

professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 8684. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 8685. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for relocation payments to persons displaced by public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 8686. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for relocation payments to persons displaced by public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8687. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.R. 8688. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum amount of certain home improvement loans which may be insured, to extend the permissible maturity of these loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 8689. A bill to appropriate funds to the Secretary of the Army for the acquisition of a building on Fort Jay Military Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8690. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8691. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8692. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8693. 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. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 493. 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. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 494. 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. CURTIS:

H. Res. 405. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should take such action as may be necessary for the preparation of an international agreement to harmonize the operations and administration of the antidumping laws of all the countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 406. Resolution to authorize the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

288. By Mr. RYAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York relative to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

289. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, urging construction of an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

290. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to establishing a Pacific Medical Center in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

291. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, expressing admiration and appreciation of the valor and courage of the fighting men and women of the various branches of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

292. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the apportionment of membership in the State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the retention of Federal excise taxes and to distribute the proceeds thereof to the individual States in the proportion of amounts collected from each individual State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

294. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to amending the Constitution prohibiting the denial or abridgment of rights under the laws of the United States or of any State on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the proposed discontinuance by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of its utilization research program on western rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 8694. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 8695. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66-55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8696. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66-55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8697. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Lawrence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 8698. A bill for the relief of Miss Fong Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 8699. A bill for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8700. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cirrincione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

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

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

Our Father, God, returning to the demands of a new week, we come with grateful hearts as we have bowed with all the Nation at the altar of hallowed memory. In the hours just past, millions have paused in quiet cities of the dead to acknowledge an unpayable debt to those who, in heroic yesterdays, paid for our freedom with their mortal lives.

We come now in the afterglow of that sacramental memorial, with the prayer, deep in our hearts, that this generation to which we belong may be saved from the supreme folly of decorating tombs and at the same time desecrating the heritage it took graves to guarantee.

As bugles are sounding, summoning the Republic to new tests and decisions in liberty's cause, solemnize our hearts with the realization that evergreens of gratitude and forget-me-nots of love for the sacrifices of the past will not suffice as weapons with which to preserve the costly heritage of which Memorial Day is a solemn reminder. In days as crucial and as dangerous as any the Republic has ever known, save us from cowardly surrender to the easy policy of "safety first," lest in the future we lose both the peace and freedom, and so fall both man and Thee.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 27, 1965, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5241. An act 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; and

H.R. 5883. An act to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a 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., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### 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:

S. 800. 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; and

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 5241. An act 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; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 5883. An act to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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., was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, 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 an-

niversary 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 to June 17, 1965.

#### 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.

#### ST. MARY COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have the honor to address the graduating class at St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans., on Sunday last. In effect, it was like coming home to Montana because so many of the sisters and the novices were from my State, and those who were not from Montana had been sent up there to teach in our schools in Butte and Anaconda, to work in our hospitals, and, in general, to do good for our people.

It was a real pleasure for me to meet so many Montanans and adopted Montanans, to recognize the daughters of many of my old friends, and to participate in the commencement exercises.

This order, within a decade of its founding, set up its first mission in the State of Montana, and the sisters traveled by boat up the Missouri River, later over the Oregon, Bozeman, and other trails. Their contributions to Montana and the West have been many. They have been most helpful and most beneficial and we look upon them with respect, admiration, and affection. They are responsible, in large part, for the close bond between Kansas and Montana and for that we are grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the commencement address which I delivered at St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans., on Sunday, May 30, 1965.

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

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, OF MONTANA, ST. MARY COLLEGE, XAVIER, KANS., SUNDAY, MAY 30, 1965

First, let me thank you, Sister Mary Janet, for the historical sketch you have just given of the connection between the development of Montana as it applies to your order and as a result of the close relationship between Kansas and Montana based on that fact. In addition to the places you mentioned, we

could refer to the outstanding work performed by the sisters in my State within a decade after the founding of the order.

