a right to expect understanding and support from its true friends and the beneficiaries of its policies.

He expressed this feeling very pointedly in his state of the Union message when he said: "We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interest, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad. A community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it."

There is certainly nothing unreasonable about expecting one's friends to rally to one's support when the chips are down in a crucial confrontation or test of determination between the forces of freedom and those of tyranny. If they cannot give that support, they at least can keep silent.

No one expects unanimity, and there is no such thing as infallible judgment. There is always the possibility of equally effective alternatives. But differences in viewpoint, opinion and judgment can be presented in such a way as not to give aid, comfort and help to the common enemy.

Perhaps there is no such thing as morality in international relations, but there can be loyalty.

IOWA FARM POLL INDICATES STRONG SUPPORT FOR FOOD-FOR-PEACE AND FEED GRAINS PROGRAM, OPPOSITION TO SOY-BEANS ON DIVERTED ACRES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, as we prepare to consider pending agriculture legislation, the results of a poll of agricultural producers in southeast Iowa for which I received over 1,500 returns during the past few weeks.

In answer to the question, "Do you favor the continuation and improvement of the present feed grains program?" 86 percent of the 1,519 responders answered in the affirmative. In answer to the question, "Do you favor the proposal to permit soybeans to be grown on diverted acres?" a resounding 82 percent responded in the negative. Most promising for the future of both our foreign policy and our agriculture program is the overwhelming 88 percent who favored expanding the food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. An additional 81 percent favored strengthening, rather than weakening, our worthy conservation programs. On this latter question, I received a great many thoughtful letters suggesting that the conservation program be strengthened in order to fulfill direct conservation goals, such as developing sound watershed projects. These letters were equally strong in suggesting that those portions of the program which have been used to increase agricultural production be modified. I recommend these viewpoints for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

For those who have criticized our fine feed grains program I would like to point out that the stability and strength of our agricultural economy is basic to the overall growth of our national economy. Earlier this year, a fairminded urban newspaper, the Washington Post, recognized this when it stated:

Every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of non-agricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified.

On the basis of these considerations, I urge you to support attempts to strengthen our agricultural program.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXX

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is another in the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article—as others in the series—concerns the narcotics problem and appeared in the Tribune on April 6, 1965. The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—ADDICTION: MAYOR'S MAZE OF CONFERENCES

(NOTE.—Ultimate responsibility for solving New York's narcotics problems rests in one

man—Mayor Wagner. Yet, his characteristic weapon in the battle has been words rather than action. In this, another in a series of "New York City in Crisis" articles on narcotics, Reporter Paul Weissman tells the story of what the Mayor and his administration have—and haven't—done about the blight that has made New York the criminal addiction capital of the Western World.)

(By Paul Weissman)

Dressed in a blue suit, button down shirt, blue-black rep tie and black tasseled loafers, the mayor of the city of New York walked into the New York Hilton Hotel on February 3, 1965, at 10:35 a.m. He took the escalator to the Sutton Ballroom on the second floor and began shaking hands.

"Jim, how are you?" he asked Welfare Commissioner James R. Dumpson. "I see you're smiling." Mr. Dumpson was. A 28-day strike in his department had just been settled.

In the main ballroom, the mayor nodded to Correction Commissioner Anna Kross, Judge John M. Murtaugh, and Police Commissioner Michael Murphy, who sat in the first row with his arms folded across his chest. Rev. Oberia Dempsey, organizer of a halfway house for addicts in Harlem, was waiting by the dais to shake his hand. The mayor's seat was on the dais. On his right, City Narcotics Coordinator Dr. Catherine Hess. On his left, Health Commissioner Dr. George James, and Hospital Commissioner Dr. Ray Trussell. In front of him, 200 narcotics experts and a battery of television cameras.

The ballroom was impressive and so was the brass as the mayor prepared to open the Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction, an event carefully designed in the mayor's office to show that his administration was coming to grips with New York's growing addiction problem and its most drastic consequence: Crime in the streets. But though it was held under the auspices of the health department, that department's officials had not been notified of the conference's existence until 10 days before. Suggestions for postponements were rejected. The need—to convince the public the city had a program—was great, it was said. Budget limitations a problem? Charge the conference to the department of public events. More time needed to arrange for distinguished foreign speakers? Get other speakers.

And so at 10:45 a.m., "Your Honor, the Mayor" was introduced by Dr. Catherine Hess.

A STRANGE SPEECH

The conference had begun. And for the next 20 minutes, Robert F. Wagner slowly read a 29-page statement printed in quarter-inch block type. It was one of the strangest speeches New York's mayor has ever delivered. At once, he described addiction as a "raging problem," then said it was not widely known, then noted that the incidence of "narcotics addiction has greatly decreased since the twenties."

The mayor said the city had initiated programs, but he looked to the conference for "directions." He said the city now had hospital facilities for addicts "that increased from 25 beds in 1959 to 300 by February 1965." The city has other programs and the mayor mentioned them all: the West Side rehabilitation program, the intake centers, the hospital detoxification programs, the experiments on withdrawing addicts from heroin by using methadone, a substitute drug.

The mayor said Dr. Hess "had provided both the leadership and the coordinated effort that are so desperately needed in this field," and asked the conference to answer specific questions dealing with the relationship between crime and addiction, the sig-

nificance of teenage addiction, and whether the addict is "a criminal, a sick individual, or a sick criminal."

What the mayor was talking about was not a new problem in New York, even though he appeared to be treating it that way. Largely eliminated by cessation of sea and air travel during World War II, narcotics addiction had mushroomed to a serious problem in the city by 1950. Until July 1952, when the city initiated a \$4 million program at Riverside Hospital, addicts either withdrew "cold turkey" in jail or, if they were not arrested, volunteered for admission to the Federal narcotics hospital in Lexington, Ky.

RIVERSIDE CATASTROPHE

Riverside was open only to adolescent users. There were no facilities at all for adult addicts. The facility was finally closed on May 3, 1963 and even Mayor Wagner admits "generally speaking, it was a failure." It was, in fact, a catastrophe. Addicts were permitted to come and go as they pleased. Often when they came back from outside they brought heroin. Other addicts treated at Riverside report guards abetted sales. Female patients became pregnant. The cure rate was almost nil. It has even been argued that by mixing addicts from all over the city, public officials actually contributed to increased addiction by creating a circumstance in which addicts readily became more knowledgeable. After Riverside was closed, the city transferred its staff to other city facilities.

But appeals to city hall for leadership in the fight against narcotics addiction began long before Riverside was closed. They first became intense during Mayor Wagner's second term. Ministers, teachers, and others wrote to the mayor saying they were fearful then—it was 1957—of the grip heroin had begun to take on their communities. As far as can be determined, their letters went largely unanswered.

The mayor did not respond fully until 1959, when 200 pickets from an East Harlem Protestant parish marched on city hall. Then Mr. Wagner did something. He agreed to meet with 35 representatives of Protestant churches to set up "a broad program of rehabilitation."

Nothing happened.

A year later, in a "Report to the People," Mr. Wagner viewed the narcotics problem, particularly among teenagers, as "even more critical than in previous years." That was 1960. At his 1965, Gracie Mansion Narcotics Conference, he said, the number of addicts had been increasing only during the last 2 years, 1963 and 1964.

The mayor campaigned for a third term in 1961. He formed a "task force" for the organization of medical services for addicts and promised to move quickly on broad aspects of the narcotics problem. Indeed, he made his intentions part of a strong, anti-crime platform.

"These addicts are responsible for much lawlessness," he said typically a few weeks before election day, 1961. "Depraved and reckless, they must be confined to proper hospitals."

No one questioned then whether the addict was "a criminal, a sick individual, or a sick criminal." The mayor was going to get him off the streets. But the mayor did not say how he would have it done or where he planned to send addicts.

By March 12, 1962, the heat of the campaign was over and the reelected Mayor Wagner began implementing his pledge, though not quite in the way he had promised. He said now the city would come to grips with "the vexing, baffling, and tragic problem of narcotic traffic." Mr. Wagner did not now say he was going to curb lawlessness. He appointed Dr. Theodore Rosenthal, a deputy

commissioner of the health department, as the city's first narcotics coordinator, and announced there would be a "wide range of new and supplementary projects."

He said neighborhood narcotics treatment centers had been developed (they hadn't: the city had only 1 day-care center with a maximum caseload of 100 and no facilities for women), established Box "N" at police headquarters for narcotics information, and announced an expanded information center and a beefed-up narcotics squad.

There was also a 1962 narcotics conference and a council of neighborhood service agencies to deal with addiction. Individually, these agencies have become the most vociferous critics of city hall's failure to implement a narcotics program. The mayor also said he would "double the number of beds" available for addicts. He did and the city now has 300. It sounded like a massive program. It wasn't. Virtually no serious provision or treatment was made for addicts after they were withdrawn from drugs and left the hospital.

Mayor Wagner kept talking.

"We will continue to regard addicts as persons afflicted with disease and not criminals," said the mayor one day in 1962 and then almost as if he had forgotten, a while later estimated, for the first time, that New York's addicts "steal about \$1 billion a year to support their habit."

The mayor's seeming contradiction reflects the great debate that has developed among people concerned with addiction: Are addicts depraved and reckless criminals or are they afflicted with a disease?

PROGRAMS ON PAPER

Curiously, the debate has had relatively little to do with how addicts are to be treated, since in actual practice almost no facilities have existed. Instead of acting as a goad to the creation of either prison or hospital facilities in which the addict could be treated and—at least as important—studied, the debate actually has become a deterrent. As long as medical people cannot answer this basic question, the mayor is saying, in effect, that it is impossible to implement a program.

But as this debate has paralyzed hopes for a real program, it has also frustrated attempts of researchers and others working in the field to develop meaningful research programs that might provide an answer to the nature of addiction in New York. The result is that for all intensive purposes, the information that is now available is useless in recommending programs. For example, after 10 years of a growing narcotics problem, virtually no clinical statistics are available that would provide valid insights into possible courses for treatment.

In any case, the city's programs continued to exist only on paper, even as the mayor was saying firmly that he would like to "have New York City lead the way in this field (narcotics) as in other regards."

The mayor led the way—to a bigger and better conference. At his request, President Kennedy called a White House Conference on Narcotics. A principal speaker was Robert F. Wagner.

There were other speeches. Addiction became at once "a tangled forest" and later, with apologies to Winston Churchill who said it first about something else, "a riddle wrapped in an enigma at the center of a mystery."

By 1964, the city council began to stir. Legislation was introduced to effect narcotics control. But it was never passed.

"Screwane (Council President Paul Screwane) told us to hold off for a while," one councilman says. "He said the mayor was coming out with something big."

This promise of "something big" was fulfilled on October 27, the day the mayor delivered his annual report. He said, "the city government is working hard at this problem both in research and practice, both in treating the addicts and in pursuing and encouraging the search for the causes and cures of addiction."

In order to coordinate information and research, the mayor said, he had "agreed to call and sponsor a major conference in New York City to decide on actions that may be considered desirable." He announced that he would call a Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics "sometime in the month of January."

Either city officials by now had become inulated to announcements by the mayor, or City Hall simply forgot to tell the health department. No preparations were made. No speakers were invited.

Actual dates for the conference did not come in an announcement either from City Hall or the health department. They came about this way:

On December 3, Mayor Wagner went to dinner in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Astor. He was attending the Humanitarian Award Dinner in his honor given on behalf of the National Association for the Prevention of Addiction to Narcotics.

The mayor told the group he had directed that the views of the interested voluntary agencies and organizations "be solicited in the planning and programing" and announced the conference would be held for 3 days starting February 3. Dr. Catherine Hess, the city's narcotics coordinator, he said, would organize the conference in consultation with the interdepartmental health council.

In January, Dr. Ray Trussell, as current chairman of the council, wrote to city hall and suggested the conference be postponed so that experts might be invited from all over the world. City hall refused. Several voluntary agencies reported they were never consulted regarding planning or programing and, in fact, were made aware of the conference less than 10 days before it was scheduled to begin when they were invited as speakers. Staff members within the narcotics coordinators' office say they strongly recommended that Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and Dr. Kenneth Clark be invited to speak, but both were rejected.