By boat you traveled up the Missouri and by land over the Oregon, the Bozeman and other trails. You made your imprint in the Beaverhead, the Madison, the Bitterroot, the Silver Bow and many other areas in Montana. In return we have contributed many of our daughters to this order and the work begun long before Custer's last stand in the Little Big Horn is being carried forward to this day. Your contributions have been many, varied and most deeply appreciated. It is my hope and expectation that this relationship will continue to fulfill its promise in the years ahead as it has over the past century.

Now, let me thank you for the invitation to come here today and talk with you. No man is so old or so tired that he likes to admit that he has nothing of interest to say to a group of attractive young ladies. So, while I am not sure I can do the trick, I very much appreciate the chance to try.

I am glad to be here for another reason as well. For young women along with other young men and women who have been given the blessed gift of education, will bear a special public responsibility in the future. This is true of course in all areas of national concern, but nowhere more so than in the difficult area of our relations with foreign governments. Here emotionalism easily runs wild, if it is untempered by education and contact with the day to day realities. In foreign affairs, more than elsewhere, there is a need for an up-to-date, sophisticated and restrained outlook. Without it, free government can be locked into postures made obsolete and dangerous by the shifting tides of international affairs. Without it a nation is likely to be always fighting the last war or the last diplomatic encounter over again, instead of facing directly and with fresh and penetrating thought the issues of the contemporary situation. And, finally, without an informed approach on the part of the people, the Nation may be unable, in its foreign policies, to take advantage of changes which occur continuously in the world, in order to strengthen the security of the Nation and the prospects for an enduring peace.

It is of some of these international changes of the past 15 years which I would like to speak today. These are changes which began as trickles just after you were born and are now coming into flood as you enter adulthood.

An overriding change since the Korean war has been the emergence of a kind of stalemate between Russia and the United States in terms of destructive nuclear capacity. Nuclear technology in both nations has now reached a point at which no significant military advantage is likely to be gained merely by pushing the accumulation of more destructive power. That is not to say that the Russians are not alert to possible technological breakthroughs or that we have gone to sleep. The search goes on here and it also goes on there. But a decisive altering of the basic nuclear stalemate is not in sight.

The fact is that both Russia and the United States are already in a position in which each can obliterate at least half the population of the other in a very short time. That is a sobering reality for all those with a share of the responsibility for the many decisions which, in the end, may involve an ultimate decision as to whether or not these instruments are used.

The very magnitude of the nuclear threat which hangs over the earth has had, oddly, a kind of constructive influence on world affairs. It is one of the realities which underlay the Russian withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a couple of years ago. And it was a major factor in the achievement of the nuclear test ban treaty. That treaty, in turn, was a precipitant in bringing about

an improvement in the general relations—at least until recently—between the two principal nuclear powers. In that respect, the treaty was a most significant achievement in the drive for a more peaceful world. It stands as an enduring and appropriate monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy—who would have been 48 yesterday—who refused, with great courage, to be deflected by political considerations, from his determination to achieve it.

The nuclear stalemate between Russia and the United States, then, is, indeed, one of the most significant changes of the past decade and a half. It has produced an international situation with which the principal nations have managed to live in reasonable stability for several years. In its context, the prospect of a Soviet military invasion of Western Europe which, for example, was once regarded as acute, appears to have receded. And by the same token, the military liberation of Eastern Europe which once was loudly trumpeted is no longer pressed from any responsible source as the basis of a sound policy for the Nation.

In short, the overall position of the two great nuclear powers in today's world appears to have become, increasingly, one of live and let live. This trend has emerged largely because the point has sunk home that the alternative is the opposite on such a scale as to drain either the triumph of freedom or the victory of communism of rational meaning. But the picture of a gradual easing in Soviet-United States relations is not complete unless we also take into consideration the effect of recent developments in Vietnam. These developments have not helped the trend which was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, pursued most effectively by President Kennedy, and vastly encouraged and continued by President Johnson.

The changed situation in Russian-United States relations in turn has been paralleled by changes throughout the Soviet bloc. It is obvious that the greater stability in Russian-United States relations has not set well with China but it has generally been welcomed by such eastern European nations as Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Communism did not spring full-blown in those eastern European nations at the close of World War II. Communism was in fact grafted by Soviet power onto several countries with different traditions, even as Stalin shut down on them an iron lid or ideological uniformity. The clothes of Communist conformity, however, were uncomfortable in eastern Europe and beneath them, the individual national traditions continued to stir. In recent years, this force for diversity has begun to find fuller expression.

The growing independence in Eastern Europe has been encouraged cautiously by recent policies of the United States. This was a cardinal principle of the foreign policy of President Kennedy, who recognized its value with respect to Poland even when he was a Senator. The conclusion of trade agreements and travel arrangements with Eastern European countries which pose no threat to us, as, for example, with Poland and Yugoslavia, has tended to increase their independence from the Soviet Union and provided some inducement for other satellite countries to follow in their footsteps—and that they have been, in fact, doing.

In this atmosphere of reduced tension in Europe, a difficult and intricate problem remains as the central roadblock to further progress toward a stable peace in that region. That is the problem of a divided Germany. In East Germany, the Soviet Union has continued to maintain a harsh and rigid control over a people who dislike the Communist system intensely. For our part, policy with respect to Germany is, apparently, based on an official assessment of immediate Soviet intentions in Europe which differs consider-

ably from that of our allies in Western Europe. It appears to me that these nations—West Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and others—see the Soviet situation in quite a different perspective—at least insofar as this perspective is reflected in policies. The Europeans, for example, carry on a trade with the Soviet Union which over recent years has run in the billions. What we have done in a most limited way in trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, they have done many, many times over with all of Eastern Europe and, of course, with the Soviet Union itself. Travel within Europe—East and West—is now very extensive and the lines of communication by sea, rail, road, and air between the two parts of the continent have expanded very markedly. In short, the Europeans generally have been acting with respect to the Soviet bloc as though peace had arrived in Europe. We have not, in policy, shared that optimism.

If there were a fusion of views as to precisely what the situation is, it is conceivable that, with it, there might also come a parallel recognition that proposals aimed at ending the armed confrontation in Germany and moving toward reunification are worth pursuing most intensely. A number of ideas have been advanced over the years which could serve as a beginning, but they have not as yet led to significant changes in policy.

The shift in Europe over the past few years is not unique. It is paralleled, for example, by significant changes which involve the underdeveloped countries. The political face of Africa has changed and over most of that continent, control is now exercised by African leaders rather than by Europeans. Many new nations have been added to the ranks of the intensely independent and underdeveloped states. But from the point of view of the nuclear powers, almost all such states are, now, of less importance as strategic prizes, to be wooed for their value as bases in the event of a total war. We ourselves have recognized this change to a considerable degree. We have, for example, abandoned a number of advanced air bases in these areas in the light of the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile and Polaris-carrying nuclear submarines. Similarly, the control of alien territory to insure access to strategic military raw materials which was once an absolutely vital consideration for all great powers may no longer carry quite so much weight.

This change in attitudes involving the underdeveloped nations applies in southeast Asia. President Johnson has said that there is no need for a forward base in that part of the world. Our fundamental power in the Pacific is air and sea power. This power, supreme throughout the Pacific, is sufficient to protect American security from any direct military threat from that part of the world for some years to come.

We also have in Vietnam, as elsewhere in southeast Asia, a shared interest with all free nations in resisting aggression. We can and will remain prepared to assist in stopping overt attempts to overrun peoples by force. But beyond this goal of preventing aggression in order to promote peace and freedom under the rule of law in the world, our direct national interests in southeast Asia are not nearly as great, for example, as those which we have with respect to Latin America.