So the meeting went on as scheduled.

After the mayor's keynote address, six panels, each including several speakers, were held each day in which law enforcement, society's attitude towards addicts, Federal, State, and city treatment programs, the work of voluntary agencies and similar topics were discussed.

A large majority of the speakers had heard each other before and had appeared on platforms at a dozen different seminars. Many of them complained the conference had offered little new. On the second day of the meeting the mayor invited the participants to Gracie Mansion for a cocktail party.

"Some day," one city official said, "that guy may have enough guts to play it straight. Then he'll call a conference to end all conferences and be done with wasting our time for good."

There were 200 people from all over New York at Gracie Mansion for cocktails that day. City officials, politicians, representatives of voluntary agencies and friends of the mayor chatted amiably as they munched catered cheese bits and shrimp.

An hour after the party began, the group was gathered in the west wing of Gracie Mansion. Looking straight at autographed pictures presented to him by King Baudouin of Belgium and the Prince and Princess of Monaco, the mayor said he was going to create a "working panel" to assess the work of the conference. He appointed city council pres-

ident Paul Screvane, who is chairman of more committees than anyone else in New York and perhaps the universe, head of still a new committee: "The Temporary Gracie Mansion Committee on Narcotics."

A white Protestant minister, working in the narcotics field in New York for almost a decade who had expected some tangible results from the conference, reacted this way:

"I thought I'd puke," he said:

No; he did not want to make his reaction less graphic, or under the circumstances, did he think it necessary to be more specific.

QUESTIONS REPEATED

The conference then returned to the Hilton for a final day of meetings and, when it was over, Dr. Hess delivered the city's promised "action packet" on narcotics. But this did no more than restate the objectives of the conference and repeat the questions Mayor Wagner had asked the conference to answer particularly this one: Was the addict a criminal, a sick criminal, or a sick person?

Some weeks later, Mr. Screvane's small steering committee held its first meeting. A member gave this report:

"Edelstein (Julius C. C. Edelstein, the mayor's executive assistant) was there and I never expected him to be as frank as he was. He said it was an election year and the city had to come up with something big for narcotics. He said it had to be 'newsworthy.'"

Another member of the committee says Mr. Screvane already knows which programs will be announced as public pressure increases: Extension of the Daytop Lodge program, a project started by the Kings County Department of Correction for Juvenile Addicts; and further development of the use of "methadone" as a substitute drug in the ambulatory treatment of addicts and a "half-way house" program. But, he says, the city will not subsidize half-way houses until it can find a way of "approving" all of the people employed in them.

In recent weeks, there have been reports that there will be an \$8 million wing addition to a city hospital to deal only with narcotics. If this wing is constructed, it will be as a result of the same factor that has guided all narcotics programs in New York in the last decade: mounting public pressure, not serious, careful, thorough research and analysis.

No real progress can be made by such a step because the city still has no real information concerning patterns of addiction, the number of addicts, the degree of their addiction, or the relationship between addiction and crime.

Some critics have gone as far as to charge that the city refuses to acknowledge that a narcotic problem in fact even exists. This is too stern a view. Existence of the problem is not the issue, doing something meaningful—and not just political—about it is.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART LXXXI

MR. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the fight against dope addiction in New York City and is another in the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article appeared in the Tribune on April 7, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY'S DOPE- ADDICTION FIGHT: A POLICE ACTION, NOT A WAR

(By Paul Weissman, of the Herald Tribune staff)

This is the story of how the war on narcotics addiction is going in the office of the narcotics coordinator, the city agency primarily responsible for the battle against the addiction in New York.

It takes place in the command post of the agency whose work will hopefully result in a decline of the \$1 billion Mayor Wagner says addicts steal every year to support their habit.

The general in charge of this office is Dr. Catherine Hess, a former obstetrician, who Mayor Wagner selected to replace Dr. Theodore Rosenthal in April 1962 as the city's narcotics coordinator. (The only official requirement for the job—a deputy health commissioner—is a medical degree.)

She is paid \$20,000 a year as this city's narcotics expert and this is her view of the relationship between narcotics and crime:

"Crime is just plain increasing everywhere," she says. "It's not my addicts that are stealing. Of course, my addicts are stealing, but they're not responsible for the crime rate."

In the 3 years that Dr. Hess has held the job, narcotics in New York has become her field, one in which she is the main source of information, the principal person Mayor Wagner relies on to evaluate programs. This, at least, is the view of many competent professional observers.

The headquarters for this operation is a fourth-floor office at 325 Broadway and one day not long ago, this is the way Dr. Hess described New York's addiction problem and addiction program:

"How many addicts do we really have? Close to 25,000," she said. (Other estimates range as high as 200,000. Police unofficially put the number at 100,000 addicts in New York. Dr. Hess' estimate is based on the 23,000 unduplicated names of addicts reported in the health department central registry.)

"Ninety-eight percent of our addicts are school dropouts. We detoxify 7,500 of them every year." (Though Dr. Hess did not mention it, more than half the addicts that voluntarily go to hospitals are repeaters.) "There are 800 State and city beds available to us" (300 are city beds). "Manhattan General tries to keep them 21 days, Metropolitan Hospital 6 weeks. We are going to make Metropolitan New York's addiction hospital."

A jolly woman, Dr. Hess will tilt back her chair as she answers a phone call and say: "Why sure I'm fine. I'm sittin' here in New York givin' fixes right and left."

When the call is completed, Dr. Hess, who on the day she was interviewed, wore her leather wallet tucked in her belt Gary Cooper style, began twisting the opal ring on her left pinky. She said she had to disagree with Mayor Wagner, if he said addicts commit half the crimes in New York City. "Quite frankly," she added, "I don't think narcotics addiction is increasing in New York."

BUSY PARENTS

A 49-year-old spinster, Dr. Hess blames the rise in teenage addiction on "a change in parental authority." She says, laughing as if she were still joking about "giving fixes right and left," that parents today are too busy to bother with their children. "They all say to their kids, 'here's 2 bucks. Go out and have some fun.'"

Dr. Hess does not dispute the need for research, but she says a great deal is known about addiction.

"I know what the addict's life is like," she says. "He gets up at 6 a.m. and his skin pops. Then he has to find a fence and get his orders for the day. He fools the police, and if he's a booster, he fools storekeepers. When he's successful, he gets money for his shot. Of course, it's absolutely no fun doing it yourself so you've got to find some friends."

"What people don't understand is this thrill of stealing—this thrill of beating police. I have to meet this excitement. I have to meet this with meaningful values where there were no values. I have to teach him how to dress. I have to teach him how to hold a fork. I have to teach him how to deal with all the things he's solving with a shot."

The problem is, as other medical authorities have pointed out, that there are many kinds of addicts and a hundred causes why people who are addiction-prone turn to heroin. The availability of drugs in some communities is a major factor. The use of drugs by "leaders" of teenage gangs is another. But in all cases, psychiatrists are almost universally convinced addicts are using drugs to cope with tremendous internal pressures that arise from deeply rooted psychological problems.

To come to grips with the problems of addiction, New York City has extremely limited facilities. It has 300 beds at Manhattan General and Metropolitan hospitals. Intake centers, that refer addicts to these hospitals for withdrawal from drugs, are maintained in central Harlem, Astoria, and Washington Heights. Other addicts are accepted when they are referred by recognized voluntary agencies, among them East Harlem Protestant Parish, Teen Challenge, the Salvation Army, and the Greek Pentecostal Church, all of whom maintain their own programs to combat addiction.

Because most of the research work, in practice, is conducted independently of the narcotics coordinators office, Dr. Hess occasionally does not refer to it in describing the city's program. It has led some voluntary agencies to complain that the city's approach to addiction is virtually incoherent.

Dr. Hess, in the interview, rubbed her eyes with her knuckles, leaned forward and rested her head on her elbows, and said the charge just wasn't true.

"As long as you've got addicts to go for the hospital they're off the street," she said. "That's our basic operating theory."

"Let him free for 24 hours," Dr. Hess says of the addict, "and they're nudging him. Let's try one. Let's just try one shot."

Dr. Hess agrees that halfway houses—voluntary guidance clinics must play a major role in the city's program.

"They all need funds. They all need guidelines. But we also have to see that certain standards are met before we can help them. We have to try to give them the benefit of our experience. They must have good structured programs."

What standards have to be met?

"Why they have to meet the sanitary code, the health code and the fire code," she said.

But halfway houses generally do their work in the slums. What of teenage addiction in better-income groups?

TEENAGERS

"I frankly admit I just don't know what my problem with the middle class is," says Dr. Hess. But she does know the problem with teenagers: "How do I prevent these kids," is the way she puts it, "from using everything under the sun?"

In her fight against addiction, Dr. Hess speaks on an average of once a week, sometimes more often, to any group, large or small, that requests a speaker on narcotics, from the health department. She has also commissioned a freelance writer to prepare five pamphlets for the narcotics coordinator's office. They deal with, she says, pep pills,

barbituates, marihuana, narcotics, and alcoholism. But Dr. Hess has not consulted public information experts in the health department on how the booklets should be prepared, or who should do them.

Dr. Hess says she agrees with most of the medical profession that marihuana is less dangerous than heroin and its usage does not deeply trouble her.

"You take a street like 100th Street in central Harlem," she says, "practically all of them are smoking marihuana. Say 2,000 people. Only 10 percent of them become heroin addicts."

But marihuana at present is an illegal drug. Did Dr. Hess not feel the law should be enforced?

"Well," she said, "probably you and I commit all kinds of criminal acts every day. Society has become more permissive."

When halfway houses actually become part of a city program, Dr. Hess has this plan for using them:

"We can put the addict in the slot where he will do well, I intend to make this selection in a hospital setting. I might send an addict, for example, to East Harlem Protestant Parish. If he fails and goes back on drugs, quick, right away, I make a home visit and try to find the cause of failure. Then I decide which slot to try him in next."

Meanwhile, New York has no organized halfway house program, and Dr. Hess' office does no more than warn voluntary agencies when a patient they have referred to a city hospital is being released. Other addicts are referred to the West Side Rehabilitation Center at 96th Street and Broadway in Manhattan, the city's only facility for posthospital care.

But 21 days or 6 weeks after an addict enters a city hospital to withdraw from drugs, if he voluntarily remains for the full period of treatment, he is back on the streets again. The narcotics coordinators office does two things. If the patient was referred by a voluntary agency, the agency is immediately notified that he is about to be released. Those that are admitted from one of the city's four intake centers are told to report to the West Side Rehabilitation Center at 96th Street and Broadway in Manhattan. The center—the only municipal one in the city—comprises 5,000 square feet in what was once a bowling alley that burned out a few months before it was opened. The addicts who report within 24 hours are examined, processed and put on welfare roles. Periodically, urine samples are taken to test whether they have remained off drugs. This test is supposedly a condition of welfare eligibility.

Until 8 months ago, the center's technique of collecting urine samples was easily foiled by addicts who did not want to stay clean. A "black market" in "clean urine" developed in the neighborhood. The price for a sample was 50 cents. Samples are now collected under the direct observation of one of the center's staff members.

Mayor Wagner has said, not without pride, that West Side is the only rehabilitation center of its kind in the United States. It is. The only trouble is that the rehabilitation work it does is almost nil.

An addict who reports there for the first time comes from the subway at 96th Street and Broadway. On both sides of the avenue as he exits are cafeterias, which he has been told at times were two of the best places to "cop" heroin in the city. Police in the 24th precinct have recently kept the area clear of sellers, but the corner is still a gathering place for addicts and ex-addicts.

A NO. 25 SPIKE

Standing in front of the entrance to the center, street talk is invariably drug talk. Nellie, a 60-year-old addict, says she got a new No. 25 "spike" (hypodermic) for Christmas. Jack wants to talk about the great days of addiction and the times he had when

"stuff" was real stuff. Other addicts talk about the Federal hospital in Lexington and doctors they know on a first-name basis.

The patient making his first trip to West Side, when he finishes lounging around in front, walks up one flight of stairs to the center itself. Directly in front of him is a wall. On his right is a commercial pool hall. On his left is a large white door that is always locked. Faced with this alternative, dozens of addicts assume the center is closed and go home. Some discover that the facilities entrance is around the stair well at the opposite end of the building.