For these reasons, as well as a basic aversion to war itself, the President has made it clear that we are willing to enter into unconditional discussions in an effort to find an honorable settlement in Vietnam and a more stable situation throughout southeast Asia. But if there is ever to be an honorable settlement, there has to be a beginning. There has to be a confrontation across the tables of peace. If such a meeting is to have any prospect of a successful outcome, there is also a parallel and simultaneous need for an interim cease fire and stand fast—both north and south. Unless the sounds of con-

flict are, first, stilled on all sides, the words of peace will not be heard on any side.

I am at a loss to understand how those elsewhere—in Peiping, for example—expect to be taken seriously in professing to hold paramount the interests of the people of Vietnam and a restoration of peace when, at the same time, they insist upon interpreting the President's words as meaning something other than unconditional discussion. It would be in our own best interests no less than in the best interests of the underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia were the latter able to concentrate on their own inner national needs and growth. That was clearly the President's hope when he offered to join with the Soviet Union and other nations in a common effort for the development of southeast Asia.

A common effort of this kind is clearly, too, the best way to help most of the underdeveloped nations, wherever they may be in the world, to remain free of outside domination and influence and to give indigenous institutions of freedom an opportunity to take root. Indeed, in the long run, it may be just about the only way to help them.

We are not likely to insure freedom within these nations by taking it upon ourselves either to overwhelm them with unilateral help or by turning our backs on their genuine needs for help. The one is the road to an isolated internationalism for this Nation. The other is the road to a national isolation for this Nation. And neither road is likely to lead to the safeguarding of the basic interests of this Nation. In short, the great need is for a discreet and discerning cooperation with other nations in dealing with underdeveloped nations.

This principle has relevance for the current crisis in the Dominican Republic which, after decades of a cruel dictatorship, is still a most underdeveloped nation. The President faced a critical situation—an emergency—there some weeks ago. He acted to meet it on humanitarian grounds and he met it well. And he is acting now to bring fully into play, the concept of cooperation with others in that situation. As a member of the Organization of American States, our military and diplomatic resources in the Dominican Republic are being used more and more in support of the Organization. For the problem in the island is not one of unique responsibility for the United States. It is one which must engage primarily the Dominican people and their leaders and, to the extent that it is necessary, the entire Western Hemisphere.

With the development of an inter-American military force, the heavy initial commitment of American forces on the island has already been reduced. And it is to be hoped, moreover, that this reduction will be rapidly accelerated if stability can be restored under the guidance of the OAS. I would hope, too, that the inter-American force which would remain could play two roles—that is, to support the efforts of the OAS and also to help in the reconstruction of Santo Domingo which has been seriously damaged in the struggle. It would also be desirable if other American states could develop a peace corps and send contingents to join the young men and women of this Nation who are already undertaking in the Dominican Republic many works of useful and peaceful construction.

To Americans, even to college students like you, the affairs of nations outside our borders may seem remote and unimportant at times, especially on a day like today. But I need not remind you—on Memorial Day—that events whose origins lay thousands of miles from our shores have reached into this Nation in the past and called us to sacrifice. As Americans, as inhabitants of the only world we have, I ask you to exercise the increasing responsibility which will be yours in the years ahead to see that no stone lies unturned, that no outdated myth or ancient hatred lies unexamined, and

that no opportunity is neglected in the slow painstaking search for a lasting peace.

And I ask you, too, to give your prayers to the President of the United States. His is the enormous burden in these matters. His is the paramount responsibility. For him, there is no rest from the incessant pressure of the problems of the Nation. For him, there is a plethora of advice and criticism which is easily enough extended. But upon him, in the end, falls the weight of grave decision as he seeks to follow the slender path to that stable peace which is the world's great need.

For our President we give our prayers and for you, the graduating class of 1965, I express the hope, the wish, and the prayer as laid down in an old Gaelic blessing:

"May the road rise to meet you.  
May the wind always be at your back.  
May the sun shine warm upon your face  
And the rains fall soft upon your fields.  
And, until we meet again, may God hold  
you in the hollow of His hand."

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

**PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1965, TO INCREASE THE U.S. QUOTA TO THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (S. Doc. No. 31)**

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1965, in the amount of \$1,035 million, in order to increase the U.S. quota to the International Monetary Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK**

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

#### REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of certain appropriations within that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

**REPORT ON APPROVAL OF LOAN TO EAST RIVER ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE, INC., MADISON, S. DAK.**

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., of Madison, S. Dak., in the amount of \$5,919,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

**PROPOSED TRANSFER OF CERTAIN BOATS TO U.S.S. "ALABAMA" BATTLESHIP COMMISSION MOBILE, ALA.**

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of two motor whaleboats to the U.S.S. *Alabama* Battleship Commission, Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

**REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER FIRMS**

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on De-

partment of Defense procurement from small and other firms, for the period July 1964-March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMEASUREMENT OF SMALL VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on observations on program designed to evaluate effectiveness of controls over highway construction, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional overpayments of rentals for automatic data processing machines at Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of Hawk and Nike-Hercules missile spare components because of deficiencies in requirements computations, Department of the Army, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings in interest costs to the Government attainable by greater use of Treasury checking account, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loss of revenue resulting from inadequate negotiations for communications services between Alaska and the U.S. mainland, Department of the Army, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs incurred under the dairy products price-support program by purchasing butter outside the general areas of production, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS ON PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE CELEBRATION OF ALASKA'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, his recommendations on participation by the United States in the celebration of Alaska's 100th anniversary under the American flag (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACTS OF GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam, and to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### 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 25

"A concurrent resolution proposing to apply to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the apportionment by the several States of membership in the legislatures of such States

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring) That the Legislature of Louisiana respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"ARTICLE —

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

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

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

"Be it further

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

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

"C. C. AYCOCK,

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

"VAIL M. DELONY,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

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

"STATE OF NEW YORK RESOLUTION 27

"Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt an appropriate amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting the denial or abridgment of rights under the laws of the United States or of any State on account of sex

"Whereas the women of our Nation have enjoyed full civil rights since the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendments; and

"Whereas all citizens of our Nation should not only share equal civil rights but also equal legal rights; and

"Whereas there exist many statutes discriminating against women; and

"Whereas such legal differentiations, merely because of sex, lower the nation's prestige and status in the world community; and

"Whereas both political parties announced support of equal legal rights in their respective platforms; and

"Whereas such a discriminating situation is outmoded and intolerable: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give favorable consideration to the required enabling legislation to present to the States for adoption an amendment to the U.S. Constitution providing, in substance, that 'equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex'; and be it further

*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

"In senate, May 20, 1965.

"Concurred in, without amendment.

"By order of the senate:

"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,  
Secretary.

"By order of the assembly:

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN, Clerk."

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

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 30

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

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

"Whereas, there is pending before Congress, the Dodd bills, known as S. 1591 and S. 1592, relating to regulation and registration of interstate firearms sales; and

"Whereas, this legislation, if enacted could: (1) Deny private citizens their constitutional property rights of selling personal valuable or rare firearms to other private citizens through interstate shipment; (2) force private citizens to sell firearms in interstate commerce only to dealers at a property value loss; and (3) infringe upon the constitutional right of private citizens to keep and bear arms: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialists respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take great caution not to enact any legislation relating to the regulation and registration of interstate firearms sales which would tend to infringe upon the aforementioned constitutional rights of citizens of the United States; be it

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

"Passed the house April 27, 1965.

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,  
Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate May 7, 1965.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,  
President of the Senate.

"I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of House Joint Memorial 30.