The inside of the center might be a locker room. The entire facility is one huge room, separated into offices, examining sections, and a recreation room separated by beaverboard partitions. The first sign he sees amid the bulletin boards in the reception room says: "Ladies room. Only one person allowed in this room at a time. If you violate this rule you will be told to leave the center."

His second greeting comes from one of the two receptionists whose desks are in the waiting room. While he waits to be registered and examined, he notices a ping pong table in the recreation room. No one is playing ping pong, but he sees four or five men he may know sitting on chairs near it, looking uncomfortable, with little more to do than read a magazine.

Sherman Patrick, executive director of the center, has an office in one of the partitioned sections. He has a note on his desk from Dr. Hess, his immediate superior. It says bluntly: "I would like you to stress as many positive aspects of the program as possible."

The pay in this job is \$9,800 a year, but Sherman Patrick looks at the memorandum as if it were a coffee stain on his desk. He begins to describe facilities, group therapy, and the center's limited recreation facilities and the role they play in the center's program. In theory, it all sounds very good.

"You better ask me questions," Mr. Patrick, a scholarly Negro researcher says, waving the memorandum from his superior. "You better ask me questions if we're going to talk about this program at all."

City records indicate that about 1,000 addicts report to the West Side Rehabilitation Center each year and give the impression that the figure represents the number of addicts in a rehabilitation program of some kind. Mr. Patrick said this is an inaccurate impression. The great bulk of those who report are examined, placed on welfare rolls, and told to check in regularly to deposit urine specimens. That is the extent of their rehabilitation. Only 37 male patients are in a day-care program of any kind because of the limited facilities. The center has absolutely no day-care facilities for women.

Between 40 and 45 people are employed by the city at West Side although the figure changes because it is frequently difficult to fill jobs already in the budget. A substantial portion of the \$789,979 in the health department's 1964-65 budget for addictive diseases is used to pay these people.

Some others who work at West Side are on the department of hospital's pay roll. Even in such a limited facility as West Side, paperwork is such a factor that a person is employed almost full time, Mr. Patrick says, merely to account for the half-dozen people on the hospital payroll.

Though this is a center where a primary concern is recordkeeping and research work, three of the four stenographers assigned to the unit cannot even type.

For more than a year, a full-time social-worker was included in departmental budgets for the center, but no one was hired. This was typical of the limitations under which the center had to operate. The center still has no occupational or vocational therapist, though such skilled people are crucial to any rehabilitation program.

What West Side does have is a number of doctors paid to devote a specific number of man-hours to work at the center. They examine and treat patients for physical diseases, supervise limited group therapy sessions with patients in the day-care program and occasionally treat a patient on an individual basis.

Because payroll represents more than 90 percent of Dr. Hess' budget for addictive diseases, West Side is pitifully lacking in physical facilities. Its budget request, submitted to Dr. Hess on October 19, 1964, tells part of the story. In addition to requests for an occupational therapist, the center said it needed such basic materials as nine desks for staff members, a conference table, a half dozen lamps, and three filing cabinets to add to the one allotted for the entire facility. Cooking, one of the therapeutic activities Dr. Hess has prescribed for patients, also creates some problems. As the budget pointed out, the only room available for this was without windows or proper ventilation and the center had no fan.

West Side's present facilities include a ping-pong table, a television set donated by a staff member, and a magazine reading rack. It has no real recreational facilities. It has no facilities for woodworking, machine lathing, or any other machinery that could be used to provide addicts with work in which they might take pride.

But despite the center's handicaps, Mr. Patrick says there are patients who, after a year in the day-care program, are ready to be trained for a job. But there is literally no place in the city of New York for them to go.

"It's like Charley Brown and the football," Mr. Patrick says. "Here this guy has worked to keep himself clean and we've spent time and money to help him keep clean and help him get at some of his problems. He's ready to move ahead and he steps up to kick the ball. What happens? Somebody pulls it away and he falls flat on his face. Where does he go? Back on drugs."

Another problem tends to further distort the city's official picture of the addict. The average age of patients at West Side is 37, almost 20 years older than the younger addicts police believe are at the root of the crime problem. Most doctors believe that, after 35, addicts tend to "mature out" on their own, change their values, and give up drugs. The age of its patients are another factor in the meaninglessness of the West Side program.

NO PLACE TO GO

"We're supposed to be a rehabilitation center," says Mr. Patrick, "and we get people in an age group that have the least potential for rehabilitation. They're not only the oldest, but the people with the fewest skills. And even when we do succeed, there is just no place to send them."

New York's narcotics coordinator may or may not know all this. She visited the city's only rehabilitation center exactly twice last year, once for a Christmas party and once to introduce a consultant from her hometown, Philadelphia. Dr. Hess is the central official source of narcotics information in New York City, but she also has not held a single full staff conference in the last year, and many on the staff say that this has not helped morale any.

New York's narcotics addiction problem is indeed, in the mayor's words, a "tangled forest." But the tangle does not arise simply because there is no absolute cure, no single solution to narcotics addiction. Most experts agree that there are many paths to follow to a solution, many programs that could facilitate real care and possibly even cures for addicts.

But part of the trouble is that basic research the city might have done, and could still do, is totally lacking. More of the

trouble is with the inability to develop meaningful programs even within facilities, like West Side, that the city is providing funds to support.

Exactly how grim the tangled forest in the city narcotics coordinator's office can be was evident not long ago.

Anxious to further the care New York was providing for addicts after they left city hospitals, on March 11, Mayor Wagner sent to the board of estimate registration No. 6606 (vol. 139) requesting \$305,587 "to provide new services in an area of addictive control."

It was, of course, a program that would parallel the methods of the West Side Rehabilitation Center and this one would be in the Bronx, starting later this year. Brooklyn, the mayor said, will get its rehabilitation center, too, also modeled after West Side. If the city follows present plans, this one will be set up in 1966.

Sherman Patrick's view, based on his experience at West Side, was never communicated to Mayor Wagner.

He says what he has to say clearly enough. "I think they should close this facility," says Sherman Patrick. "The way things are now, we're just spending a lot of money and fooling the public."

"In war," Napoleon once warned his staff, "a great disaster indicates a great culprit."

There are no culprits in New York, because this city's attack on addiction is not really a war at all.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. KREBS. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is National Small Business Week by proclamation of President Johnson. It is fitting at this time that we honor achievements on behalf of small business.

Small business produces one-third of our Nation's goods and services and is a principal source of employment and opportunity for our people. Our Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the American market, and the manner in which it exercises this function profoundly affects the destiny of the Nation.

Through the years, as a Member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I have studied the small business programs of the military and civilian agencies.

In 1964, prime contract awards to business firms by these agencies were \$35 billion, of which the Defense Department awarded \$27 billion. Defense awards to small business were \$4.8 billion, or 18 percent. This represents an increase in dollars and percentages for small business over the previous year in the face of a decrease in Defense Department procurements.

During the first 9 months of 1965, we again witnessed an increase in prime contract awards to small business despite a decrease in Defense spending. Procurements decreased \$1.6 billion while small business awards increased \$345 million. This represents an in-

crease to 20.7 percent from 17.1 percent for the same 9-month period in 1964.

Last October, President Johnson commended the Department of Defense for its fiscal 1964 activities on behalf of small business. From present indications, the current fiscal year may be even better for small business. We are pleased to note that the Department of Defense heeded our Government procurement Subcommittee's recommendation in its report at the close of the last Congress, which stated that the Department "must continue to aggressively enforce its small business prime procurement program during 1965 to maintain or better its 1964 results in the face of expected further curtailment in defense spending in 1965."

In recognition of National Small Business Week, the Secretary of Defense has urged the military departments to join in honoring the role of small business in the U.S. defense mission. This is in line with our continuing interest in small business.

The achievements of small business will receive our attention throughout the year. We must be sure that small business continues viable and continues to make a meaningful contribution to our economy and people.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF REA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to one of the great social and economic programs started by the Congress whose 30th anniversary was celebrated May 11 of this year.

When the Rural Electrification Administration started in 1935, the percentage of farms in Iowa with electric service was only slightly more than the national average of 10.9 percent. However, the real surge forward to lighten the work of the farm wife and to add electric power to the farmer's production capability arrived with the availability of REA loans to finance construction, on a greater scale than heretofore attempted.

Iowa was represented among the very first group of loans to be granted from work relief funds at the disposal of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was the Central Iowa Power Co., of Des Moines; which, 3 months after receiving approval of the loan, energized the first line December 15, 1935.

After 30 years of devoted effort by hundreds of Iowa farm leaders working with the REA staff, we can proudly say our State is now 99 percent electrified. It has taken 58 REA electric borrowers, including 55 cooperatives, to reach this goal of almost 100 percent electrification. Over 150,000 rural Iowa consumers are being served over 61,000 miles of lines.

It has required a quarter of a billion dollars of investment to make this unexcelled electric service possible. all of

which is being repaid with interest, ahead of schedule and without a single borrower overdue in its repayments. That is a fiscal record of which I am sure we all can be proud.

Iowa has also made use of REA's telephone program. There are 50 telephone system borrowers who have been approved for over \$45 million to build modern, automatic dial telephone service benefitting 100,000 subscribers. Of this number 13,000 are receiving telephone service for the first time.

At the beginning of this year Iowa electric consumers had made a total of \$106 million in payments on their Government loans. This sum included \$56 million repaid in principal as due plus \$18 million of principal paid ahead of contract schedule. In addition to these principal repayments, Iowans through their use of electricity had paid in interest to the U.S. Treasury a total of \$32 million.

Thus the first three decades of rural electrification reveal that the foresight of the Congress in providing these programs of electric and telephone service has changed the entire living and working standards of rural America, enabled our agriculture to outproduce the world, and make possible living standards in the country that are comparable to those in our cities and suburbs.

Although we may rejoice over the success of REA we cannot lose sight of the fact that much remains to be done in this far-reaching activity. Where are the additional supplies of electric energy to come from? For every 8 to 10 years the energy requirements of rural consumers is doubling and more and more sources of cheap energy must be found or created.

In 1953 monthly consumption on Iowa REA-financed lines per consumer was 317 kilowatt-hours. By 1963 the average had risen to 679 kilowatt-hours, or more than double. So the work of REA and its need is not done because there is a continuing objective to provide adequate service under rates and conditions comparable to those available in urban communities.

Congress should not hamper this program with restrictions that are demanded by its critics who do not have the best interest of the farmer at heart. Low consumer density and low revenue per mile make the service job harder for REA borrowers than for other groups in the power business. REA borrowers in Iowa serve only 2.5 consumers per mile and average \$511 in revenue per mile. This compares to 29.6 consumers and \$6,105 per mile for class A and B commercial utilities.

When we consider that for every dollar of REA loans invested in these Iowa systems, consumers have invested \$5 in house wiring and electric appliances and equipment, we can see what impetus has been given our economy. Nationwide surveys show that these REA-financed lines are making possible over a billion dollar market a year for new electric equipment, a flow of dollars that reaches into every industrial center of the Nation and fully justifies this program as a catalyst to the continued prosperity

and growth of our gross national product.

As REA looks forward to its future help in the fields of electric and telephone services, I want to express my profound admiration for what has been accomplished and to wish the agency and its dedicated staff many more years of fruitful activity.

EXPLORER SCOUTS OF BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, a group of young Explorer Scouts in Bridgeport, Conn., is importing 40 troubador uniforms from Mexico. I am asking that they be relieved of paying the 42.5 percent customs duty on the apparel worth about \$1,000.

The Scouts have founded a drum and bugle corps. They are studying and playing the music of Latin America. To strike a note of authenticity, they wish to wear the troubador uniform. Attempts were made to procure these in the United States. None could be found on the retail market. It would cost approximately \$4,000 to have them custom made in this country. This is too high for the Troubadors.

The Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps is a nonprofit organization, sustaining itself by the more tedious and low-profit methods of fundraising—as paper drives and cake sales.

One of the most compelling reasons for helping this group is in the nature of the city, Bridgeport, in which they live. Bridgeport, like many cities, is taking action to combat its poverty. To meet poverty's challenge, we must encourage groups as the Explorer Scouts.

In addition, that cultural diversity and interest which we are trying to promote across the country is dependent on such international contributions.

It is for this reason, that I ask for relief on this single shipment of uniforms.

NEED FOR NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSIONER

Mr. RYAN. 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. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for the Federal Government to regulate the sport of boxing. The Clay-Liston fight, with its incredible blunders and mismanagement, is just another example of the need for a National Boxing Commissioner.

There is no doubt that boxing is involved in interstate commerce and that

the Federal Government has the power to control this activity. It is also clear that the Federal Government has an obligation to exercise this power.

The Clay-Liston fight proved the necessity for Federal standards to protect the public from being cheated. There are other pressing considerations.

We need a National Boxing Commissioner to eliminate the influence of racketeers.

In addition, often boxers, who are not physically capable of fighting, are allowed to fight at great risk to their physical and mental well-being and in some cases even their lives.

The States have recognized the need for some form of policing of this sport. However, State boxing commissions have time and time again proven inadequate. In addition, State commissions have no power over the showing of closed-circuit television in the State. Overall coordination and supervision is clearly needed.

Today I have again introduced legislation to establish, in the Department of Justice, the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner. I sponsored similar legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses. This legislation is the product of the dedication of one of our greatest Senators, the late Senator Estes Kefauver with whom I worked very closely on this matter. In fact, in June of 1961 I testified before the Kefauver committee on behalf of this bill. If the Congress had followed the leadership of Senator Kefauver the ludicrous performance of last Tuesday night might have been avoided.

Under this legislation the National Boxing Commissioner would have the authority to grant licenses where the issuance of licenses "is not contrary to the public interest or the interest of the lawful conduct of activities in professional boxing." The bill provides criminal penalties for those who participate directly or indirectly in professional boxing without receiving a license from the National Boxing Commissioner. The Boxing Commissioner is also authorized to establish standards for the physical examination of boxers. He would have supervisory authority over boxing contracts and other matters pertaining to the sport of boxing.

I urge the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on this bill, and hope that it will be promptly enacted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNN (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) were given permission to address the House, to revise and

extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. QUIN, on June 1, for 60 minutes.
Mr. SMITH of New York, on June 2, for 30 minutes.
Mr. REINECKE, on June 3, for 30 minutes.
Mr. CALLAWAY, on June 7, for 30 minutes.
Mr. GURNEY, on June 8, for 30 minutes.
Mr. WYDLER, on June 9, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TENZER.
Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter in his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 5883. (The following Member (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. RHODES of Arizona.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. CALLAN in two instances.
Mr. STEPHENS.
Mr. FRIEDEL.
Mr. IRWIN.
Mr. HOWARD.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1689. An act 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); to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 806. An act to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product.

H.R. 6691. An act to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

H.R. 7031. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from CXI—758

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1169. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings in interest costs to the Government attainable by greater use of Treasury checking account, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1170. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary procurement of Hawk and Nike-Hercules missile spare components because of deficiencies in requirements computations, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2263. A bill to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5024. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5252. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 903. A bill to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5280. A bill to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8439. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8639. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8283. A bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness

of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 618. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Edward V. Amason and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason; with amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett; with amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3103. A bill for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans; with amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3750. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MCCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Jong Wan Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; with amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gorfain; with amendment (Rept. No.

401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5265. A bill for the relief of Gordon E. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5471. A bill for the relief of the widow and minor children of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5819. A bill for the relief of John Henry Taylor; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5613. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5815. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5839. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurtle, U.S. Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5902. A bill for the relief of Cecil Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5911. A bill for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and Capt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6318. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son; without amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6441. A bill for the relief of Arthur O. Berry and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6527. A bill for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort; with amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7137. A bill for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7233. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7355. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Claude E. Tabor, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7435. A bill for the relief of Col. Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7822. A bill for the relief of Marvin D. Neils; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLODY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5830. A bill for the relief of CPO James J. Griffin, U.S. Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7439. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7436. A bill for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRIDER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7437. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7438. A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7440. A bill for the relief of Col. William W. Thomas and Lt. Col. Norman R. Snyder, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 8615. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ARENDTS:

H.R. 8616. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 8617. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 8618. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 8619. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREIG:

H.R. 8620. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 8621. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 8623. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 8624. A bill to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 8625. A bill to grant full retirement benefits to U.S. Government civil service employees after 35 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 8626. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally impacted areas, to provide that payments on account of children who live on Federal property with a parent employed there will be made at a rate equal to the State average per pupil expenditure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 8627. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 8628. A bill to prohibit the mutilation of currency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 8629. A bill to extend and amend the provisions of the wheat program authorized in the Agricultural Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 8630. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8631. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8632. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 8633. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from income pension and annuity payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's pension under chapter 15 of that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 8634. A bill to provide premium pay under specified conditions to certain employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8635. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLODY:

H.R. 8636. 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; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8637. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 8638. A bill to amend section 316 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958 to extend the time within which teachers and other employees covered by the same retirement system in the State of Maine may be treated as being covered by separate retirement systems for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 8639. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.J. Res. 488. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide for the development of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 490. Joint resolution extending recognition to the international exposition, HemisFair 1968, and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 491. Joint resolution to require Members of Congress to file at the beginning of each regular session of each Congress a financial statement and a statement of business dealings with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 403. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of professional boxing; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8640. A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Robert J. Becker, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8641. A bill for the relief of Maj. Derrell deS. Trenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8642. A bill for the relief of Col. Eugene F. Tyree, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 8643. A bill for the relief of Grigorios Tsioros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 8644. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by a contractor of the Forest Service who were not paid for their services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 8645. A bill for the relief of Petros D. Dimitra Roumellotis (Romas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8646. A bill for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 8647. A bill for the relief of the Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 8648. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramon K. Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8649. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8650. A bill for the relief of Mother Narcisia (Gregoria Rodriguez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 8651. A bill for the relief of Kim Diana Moody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 8652. A bill for the relief of certain employees and former employees of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Basis for Support of Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been proposed a \$3.5 billion tax cut and I think it is important that we understand the basis for our support for this measure.

This proposal follows the income tax cut of 1964 of \$14 billion. Following that change, consumer buying rose by \$28 billion, business investment in plants and equipment rose \$6.5 billion, and employment increased by 2 million and unemployment was reduced to new lows. This Nation has enjoyed the longest continued stretch of economic expansion in many years.

The most recent proposal to reduce taxes will have, we are told, similarly beneficial effects on our economy.

In addition to these predicted effects on our economy, I have received assurances that the reductions in the taxes on local and long distance telephone calls will be passed on to the consumers and I expect that the other businesses in-

involved will also pass the reductions to the consumers.

This will mean more money in the pockets of our consumers and will provide a lift to our economy.

I support this measure on this basis, Mr. Speaker, secure in the knowledge that our people and the economy will be the beneficiaries.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Armenians have been one of the most persecuted of all peoples in known history, and have suffered most in their historic homeland under conquering alien oppressors. They had lost their national independence more than a century before Columbus discovered America, and since then most of them have been living in dispersion. Their country was divided among their three powerful neighbors—the Turks, Persians and Russians. Un-

der the domination of all three they suffered, yet in suffering they hoped to find their national salvation. During all that time they steadfastly clung to their national traditions and ideals; their Christian faith and their love of freedom. The more they were oppressed, the more firmly they believed that some day and somehow their day of freedom would come. That day came at the end of the First World War.

During that war most of the Armenians in the Asiatic provinces of Turkey—actually ancient Armenia—were deported and massacred. In this holocaust about 1 million Armenians lost their lives and several hundred thousands of the survivors escaped to the Caucasus, the northern part of Armenia then under Russian domination. As a result of the Russian Revolution and the collapse of czarist authority there, Armenians felt free to take their destiny into their hands and proclaim their independence. That was done on May 28, 1918. At the time the Armenians were fighting the Turks, and the population of the country consisted mostly of refugees. Under such difficult circumstance the existence of the new state was most precarious. But in the midst of insurmountable difficulties the leaders of reclaimed Armenia struggled hard, and did manage to carry on for about 2 years. Then the turn of

international diplomacy played a trick upon them. The rising Turkish nationalist state and Communist Russia were determined to put an end to the Armenian state.

Late in the fall of 1920 Armenia was attacked both by the Turks and the Soviets. In a few weeks it was overrun by both. By early December independent Armenia was no more. Then the Soviets set up the Soviet Socialist Armenian Republic within the Soviet Union, and that is the only trace left of the short-lived independent Armenia. But the idea of freedom and independence lives on in Armenia, in the hearts and souls of the Armenian people, and they celebrate their Independence Day as a most memorable event in their turbulent history.

H.R. 8442: To Provide Increase in Social Security Lump-Sum Death Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8442 which provides for an increase in the maximum lump-sum death payment under social security from \$255 to \$312 immediately and to \$368 after 1971. The present lump-sum death payment was established by Congress in 1952 and it is apparent that since that time the Consumer Price Index has risen; the cost of funerals has skyrocketed, having risen at least 30 percent; and hospital and medical costs of the last illness have risen approximately 50 percent—all without a corresponding increase in social security death benefits.

My bill, H.R. 8442, incorporates the proposals of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security which strongly urged a revision in the maximum lump-sum death payment. The Council specifically recommended that the amount of the payment be changed from the present maximum amount of \$255 to the highest family maximum monthly benefit. In other words, under this proposal the maximum death payment would increase whenever the maximum monthly family benefits is increased. At the present time this would mean an increase of the death payment from \$255 to \$312 and after 1971, when the statutory ceiling for maximum monthly benefits rises, from \$312 to \$368.

This revision would benefit more than 600,000 families including millions of dependents who face the tragedy of the death of the family breadwinner with insufficient financial resources. While benefiting many, the cost of implementing this legislation would be minimal.

We cannot become complacent with what has gone before but rather we must recognize and deal with, each year, the problems concerning social security which were not envisioned by those who

drafted the original Social Security Act. The social security program has been a successful investment for millions of Americans, and its continuing expansion and improvement can be a source of pride for Congress and for every American.

On March 26, 1965, I introduced H.R. 6843 to provide benefits to widows who remarry after age 62 but who under the present social security law forfeit benefits because of their remarriage. I stated at that time that this was but one of many inequities of our present law, inequities which should be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

The proposed increase in the lump-sum death payment is another example of an inequity which has resulted from the lapse of 13 years without an amendment to a section of the Social Security Act which applies to more than 1 million families each year.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal careful consideration and continue the record of success in working toward an efficient, comprehensive social security system.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Georgia, I wish to bring the attention of the House to a most significant anniversary which occurred this month—the 30th birthday of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I deem it an honor and a privilege to make this tribute because it was from our State that two of the more outstanding events occurred which made possible the electrification of rural America and the ability to reach unserved farms which would have never been served in any other way.

Although REA is 30 years old, it was as far back as 1924 that Franklin Delano Roosevelt first began thinking about the problem of electrifying rural America. In August 1938, in a speech at Barnesville, Ga., President Roosevelt gave this account of the birth of REA:

Fourteen years ago, a Democratic Yankee came to a neighboring county in your State in search of a pool of warm water wherein he might swim his way back to health. There was only one discordant note in that first stay of mine at Warm Springs. When the first-of-the-month bill came in for electric light for my little cottage, I found that the charge was 18 cents a kilowatt-hour—about four times what I pay at Hyde Park, N.Y. That started my long study of public utility charges for electric current and the whole subject of getting electricity into farm homes . . . So it can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Today a suitable plaque and marker at Warm Springs remind visitors that here

arose the circumstances which started the search and inspired the efforts to light up rural America and bring the blessings of abundance of electric power to the farm homes of this great country of ours.

At the time President Roosevelt issued his executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration, only 6,956 farms in Georgia had service, 2.8 percent of the farms. The national average then was 10.8 percent of the farms electrified and we in Georgia were only a fourth of the national average. In August 1935, REA approved its first loan to the Peach State, and in June of 1936 the first line was energized.