S. R. HOLCOMB,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

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

"Whereas funds available for construction, renovation, and modernization of hospitals under the Hill-Harris Act depend upon congressional appropriations; and

"Whereas the amounts appropriated have been generally less than the full statutory amounts authorized; and

"Whereas grants under the Hill-Harris Act may constitute up to 48 percent of the total costs of hospital construction, renovation, and modernization but have constituted less than the maximum allocation because of insufficient congressional appropriation; and

"Whereas hospital construction, renovation, and modernization in the State of Hawaii are vital to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of Hawaii where the projected population growth requiring expanded health facilities imposes a heavy burden on State and local financial resources: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1965 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation which will appropriate the full amount of funds authorized to the U.S. Public Health Service under the Hill-Harris Act for construction, renovation, and modernization of hospitals; and be it further

*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress and to the members of the Hawaii contingent in Congress."

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

"Whereas prior to statehood a veteran in Hawaii could be hospitalized in a hospital located in his own island community; and

"Whereas the advantages of local community hospitalization for veterans are many and significant in a State comprised of islands separated by ocean waters, including the advantages of economy, convenience, comfort, and proximity of family; and

"Whereas prior to statehood, Hawaii's hospitals assumed their full obligation to veterans and built their facilities with adequate beds to care for veterans and such facilities are now available to provide care and service for veterans: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1965 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to consider legislation which will authorize the Veterans' Administration to contract with local hospitals in the State for hospital services to veterans when there is no U.S. Government hospital on the island on which the veteran resides; and be it further

*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to the Members of the Hawaii contingent in Congress.

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

"STATE OF WISCONSIN ASSEMBLY JOINT  
RESOLUTION 81

"A joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to exempt domestic or household telephone services from the Federal excise tax

"Whereas the Federal Government charges an excise tax on domestic or household telephone services, including long-distance services; and

"Whereas such tax was established as a wartime measure, and has long ceased to serve the purpose for which originally passed; and

"Whereas such tax is grossly unfair and discriminatory in that it imposes an undue hardship upon millions of households in this country, and is discriminatory in that no other household public utility services are still so taxed; and

"Whereas there is a direct relationship between family income and household telephone development, and between farm income and farm telephone development, and the reduction in cost of service by elimination of the excise tax would promote telephone development in this State, which is below the Nation's average; and

"Whereas since in today's Great Society, telephones are a necessity, the elimination of the excise tax takes precedence over the elimination of the tax on less essential needs; and

"Whereas telephone rates are established throughout the Nation after careful consideration of all relevant facts, with objectives of the full development of the industry and provision of the maximum service to the public at the least possible cost; and

"Whereas the levying of a Federal excise tax distorts such rates, has a restrictive effect on the use of communication services, is discriminatory, adversely affects the earning potential of communication companies and thereby impairs the growth and improvement of such services; and

"Whereas it is believed that the Federal excise tax on telephone services should be modified to exempt therefrom telephone charges for domestic or household uses or for long-distance charges resulting from such uses: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to reconsider the Federal excise tax on telephone services and modify such tax to exempt therefrom telephone charges for domestic or household uses or from long-distance charges resulting from such uses; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Wisconsin Member of Congress.

"ROBERT T. HUBER,  
Speaker of the Assembly.

"JAMES P. BUCKLEY,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"PATRICK GLUX,  
President of the Senate.

"WILLIAM P. NUGENT,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate."

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

"RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND  
"Resolution of the general assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

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

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

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

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

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized by the general assembly to propose an amendment to the Constitution; such amendment to be in the following form:

"ARTICLE —

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

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

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

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A resolution adopted at the 31st annual convention of the Independent Bankers Association of America, at Hollywood, Fla., favoring the proposal for a blue ribbon commission to conduct a fundamental examination of the policy of the United States toward agriculture and rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia (Pa.) Typographical Union, the composing room chapel of the H. Wolff Book Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, N.Y., the Los Angeles (Calif.) Allied Printing Trades Council, the Boston (Mass.) Allied Printing Trades Council, and the Roanoke Typographical Union, of Roanoke, Va., all favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit interstate trafficking in strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the 74th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; ordered to lie on the table.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORDER OF LAFAYETTE