Today 69,000 miles of line are reaching 368,000 rural consumers as a result of this most significant program, one which has done more to change the lives and living conditions of rural Georgia than anything else. The investment to serve these fellow Georgians totals over \$166 million and it is being handled through interest-bearing loans to 45 borrowers, of which 44 are nonprofit electric cooperatives.

What a contrast. In 1935, only 2.8 percent of our farms had electric service. Today 98.8 percent of the 92,000 farms in the State are served. And of that percent, three-fourths have received service made possible by REA loans.

But this fine record, repeated in most of the States throughout our Nation, would not have been possible but for a most significant milestone sponsored by a Georgia Congressman. I refer, of course, to Stephen Pace. It was his bill in 1944 which made a significant change in the interest rate on REA loans and the payout period. His legislation removed the shackles which prevented REA from moving ahead rapidly to electrify rural America and reach those thinly settled areas to which no one else could ever bring electric service using conventional means and methods.

The goal of area coverage received concrete support through the provisions of the Pace Act. Farms never before capable of receiving electric service now found this great modern invention capable of application and aid in increasing farm production and making us the greatest food-producing nation the world has ever seen.

The Pace Act set a uniform, firm interest rate. This made it possible for directors of the hundreds of electric systems to plan their future expansions on a sound basis, without jeopardizing the ability to repay loans on the earlier sections they had built. By extending the payout period the Pace Act provided an extra margin of credit which enabled the REA borrowers to expand and serve more consumers without endangering their ability to meet payments on what had already been borrowed and invested.

Because more money is invested in the electric power business than any other business in this country and because investment capital plays such a large role in developing additional electric service, the wise provisions of the Pace Act made possible one of the most remarkable loan

repayment records in the history of finance.

By the first of this year, REA borrowers in Georgia had made a total of \$78,-297,355 in payments on their Government loans. These included \$48 million repaid on principal as due, \$6 million of principal repaid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of \$24 million. No borrower was overdue in its payments.

The record is also outstanding in the other 45 States in which REA has made loans. The money invested in rural electric systems is coming back to the U.S. Treasury on schedule and even ahead of the contract payment dates.

From time to time there has been opinion voiced that the interest rate set by the Pace Act is not high enough. Yet we must consider that in my State of Georgia, the REA-financed systems, with three-fourths of all the rural load, are still averaging only 4.3 consumers per mile and annual revenue of \$437 per mile.

In Georgia, as in the other States, for every \$1 invested in our electric lines, the consumers have spent \$5 in wiring their homes and farmsteads and getting appliances with which to use the electricity now available to them. In 1953 the average monthly consumption was 208 kilowatt-hours. By 1963 the average had risen to 450 kilowatt-hours, more than double. And it is continuing to rise and double every 8 to 10 years.

Surveys have shown that the nearly 1,000 REA electric borrowers have created a new rural market for over a billion and a quarter dollars for equipment and appliances. Here is a stimulus to the economy which could not be reached in any other way. Workers in the cities, manufacturers everywhere have greater demand for their products as a result of rural electrification. Yes, REA can be proud of the record it has made.

**Address by Hon. Carlton R. Sickles at the
Graduation Ceremonies of the University
of Maryland's School of Social
Work**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a speech delivered last night by my Maryland colleague, Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES, at the graduation ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work in Baltimore.

In his message, Congressman SICKLES impressed upon these emerging professional social workers the importance of harmonious cooperation between public and volunteer agencies, between professional workers and the subprofessional indigenous poor who must be involved in current antipoverty and social welfare operations.

Representative SICKLES' speech follows:

SOCIAL WORK ON THE MOVE

(By Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES)

I am delighted to be with you on this important occasion.

I commend you who have recently finished the arduous study required for a master's degree in social work, for not having been done the easy thing and decided at some point along the way that you could just as well pursue your career without full professional education.

In earning your master's degree you have equipped yourself to be a leader in the centuries-old effort to see that all of mankind have an equal chance for happiness and satisfaction.

You have earned the right to have your professional judgment respected—and acted upon. You have shown your willingness to tackle jobs that require responsible and decisive action. You have demonstrated your patriotism—for the social well-being of our Nation depends on the social well-being of her people.

Your master's degree means that you have the knowledge and the professional competence to carry out responsible missions in the congested quarters of the inner city and in the barren hollows of Appalachia. You understand and know what should be done about crowded housing, illiteracy and lack of skills, sickly bodies, and—more damaging than all the rest—bias and bigotry—aimed at people solely because they are poor, or poor and dark skinned.

The opportunities to practice your new profession stretch widely across the professional horizon.

Your skills and judgment and your prestige would be equally welcome in dozens of agencies, schools, hospitals, churches, and institutions throughout Maryland and, indeed the Nation. You are badly needed by hundreds upon hundreds of families, children, and adults who are suffering from social, health, and economic problems in every community in this land.

Wherever you go, I am confident that you will be appreciated because the demands upon your profession are greater than ever before.

The rapid growth of our national population—with the great increases in the proportion of young people and the elderly—is, in itself, a major challenge to the social welfare field. Child welfare and health agencies are bursting at the seams and waiting lists are long. Many of the children who need help most are not receiving it because we do not yet have the staffs and the programs to reach out to them and their parents.

Similarly, facilities and services for senior citizens—despite the widespread interest and activity in this field—have not been able to keep pace with the expanding population of the aged.

In our large cities, problems are further complicated by many other changes. Large numbers of relatively unskilled newcomers came to our cities in response to the need for workers during the two decades following the Second World War.

They have now found, in too many cases, that their job opportunities have disappeared with the impact of automation and the large number of unskilled applicants.

Unskilled workers in all age groups and in all parts of the country are feeling the pressure of technological change. While new opportunities are opening rapidly for the highly skilled worker, the worker with few skills has found his future darkened and his hope dimmed.

Statistically we know that nearly one-fifth of all American families, including one-fourth of all of our children, are living in poverty today. We are confronted by a crit-

ical situation whose solution will require the best efforts of all of us.

Our cities are involved in an especially difficult set of problems: the high concentrations of population; the continuing decay of the slums, which get older every year and would be decaying even if nobody lived in them; the serious lack of sufficient recreational and cultural facilities in neighborhoods where they are needed the most; and the urgent shortages of health and medical care that press most tightly on those with low incomes. The list of problems that complicate the lives of the poor could be extended almost indefinitely.

It was considerations such as these that led the President to declare unconditional war on poverty in America; to propose the antipoverty bill—the Economic Opportunity Act—which was enacted last year; and to urge a series of measures relating to education, health, welfare, air and water pollution, and urban development.

It was similar considerations that led 3 years ago to the passage of the 1962 public welfare amendments to the Social Security Act, the most far reaching attempt to improve our public welfare programs since they were initiated 30 years ago. These amendments have made possible a wide range of progressive changes in our public welfare programs. I don't need to remind this group that the potential benefits of this historic legislation are only beginning to be realized. States were given a 5-year period in which to fully establish the greatly expanded social services authorized by the 1962 amendments. It was expected also that it would take this period of time to get into full operation the staff development programs that would train the increased numbers of public welfare employees who would be needed to carry out these social services.

Along with this tremendous surge of activity in public health and welfare programs, voluntary agencies throughout the Nation are asking themselves challenging questions about their own programs: Who needs services? What kinds of services are needed? How can changing programs be formulated to meet changing needs? How is the role of the voluntary agencies changing as public programs are changed?

These questions are crucial. We are living in a period of rapid social and economic change, confronted simultaneously by untold opportunities and telling problems. We can look toward the future with great hope because we now have the economic capability to eliminate poverty. But we must look toward an immediate future filled with the complex social challenges that change inevitably brings.

One of the things I want to stress in my remarks to you this evening is the vital importance of pulling together. Call it inter-agency cooperation, teamwork, or whatever you want—time is too short, lives are too precious, for two agencies or two workers to dissipate their energies in an argument about which one of them will do what part of the job. You know, there is a lot of criticism of bureaucracy in the Federal Government. Some of it may be deserved, some of it may not. I daresay that all organizations—private business, military, even religious bodies—fall victim to this malady. However common it may be, may I urge you to be constantly on guard against this hindrance to effective social welfare programs.

I caution you to watch for "bureautitis" in every phase of community activity. It can paralyze the operation of a single welfare agency. It can render ineffectual the working relationship between two welfare agencies or between a welfare agency and a health agency. It can erode the mutual trust and respect that a public agency and a voluntary agency should have for each other and the saddest thing of all is that not the workers

in these agencies, but the helpless people who depend on the agencies will be the full recipients of the grief that stems from this lack of cooperation.

There is an old saying that might help to clarify what I have been talking about. It goes like this: "In any endeavor requiring the efforts of several people, you can see to it that something is accomplished, or you get credit for it, but you can't do both."

There is another area that deserves as much attention as the smooth cooperation between all of the various agencies and people whose prime object is helping to alleviate the unhappy conditions that lead to and result from poverty. And this is the use of new theories and methods.

In speaking of this, I do not want to diminish in any way your respect for the classical approaches as used by social workers. Your profession has developed a valuable body of knowledge, and I heartily commend to you the full use of proven procedures. However, the very scope of our present social problems indicates that we must all be more alert and imaginative.

We are living in a period of transition, in which we recognize the insufficiency of some of our earlier methods of dealing with social ills. There is a great ferment across the country in the evaluation of existing structures—the development of research, the testing of new approaches, the use of new techniques—activities which the Federal Government is encouraging and helping to support.

The entitlement of people in need to receive adequate public assistance, medical care, social services, and other benefits which are accepted as appropriate for the use of public funds, should be the same wherever a person lives in this Nation.

This concept of equal entitlement is inherent in our democratic philosophy. But it can be fully realized only if every citizen recognizes that the problems and needs of his fellow citizens are indeed his concern, and if he acts on this concern to assure that full advantage is taken of available resources and funds, both public and private, to provide the best possible programs in this State and community.

One of the surest safeguards for democratic social welfare programs is for agencies to involve the poor themselves in planning and carrying out the programs that are intended to help improve their conditions. I refer especially to the use of what social workers call "indigenous" leaders or helpers. These people come from—in fact, are part of—the disadvantaged communities they serve. They have a close personal knowledge and understanding of the kinds of people and problems with which the organized social work effort is dealing.

You have heard of many ways in which the indigenous leaders are used—as "team mothers" in elementary school programs where classroom teachers are not needed, such as testing vision, conducting field trips, operating audiovisual equipment, and so forth. In social work settings, former juvenile offenders have been used for interviewing and research in juvenile delinquency. Public assistance mothers whose children are of school age are used as homemakers and friendly visitors from homebound old-age assistance recipients.

As valuable as all these subprofessional services are, I believe that the most important function of an indigenous leader is to serve as a bridge between the poor and the larger community and indeed between the poor and the professional social worker. There is always the danger that professionals—and this goes for the doctor, the teacher, and the lawyer, as well as the social worker—fall into the practice of one-way communication in their effort to get their client to do what is considered good for him. By making greater use of local people from

the slum neighborhoods, social workers can insure that the two-way communication they want and need will really exist. In this way, social workers and social agencies will have the latest and most accurate picture of who the poor really are, the problems they face, and what they need to solve these problems. And at the same time, the poor will be finding out that help is available, where to find it, and how to use it and they will be developing local leadership needed to enable them to cope with their problems.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for inviting me here tonight. It has been a great pleasure to share this momentous event with you.

As you go forth, keep your chin up and your sights high. There is a vitally-needed, important job for each one of you—whatever kind and combination of talents you have. Most of you will find your greatest career satisfaction in direct service to needy people. That is as it should be. Meeting human needs is the heart of your profession. But as time goes on, you will also help meet the demand for experienced people to take responsibility for supervision in social welfare agencies, for directing these agencies, and for service as planners and consultants to those who operate social welfare programs. There is plenty of room at the top in this profession and I wish each and every one of you success in fulfilling your goals.

Isn't Everyone Subsidized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the bulk of the information available to the public today on farm subsidies is deceptive in effect, if not in purpose.

Consumers and taxpayers generally are led to believe that the total annual appropriations to the Department of Agriculture are subsidies to farmers. Actually, nonfarmers participate in a larger share of this Department's expenditure than farmers themselves.

Approximately two-thirds of the Department of Agriculture's expenditures, in the 1966 budget, are for services which are of primary benefit to the general public. About one-third goes for price support and related programs in which farmers are the primary but not the only beneficiaries.

The deception may be erased by a look at 1 year's total expenditures:

[In millions of dollars]

	1964	Estimate, 1965	Estimate, 1966
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public.....	4,835	4,582	4,373
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others....	3,062	2,276	1,984

There seems to be a planned propensity by some Congressmen and in some areas of our business community to tie a "subsidy" tag to Government programs

that seek to bring the income of farmers into a parity position with other segments of our economy. However, the word "subsidy" as a derisive expletive is seldom applied to Government policy and money aids to business and labor.

Publishers of magazines are recipients of Government subsidies through the Post Office Department. The House Appropriations Committee published figures which showed that revenues for mailing 14 national publications accounted for only 35 percent of the cost of handling these publications.

Postal deficits over a 12-year period in behalf of business almost equals the cost of farm price support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation during more than a quarter of a century.

Take the question of food costs: Food costs have risen less since 1947-49 than most other consumer items in the cost-of-living index. For all items on the list, the increase in cost to 1964 was 33 percent. For all food, the increase was 26 percent. For rent, it was 48 percent and for medical care 72 percent.

The farmer gets none of the increase in cost for the food he produces. In fact, he receives 15 percent less for the farm food "market basket" than he did in 1947-49. The retail cost of this "market basket" has risen only 14 percent although processing and marketing costs have increased 42 percent since 1947-49.

Misleading and incomplete information, given to the American public adds unnecessary confusion to established and proved concepts; and could even place our agricultural policy in legislative jeopardy. Our foreign policy could also be affected as food is an important arm in the program. Food is survival and we should never become so well fed that we forget this principle.

Our agriculture is the Nation's largest and most vital industry. It employs 6.1 million workers. This is more workers than are in the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry.

The assets in agriculture total more than \$230 billion. This is equal to about two-thirds of the value of current assets of all corporations in the United States or about three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Many are not aware of the fact that 3 out of every 10 jobs in private industry are related to agriculture.

Since here are so many myths relating to subsidies let us look at the historical records of the economy of our Nation. Do you know what the oldest economic principle written into the law of the United States is? It may come as a shock to many people—but it is the subsidy.

The second act of the First Congress in 1789 was to legislate for the new emerging Nation the enactment of a tariff law, to protect and promote the infant and frontier industrial development of America. At that time the United States was almost completely populated by farm people.

More significantly, this tariff law set up a special subsidy program to encour-

age the development of an American merchant fleet. The law stipulated that goods imported into the United States on American ships should have a 10-percent reduction in custom duties, and a tonnage tax also was imposed in favor of American shipping.

Since the birth of our Nation, subsidies through the years have taken many and various forms.

The Government granted 6,340,339 acres of public lands to private interests between 1827 and 1866, to encourage canal building and river improvement, in addition to rights-of-way grants. The Government made other contributions by direct appropriations, stock subscriptions, and loans to private canal companies.

Approximately 183 million acres of Federal and State lands were granted to railroads between 1850 and 1871.

The first mail subsidy was paid 125 years ago. Since then many millions of dollars have been assigned by the Federal Government to ocean and airmail subsidies, to foster the development of transportation, as was the case in the special considerations for railroads and waterways.

Many millions of dollars have been used to subsidize the building of U.S. ships on American ways. Here is one example: about \$40 million in subsidy was paid on the private luxury liner *United States*. The total cost of the ship was given at \$76,800,000.

Diverse as these subsidy programs are, it is unrealistic either to condemn or to praise Federal subsidies as such. Each particular program which is determined to contain an element of subsidy must be judged independently, taking into account the economic, social, and political conditions prevailing at the time.

Any broad condemnation of subsidies as such confronts these hard-core facts:

America's infant industry, without the aid of subsidy laws in the early years after the formation of this independent Nation, would have been slow to develop and the emergence of the United States as a world power could have been retarded for many years.

Without subsidy there would have been no early development of an American merchant fleet. The first accomplishments of inland transportation in this country—by canals and river improvements—would have been delayed.

Had there been no subsidy, in the form of extensive assistance to railroads in spanning the continent, the settlement and development of the West would have been retarded for many years.

The age of air travel in America, unless aided by subsidy, would have been late in arriving, and the contribution of airpower to our military preparedness would have been slowed down.

Without subsidy, no commercial sea-going ships—perhaps even now—would be built on American shores.

Subsidy has had a substantial and beneficial role in the Nation's overall industrial development.

It has been essential in stimulating vital production in wartime.

It has financed scientific development.

It has been used in efforts to balance the economic positions of vast segments of our total society.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in a special survey on subsidy and subsidylike programs of the U.S. Government reports that:

Some contend the tariff system is a subsidy structure, since it involves Government action that enables protected industries to charge more for their goods in the American markets. Moreover, some consider that accelerated tax amortization for defense plants subsidizes the owners of these plants; that "depletion allowances" provide subsidylike benefits to the petroleum and some other industries; that Federal non-interest-bearing deposits of billions of dollars in private banks and certain services of the Federal Reserve System amount to subsidies for large private bankers; that sale of Federal surplus property at a loss is a subsidy to the purchasers, and that the postal deficit on second-class mail is a subsidy to business.

Others confine their definition to direct Government payments, to the remission of charges, and to the supplying of commodities or services at less than cost or market price.

There is one concept of subsidy which extends to all persons and enterprises whose economic positions are improved, or whose purposes are advanced as the result of Government action. This embraces industries whose profits would be less without protection of the tariff laws and the many other statutes that soften the full force of competition in a private enterprise economy; and this broad definition likewise encompasses all working people whose earnings are greater because of minimum wage, collective bargaining, and immigration laws.

It should be pointed out that the economic benefits accruing to industry and labor, from Government policies, are paid for, as are the costs of the farm program; by the consumer and taxpayer. Remember this: Consumers and taxpayers are one and the same.

Most of us will agree that all of our citizens feel the social and economic impact of the subsidy programs for industry, labor, and agriculture.

Again, it should be emphasized that in the overall subsidy concept this Nation's agriculture is a lesser recipient than either labor or industry. Yet, the farmer in many areas of public opinion has been cast as the chief villain of all subsidy gatherers.

Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll; Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the results of a survey of my district, Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District. Nearly 9,000 people took the time and trouble to answer. And, for the most part, they agree with me: They like the programs of the Johnson administration.

The administration's approach in Vietnam was supported by 2 to 1 over the nearest alternative.

The administration's proposal for gradual elimination of the national origins quota on immigration also was endorsed by a 2 to 1 margin.

And more than half of those expressing an opinion favored either the administration's original medicare bill or its substitute version, passed by the House, providing for hospital, doctor, and major medical expenses.

This is good showing by any standards, and it becomes more impressive when you consider the Republican leanings of the Fourth Congressional District, which, when it sent me back to Congress last fall, made me the only Democrat in the 20th century ever to win a second term in the district.

The results are as follows:

I. Vietnam: What approach do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?

1. Expand war into Communist North Vietnam and go all-out to win, 25.3 percent.

2. Military support of South Vietnam, including attacks in North Vietnam, until a satisfactory settlement can be negotiated, 50.1 percent.

3. Restrict efforts to South Vietnam and negotiate best settlement possible, 10.5 percent.

4. Withdraw troops and advisers immediately and let Vietnamese solve their own problems, 6.9 percent.

5. None of the above, 2.4 percent.

Blank, 4.3 percent.

II. Immigration: The administration has proposed gradual elimination of the national origins quota system, and replacing it with a system favoring skilled workers and relatives of people already in the United States. Do you favor:

1. The administration's proposal, 57.4 percent.

2. No limitations on immigration, 4.7 percent.

3. Present system, 21.8 percent.

4. No immigration, 5.2 percent.

5. None of the above, 5.8 percent.

Blank, 5.3 percent.

III. Transportation: The New Haven Railroad as it now stands cannot continue commuter operations much longer. Do you favor:

1. Expanded bus service instead of commuter railroad, 3.4 percent.

2. Letting private group try to provide commuter service, 17.2 percent.

3. A multistate authority with Federal and local assistance running the railroad or contracting commuter service, 62.7 percent.

4. Having the Federal Government pick up deficit and run the railroad, 9 percent.

5. None of the above, 3.5 percent.

Blank, 4.2 percent.

IV. Medical care for elderly: Which of the following approaches to medical care for those over 65 do you favor:

1. Administration proposal, financed by payroll taxes, providing hospital and nursing home care, home health care visits, and outpatient diagnostic services, 27.6 percent.

2. AMA proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to private insurance companies, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 25.5 percent.

3. House Republican leadership proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to national insurance fund, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 13.3 percent.

4. Combination of administration approach for basic benefits and Republican leadership plan for doctor, drug, and major medical expenses, 19 percent.

5. None of the above, 7.6 percent.

Blank, 7 percent.

V. I have listed below a number of issues of vital public concern. Please "X" the three items you feel deserve highest priority in Congress.

1. Aid to education, 11.9 percent.

2. Narcotics and crime, 14.2 percent.

3. Space research and exploration, 4.3 percent.

4. Taxes and economic growth, 9.8 percent.

5. Reexamination of foreign aid, 16.5 percent.

6. Needs of our senior citizens, 4.5 percent.

7. Reapportionment of State legislatures on population basis, 2.5 percent.

8. Regulation of mail-order purchase of firearms, 3 percent.

9. Reexamination of national defense requirements, 5.7 percent.

10. Training and employment opportunities for youth, 8.8 percent.

11. Water and air pollution control, 9.2 percent.

12. Commuter railroads, 6.1 percent.

Blank, 2.9 percent.

VI. My age is:

1. Under 25, 5.2 percent.

2. 25 to 34, 16.8 percent.

3. 35 to 44, 28.7 percent.

4. 45 to 59, 31.4 percent.

5. Over 59, 16.1 percent.

Blank, 2.1 percent.

VII. I live in:

1. Bridgeport, 14.6 percent.

2. Darien, 7.7 percent.

3. Fairfield, 4.9 percent.

4. Greenwich, 11.9 percent.

5. New Canaan, 4.9 percent.

6. Norwalk, 17 percent.

7. Stamford, 24.2 percent.

8. Weston, 1.6 percent.

9. Westport, 8 percent.

10. Wilton, 3.9 percent.

Blank, 1.6 percent.

VIII. Do you favor your Congressman asking for your views?

1. Yes, 96.6 percent.

2. No, 7 percent.

3. Undecided, 7 percent.

Blank, 2 percent.

IX. How often do you use the New Haven?

1. Regularly, 27.7 percent.

2. Occasionally, 57.1 percent.

3. Never, 12.4 percent.

Blank, 2.8 percent.

of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. He also states:

The rent supplement plan is merely the latest, though the most extreme, expression of the political philosophy which would create an egalitarian socioeconomic, irrespective of individual merit, with subsidies financed by the ambitious, the industrious, and the worthy. If section 101 is rejected by Congress, this will be the reason.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very thought-provoking article regarding one of the most important questions that will be presented to Congress. It is imperative that every Member of Congress and every citizen carefully study this rent supplement proposal so that the full implication of its extreme provisions will be known and understood by all prior to the time that it is presented for a vote.

I am confident that the American public and this Congress will refuse to accept this incredibly wide-open subsidy proposal once they are fully advised as to its potential evils.

In order that Mr. Krock's fine article, the views of the minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and the statement of the House Republican policy committee may be available to everyone, I am including them as part of these remarks.

We cannot endorse, H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 in its present form.

The administration's rent supplement proposal contained in section 101 of this bill is completely unacceptable. The proposal would kill the initiative of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. It would kill the incentive for home ownership and would make renters the wards of the Government. It is a complete departure from the ordinary American way of doing things.

From the outset of the hearings on this bill it has been apparent that section 101, rent supplements, was in deep trouble. Even those persons who normally support broader housing legislation have been unrelenting in their criticism.

The proposed program is essentially a subsidy for middle-income families including those well above median income level. It is a program without effective standards and qualifications.

We are certain that the American public will refuse to buy this incredibly wide open subsidy proposal once it is fully advised as to the potential evils of the program. This is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by Government fiat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen.

The Republican policy committee urges that section 101, the rent supplement proposal, be stricken from the bill.

The article and minority views follow:

IN THE NATION: PAYING OTHER PEOPLE'S RENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Of all the legislation proposed by President Johnson for the attainment of what he calls the Great Society, none has raised a more basic issue of political philosophy than section 101 of the administration's housing and urban development bill. This sets forth the rent supplement plan whereby the difference between one-fourth of the income of an applicant for decent housing and its fair market rental would be made up by Government subsidies extracted from the taxpayers in general.

THE MINORITY REPORT

Although the House Committee on Banking and Currency approved the measure by a vote of 26 to 7, grounds for a much stronger opposition to section 101, when it reaches the floor, have been supplied by the minority members of the committee. After a doctrinal attack on the rent supplement plan as the way to economic integration of housing and to the socialistic state, the minority report exposes serious flaws of draftsmanship which could be exploited by the Administrator of the program to calculate supplemental rent subsidies on the test of what housing an applicant wants instead of what he actually needs.

While such a flagrant abuse of authority is improbable, the wording of the administration bill does make it possible. But among the sounder points in the minority report are these:

The [subsidy] formula kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. A family with \$250 a month income could live in a \$100 a month apartment and pay rent of only \$62.50. The disincentive to improve accommodations is readily apparent. It can live in the same \$100 a month apartment with \$150 a month income as it could if it increased its income to \$400 a month.

To own one's own home, no matter how modest, is the goal of the typical American family. The rent supplement kills that incentive. Why strive to own a \$7,500 home when for approximately the same monthly outlay for housing (under FHA home-purchase underwriting standards) it could rent a dwelling unit (which, by current estimates, will cost the Government \$12,500 to \$25,000 to construct)?

"We were told by the Housing Administrator * * * that [this] is an experimental program. But involved is authorization [for him] to enter into 40-year contracts with approved housing owners to pay them rent subsidies in amounts not exceeding \$50 million prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum would be increased by \$50 million on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. * * * By fiscal year 1968, \$200 million-a-year annual payment contracts would be outstanding, extending for 40 years * * * or potentially an \$8 billion program that could extend to the year 2008. To us, that is a whale of an 'experimental' program."

IMPLICATIONS

"Moreover, section 101 states that a family must first pay 25 percent of its income for rent before receiving * * * Federal rent supplements. * * * The rent gougers and absentee slum landlords in urban areas would waste little time [in demanding the same percentage of their tenants.] Their justification * * *? The national standard set by the Federal Government. * * * Precedent for [such] widespread landlords' checks on tenant income * * * would be found in the proposed means test [which, according to testimony by the Housing Administrator], is to be employed in administering rent supplements. * * * The profound economic and social effects [of a private rental requirement of 25 percent of income] can be seen in administration testimony * * * that in 1960 the typical American family paid 13.6 percent of its income for rent."

UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITY

"This [the rent supplement plan] is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by Govern-

Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the May 26 meeting of the Republican policy committee, the committee voted not to endorse H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, in its present form. This action was taken because the rent supplement proposal that is contained in section 101 of this bill is completely unacceptable. It is a complete departure from the ordinary American way of doing things.

Today, in the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock has devoted his entire article to section 101 of the housing and urban development bill. In this article he quotes at great length from the views that were filed by the minority members

ment flat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen."

To which could be added that the rent supplement plan is merely the latest, though the most extreme, expression of the political philosophy which would create an egalitarian socioeconomic, irrespective of individual merit, with subsidies financed by the ambitious, the industrious, and the worthy. If section 101 is rejected by Congress, this will be the reason.

For, though the adverse points made by the committee minority are weakened only by the exaggeration of a couple of them, the real issue is whether the Federal Union is to undergo its greatest transformation thus far into a collectivist state.

MINORITY VIEWS

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RENT SUPPLEMENT PROPOSAL

Introduction

The administration's rent supplement proposal contained in section 101 of this bill is foreign to American concepts.

The proposal kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts.

It kills the incentive for homeownership; it makes renters wards of the Government.

It is a system of economic integration of housing through Government subsidy.

It is the way of the socialistic state.

Killing incentive

Under section 101(d) of the bill, the Housing Administrator may subsidize a tenant's rent in an amount up to the difference between the fair market rental for the unit and one-fourth of the tenant's income.

That formula kills the incentive of the American family to improve its living accommodations by its own efforts. A family with \$3,000 a year income—\$250 a month—could live in a \$100 a month apartment and pay rent of only \$62.50 a month (one-fourth of income) with the Government providing a subsidy of \$37.50 a month (difference between one-fourth of tenant's income and market rent for the unit). The disincentive of the family to improve its housing accommodations is readily apparent. Should that \$250 a month family's income increase to \$300 a month, its rent payment would increase to \$75 a month, and the Federal subsidy would drop to \$25 a month. And, of course, if the family's income increased to \$400 a month, it would pay the full market rent of \$100 a month as one-fourth of family income of \$400 a month would equal full market rent for the unit. In other words, the family with \$250 a month income has no incentive to improve its living accommodations by increasing its earnings to enable it to rent better accommodations. It can live in the same accommodations with \$250 a month income as it could if it increased its income to \$400 a month.

The formula also produces another type of disincentive to a family improving its living accommodations by its own efforts. That \$250-a-month-income family might decide it wants to live in a \$200-a-month apartment instead of the \$100-a-month unit. Under the formula it could do so. And under the other proposed provisions of this section, this still would be true. The primary requirement for a qualified tenant is that he be unable to obtain standard privately owned housing at a rental no more than one-fourth of his income. As far as the proposed law is concerned, that standard housing could be standard housing suitable to the tenant's needs or suitable to his desires. The administrator could decide either way. The family would pay the same one-fourth of its income as rent or \$62.50 a month and the Government would pay an increased subsidy of \$137.50 a month to make up the balance of the fair market rent for the unit. Under the

formula the way to better housing is increased Federal subsidy rather than increased individual effort.

When another head of a family earning \$400 a month and paying \$100-a-month rent—without any help from Uncle Sam—saw that his neighbor, earning far less than he, was able to move into a much better apartment with no increase in his rent payments, he suddenly would wake up to the possibility of the formula. This family, otherwise eligible for rent supplements, by free choice could be living in standard but crowded quarters. The head of the family simply does not want to allocate more than \$100 a month of his income to housing. With the balance of his income he prefers to enjoy other amenities of life, such as a second car or an extra week's vacation. Rent supplement is his easy way out. He would be eligible for subsidy in a more expensive apartment. He, too, would move to the \$200-a-month apartment. He would continue to pay only 100 a month of this income as rent because the Government would provide the other \$100 a month necessary to cover the market rent for the unit.

This formula is a formula for killing the American incentive system of improving one's lot by one's own effort. This would be keeping up with the Joneses via Federal subsidies.

Threat to homeownership

To own one's own home, no matter how modest, is the goal of the typical American family. The rent supplement kills the incentive of a family to achieve that goal. Under FHA underwriting standards a family with \$3,000-a-year income can afford to purchase a home costing $2\frac{1}{2}$ times that amount or a \$7,500 home. The housing cost of such a home would approximate \$60 a month. But as noted in the illustration above, the \$3,000-a-year family by paying \$62.50 a month as rent could live in a partially federally subsidized \$100-a-month rental unit. The cost of such a dwelling unit would approximate \$12,500. Or, as above noted, that same family could also live in a \$200-a-month rental unit and pay only \$62.50 of its income a month as rent with the balance of \$137.50 paid by the Government under the rent supplement formula. The cost of the \$200-a-month rental unit would approximate \$25,000. Why would a family strive to own a \$7,500 home when for approximately the same monthly outlay for housing it could rent a \$12,500 or \$25,000 cost dwelling unit? Not alone would the rent supplement proposal kill incentive for homeownership, it also would be a powerful incentive for a family to discontinue homeownership and become a renter on the Federal dole. That runs counter to the American way of life.

Absurd formula

Although the subsidy formula contains no dollar amount limitations, indirectly there is a dollar limitation because of the maximum mortgage amount per unit in the FHA section 221(d)(3) program. This is the existing FHA program which would have to be utilized in financing the project. That maximum mortgage amount under existing law is \$29,000 for a three or more bedroom unit, in an elevator-type building in a high cost area. This would be left unchanged in this bill for a three-bedroom unit but would be increased to \$32,987.50 per unit for a four or more bedroom unit under the provisions of section 203(d) of this bill. Such a four-bedroom, two-and-a-half-bath unit would rent for approximately \$315 a month. A large, qualified tenant family with only \$250-a-month income could live in such a unit with the Government paying a subsidy of \$252.50 a month to make up the balance of the market rent for this unit.

But even this does not measure the full amount of Federal subsidy that could be paid. Under FHA mortgage insurance programs, the mortgage limitation is satisfied

if the average mortgage for the units in the project does not exceed the mortgage limitation per unit. FHA insured projects can and do have penthouses and our theoretical project would be no exception. It could have a penthouse costing \$100,000 and renting for \$800 a month.

The occupant could be a large family eligible for rent supplements, with its entire income derived solely from public assistance payments. Under section 101(d) of this bill the tenant's income for purposes of the formula is the "tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him" [emphasis supplied]. With this discretionary authority the Housing Administrator might determine that public assistance payments should not be included in tenant's income for purposes of the formula. Accordingly, this family's income would be zero. Applying the formula, one-fourth of the tenant's zone income equals zero, so the tenant would pay no rent. Under the formula the Federal rent supplement may not exceed the difference between one-fourth of the tenant's income and the fair market rental for the unit. So zero (one-fourth of the tenant's zero income) from \$800 a month (the fair market rental) leaves the Government paying the full \$800 a month market rent as a subsidy. The welfare family can live in the luxurious penthouse.

Fantastic? Of course the results are fantastic. Ridiculous? Of course the results are ridiculous. Absurd? Of course, the results are absurd. But they square with the rent supplement formula. It shows just how fantastic, how ridiculous, and how absurd that formula is.

Surely the Congress could devise more sensible limitations than the wideopen, socialistic subsidy formula contained in section 101 of the bill. The Housing Administrator submitted testimony to the committee (p. 255 of hearings) that under the rent supplement program:

"It should be possible to accommodate families with incomes of between \$3,500 and \$6,000 in larger cities and between \$3,000 and \$5,000 in smaller cities where costs are generally lower."

If that really is the objective of the program, then why not write those limitations into the law?

Economic integration

From a social standpoint, few would argue that one man's rental dollar should buy as much in the way of shelter as another's, within the same general area of our country. Moreover, we can support the goal of those who view with alarm the proliferation of drab Federal housing ghettos, built to accommodate a rigid and disheartening packing together of computerized equals.

But, in the disguise of calling for action against these pockets of federally sponsored sameness in our cities and towns that have low-rent public housing, the administration has recommended a program that would force—with the power of the Federal dollar—what we choose to term "across-the-board economic integration." This runs through the thinking on the rent supplement proposal, as well as the various land development programs contained within other sections of this bill.

Within broad areas of our Nation, untouched by the Federal housing dollar, we would argue with those who support an initial allocation of \$8 billion for the purpose of creating a national system of unequal opportunity in housing. We oppose the view of those who would move the \$2,000-a-year family in the apartment next door to the \$5,000-a-year tenant, and into the \$15,000-a-year neighborhood, solely through rent subsidies. Moreover, we seriously question whether the man paying \$150 a month for an apartment would understand why his next door neighbor should receive equal

value for half the rent. From a social standpoint, there is far more to neighborhood preference than the monthly cost of one's dwelling. In short, as the respected Housing Affairs Letter of April 16, 1965, put it: "Can this world's economic lions and economic lambs lie down en masse in the same veldt?"

Keep in mind, it has been made abundantly clear that rent supplements would be a nationwide program. On May 17, during the final stage of hearings on this bill, Congressman DEL CLAWSON asked the Housing Administrator, "This is going to be a rather broad program, then, is it not, if we are going to move the rent supplement program in all areas involved?"

Mr. WEAVER. "Yes, this will be, of course, nationwide."

Upper middle income families

Under date of April 21, 1965, the Housing Agency submitted to the subcommittee, a table showing income ceilings which would be set for individual cities in administering the rent supplement program. The setting of such income ceilings is purely discretionary with the Administrator. From this table it is readily apparent the Housing Administrator will substantially breach the national median family income (\$6,249), in the case of large families. Here are the income limits the Administrator proposes to set for such families in several of the larger cities:

Philadelphia.....	\$6,900
Toledo.....	8,050
Pittsburgh.....	7,150
Macon, Ga.....	6,600
Providence.....	6,650
San Antonio.....	6,450
Milwaukee.....	8,300
Paterson, N.J.....	8,100
New York City.....	8,900
Newark.....	8,750
Saginaw, Mich.....	7,850

Whereas the national median income for all families (\$6,249) as shown by census data is total family income, the Housing Administrator is not bound by any such specific definition. Quite to the contrary, section 101(d) provides that income of the tenant shall be "the tenant's income as determined by the Administrator pursuant to procedures and regulations established by him." From total family income the Administrator could and doubtless would make one or more exclusions from total family income and thereby reduce the amount of family income that would be counted under the rent supplement proposal. Precedent for this exists in the public housing program. For instance, in New York City up to \$2,400 of income earned by secondary wage earners (wife, children, etc.) in the family, can be excluded from the family's total income for purposes of determining eligibility and rent payments. Should the Administrator make a similar exclusion for the rent supplement program, the New York City family income limit of \$8,900, as shown in the above table, actually could mean that the total family income was \$8,900 plus \$2,400 excluded income, or a total, actual income family limit of \$11,300. In other words, the rent supplement proposal can reach well up into the middle-income family level.

Public housing jeopardized

It is little wonder public housing proponents are greatly disturbed by the Administrator's rent supplement proposal. (See testimony of the president of the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials, p. 425 of the hearings.) The rent supplement program could run the public housing program right out of business, because Federal subsidies under rent supplements can be far larger per month, per unit than is possible under public housing. Under the public housing program the Federal subsidy is limited to the amount necessary to pay

principal and interest over a 40-year period on cost of the unit. There is no such subsidy limitation under the rent supplement program where the subsidy can cover not alone principal and interest costs of the unit over a 40-year period, but also practically all of the operating costs as well. Needless to say, rent supplements can also run the cooperative housing, and 221(d)(3) subsidized interest rate programs out of business.

In short, the rent supplement program has a Federal subsidy potential that no other Federal housing program can even come close to matching.

Eight-billion-dollar experiment

We were told by the Housing Administrator, as well as by other witnesses, that the Administration's rent supplements constitutes an experimental program. But involved in the proposal is the authorization for the Housing Administrator to enter into 40-year contracts with approved housing owners to pay them rent subsidies in amounts not exceeding \$50 million prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum amount would be increased by \$50 million on July 1 in each of the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. In other words, by fiscal year 1968, \$200 million a year payment contracts could be outstanding, extending for 40 years. Potentially, that makes it an \$8 billion program that could extend to the year 2008. To us, that is a whale of an experimental program.

When queried about this \$8 billion potential contract cost, the Housing Administrator stated that there was "some exaggeration" in the figures. He referred to it as a \$200 million contract authorization program. But turn to page 235 of the hearings. Note the table submitted by the Housing Administrator showing the estimated cost of the rent supplement program for a 100-unit project. Here we find his estimate is that the aggregate rent supplements for this 100-unit project over 40 years will amount to \$944,000. That is \$9,440 per unit. Since this is supposed to be a 500,000 unit program, the cost of this program alone, based on these figures, is \$4.72 billion. We leave it to the reader to decide for himself which of the two cost estimates of the Administrator more accurately reflect the probable cost of the program.

Assuming appropriation and contracting of the full amounts requested (\$200 million multiplied by 40 years) there can be no question that the potential cost of the program is \$8 billion. With this program dressed up in a \$200 million outfit, Congress is confronted with an \$8 billion Trojan horse.

The means test

Additionally, we are puzzled that those who for years have objected to the means test on any and all social programs administered by Federal, State, and local governments have now reversed themselves by embracing the means test explicit in the rent supplement program.

Heretofore, means tests have been administered by various levels of government in an effort to insure that those with higher incomes and readily available assets would be ineligible for programs aimed at assisting those who couldn't afford the minimum requirements of food, shelter, and medical services. Although many charged that such tests were socially obnoxious, nevertheless they were aimed at maintaining a degree of equity for the indigent and low-income individuals and families in the total allocation of resources by the taxpaying public. In short, the means test has been restricted to indigents and those with low incomes in order equitably to carry out various social programs of public assistance.

Under the Administration's rent supplement proposal, however, we find means tests applying to those with incomes reaching far up into the moderate income levels. If such

a test were condemned as socially obnoxious before, consistency requires that they be similarly treated with regard to implementation of a rent supplement program. Under this proposal, however, the means test does not have in its defense a proper allocation of public assistance funds aimed at the most needy among our citizens.

To those who doubt that such means tests will be employed by HHFA in connection with rent supplements, we direct your attention to the Housing Administrator's colloquy with Congressman FINO, found on page 263 of the hearings, with regard to a hypothetical situation involving an investigation.

"Mr. FINO. All right. How would I be in difficulty if you do not police it or investigate it, supervise it and watch me?"

"Mr. WEAVER. You will be in difficulty because there will be spot checks, as there always are on these activities, and if this were found, you would be in difficulty for having made a false statement. I think you would be subject to quite a bit of criminal prosecution as well as being put out of the particular project."

"Mr. FINO. My time is up."

"Mr. WEAVER. And there is one other check, too, which I hate to say."

"Mr. FINO. What is that?"

"Mr. WEAVER. But your friends and neighbors would be very much concerned about this. They are the best investigators that you have in these projects."

Upon request, the Housing Administrator supplied for the record the estimated man-hours needed to investigate a prospective list of 100 approved applications for rent supplements. According to the Administrator, in just 77 areas of the country where there are FHA field offices, these investigations would be performed by employees of the HHFA. In all other areas, such investigations would be contracted for with employees and representatives of non-Federal organizations which could be either public or private. It was conceded by proponents in committee that Pinkerton's National Detective Agency could be such an eligible private agency.

The following comprise just a few of the tests that would be required, as submitted by the Administrator:

1. Check of incomes for 100 approved cases: Check W-2 forms presented, or if no W-2 forms telephone or send form letter to employer to determine if applicant is within the income limit for the area.

2. Check of assets on 100 approved cases: Check to see that the form and certification as to assets is complete and assets are within prescribed limit.

There can be no doubt that rent supplements would direct a means test at middle-income families, in support of a highly questionable social goal, while employing "friends and neighbors" in the very unfriendly and unneighborly role of informers.

Birth of national rental standards

Nowhere in the hearings has the administration shown evidence that it has studied the impact rent supplements would have on the prevailing patterns of rental rates. With the formula for virtually open-end subsidies, what would hold back limited-dividend and nonprofit organizations from building far more expensive multiunit apartment dwellings than those anticipated by the administration, with the consequent adverse impact on nonsubsidized rents? Indeed, under the language of section 101, the greatest rewards would derive to those organizations and tenants who build and occupy the most costly units.

Moreover, section 101 states that a family must first pay 25 percent of its income for rent before receiving any assistance from the Federal Government in the form of rent supplements. If this section were enacted, every landlord in the Nation could demand of his tenants that they pay 25 percent of their

total family income for rent. Their justification for such a demand? The national standards set by the Federal Government. Anyone paying less, it could be claimed, would be paying less than he should. Such a standard rule of thumb would put enormous pressure on millions of tenants, many of whom voluntarily devote far less than 25 percent of their income for rent. The rent gougers and absentee slum landlords in urban areas would waste little time taking advantage of this.

That this could have a profound economic and social impact can be seen by the administrator's testimony on page 218, where it is stated that the median gross monthly rent for families in the United States, according to the 1960 census was \$71. The median national family income for that same year was \$6,249. From this, the typical American family paid 13.6 percent of its income for rent—a little more than half of that proposed as the "norm" in the bill.

The precedent for widespread landlord checks on tenants' income conveniently would be found in the proposed means test to be employed in administering rent supplements. On page 262 of the hearings, the Housing Administrator states that Federal Income Tax Form W-2 would be checked in order to determine a tenants' income eligibility for rent supplements. In most cases, these forms would be surrendered to non-Government employees. Where this is impossible, "telephone or send form letter to employer to determine if applicant is within the income limit."

Can even the most cautious analyst deny the opportunities this opens to unscrupulous landlords?

WHO IS HOODWINKING WHOM?

From the outset of the hearings, it was apparent that section 101, rent supplements, was in deep trouble. Throughout the hear-

ings, even those witnesses who normally support broader housing legislation were unrelenting in their criticism.

In a last-minute attempt to bail out the floundering rent supplement program, the committee eliminated the income floor for those eligible to receive Federal rent payments. That this change is illusory and an attempt to hoodwink Congress can be seen by the Housing Administrator's answer to a question by Senator DOUGLAS during the Senate hearings, "Is there any reason why rent subsidies could not work for poor families, if the committee should decide to lower the income floor below \$3,000?"

"Mr. WEAVER. In the first place it goes back to something you said earlier and that is while we do have a volume of both limited dividend and nonprofit corporations which are ready and able to carry out the rent supplementation in the middle-income fields, it is my strong feeling that first many of these groups, certainly the limited-dividend groups are out, and many of the well-motivated nonprofit groups are really not in a position to take on all the management problems that are indigenous to this particular area of low-income management."

As if to underline this, in answer to a similar question from Senator PROXMIRE, "Why wouldn't they (low-income families) be the ones to get rent subsidies?" the Housing Administrator answered:

"You are not going to get the limited dividend companies building and adequately managing houses in the low-income segment."

From these candid admissions by the Housing Administrator during the Senate hearings, we leave it to the reader of this report to decide for himself the extent to which the most needy families would benefit by the committee action in eliminating the

income floor from the original administration bill.

As we have pointed out, while the open-end formula in the amended bill would permit flagrant abuses within both the lower and upper income brackets, the basic socioeconomic inequities remain.

Conclusion

On page 178 of the hearings the Housing Administrator, speaking of the rent supplement program, states:

"This program has received the greatest attention among the President's housing recommendations. It is a vital part of the proposed administration bill."

In our opinion the President has been sold a bill of goods. We cannot believe that he would "buy" such an incredibly wide open subsidy proposal had he been fully advised as to the potential evils of the program. This is a system of making the rent dollar of the beneficiary worth up to double or more the rent dollar of the unassisted taxpayer. It is unequal opportunity in housing by government fiat. It is legislated discrimination against the self-sufficient citizen.

We are certain the American public will not "buy" such nonsense as is contained in this proposal.

We hope that the Congress, alerted to the pitfalls of the proposal, will reject it.

Section 101, the rent supplement proposal, should be stricken from the bill.

PAUL A. FINO.
JAMES HARVEY.
W. E. BROCK.
BURT L. TALCOTT.
DEL CLAWSON.
ALBERT W. JOHNSON.
J. WILLIAM STANTON.
CHESTER L. MIZE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures: Romans 12: 21: *Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, as we come nearer to another Memorial Day, may we see those terrible and terrific facts that war, in the final analysis, simply means the killing of men, the destruction of property, and the breaking of human hearts.

May we catch a clear vision of those moral and spiritual equivalents to build a better world which are continually challenging and demanding our very best of effort and enthusiasm, of sympathy and service.

Help us to make the public law and the peace of the world our personal concern; give us more of that spirit of love which never faileth and which we must live by and must settle our differences and disputes by in a civilized and commonsense way.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2299. An act for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others;

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

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

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

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

H.R. 3708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 800) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and

evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

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

S. 45. An act for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.;

S. 69. An act for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen;

S. 97. An act for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr.;

S. 134. An act for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota;

S. 263. An act for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra;

S. 572. An act for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Ottilla Brueggemann James;

S. 1068. An act for the relief of Fred E. Starr; and

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Jack C. Winn, Jr.

THE WILL TO BE FREE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON which he made to the alumni of the Duquesne University School of Law.

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

There was no objection.