Mr. THURMOND, Mr. President, on May 8, 1965, the Order of Lafayette at its meeting and convention at the Shoreham Hotel adopted two important resolutions by unanimous vote. One endorses the legislation to establish a Freedom Academy and the other endorses the concept of a national defense program second to none. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both of these resolutions, with which I wholeheartedly agree, be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

##### RESOLUTION ON FREEDOM ACADEMY

Whereas it is now clearly recognized that despite economic and military superiority

during the past 20 years, close cooperation with the United Nations, the most immense foreign aid program in world history, that the United States has deteriorated as a world power, due to massive failures in the non-military area of political and propaganda warfare; and

Whereas it is now becoming increasingly clear that Communist officials are highly trained and dedicated Marxists whose consistent goal is world domination of the free world by a master strategic plan, and by effective political warfare; whose most important factor is the successful training of over 20,000 student subversives each year who return to their home countries to promote Communist infiltration and subversion; Be it therefore

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette in convention assembled, May 8, 1965, That the United States immediately initiate countermeasures to confront Communist aggression, infiltration, and political takeover, by establishing a number of Freedom Academies to enable the citizens of the free world to develop the political skills necessary to preserve their freedoms; and further

Resolved, That the Order of Lafayette recommends that the House of Representatives and the Senate take affirmative action on the Freedom Academy and Freedom Commission bills as essential measures to confront and prevent Communist aggression and expansion in the cold war.

##### RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas the survival of freedom is the single greatest issue in the world; and

Whereas the world Communist conspiracy is an ever-increasing menace to the preservation of freedom throughout the world; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette at its convention assembled May 8, 1965, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to maintain an air and missile force second to none and a Navy far greater and more powerful than any other Navy.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of the following resolutions passed by the General Court of Massachusetts.

I ask that these resolutions be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO RETAIN THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAXES AND TO DISTRIBUTE THE PROCEEDS THEREOF TO THE INDIVIDUAL STATES IN THE PROPORTION OF AMOUNTS COLLECTED FROM EACH INDIVIDUAL STATE

"Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union message suggested that some of the Federal excise taxes be eliminated; and

"Whereas the individual State are constantly seeking new sources of revenues to meet the ever-increasing costs of State government; and

"Whereas if these Federal excise taxes were retained for at least 6 additional years and the proceeds thereof distributed to the individual States in proportion to the amounts collected from each individual State, it would be a source of great financial assistance to

the States and would eliminate the necessity of the States seeking new sources of revenue: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would continue the Federal excise tax program for 6 additional years and to permit the distribution of the proceeds thereof to the individual States in proportion of the amounts collected from each individual State; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, May 17, 1965.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,  
"Clerk."

"Attest:  
"KEVIN H. WHITE,  
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FEDERAL GRANTS AND ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED AREAS AND REGIONS

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently launched an attack on certain areas of poverty, underdevelopment and underdevelopment by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and

"Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States two bills, co-sponsored by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, one providing grants for public works and development facilities and other financial assistance to alleviate unemployment in other economically distressed areas and regions (S. 1648) and one providing for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid other economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation (S. 812); and

"Whereas said bills provide for the creation of regional commissions to plan and implement regional economic programs, designed to foster regional productivity and growth; and

"Whereas such a regional commission for New England would be extremely effective and beneficial in coping with serious economic problems which transcend State boundaries, and which require Federal assistance founded on sound planning and directed to projects that will enhance long-term growth; and

"Whereas at a joint session of the General Court of Massachusetts on March 9, 1965, Senator KENNEDY expressed his hope that the general court would authorize participation in a New England Regional Commission which would work for regional development and cooperation, and his intention to sponsor major legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide Federal assistance for development of the New England region; and

"Whereas said legislation is vital to the New England region whose economic status more than qualifies it for the assistance provided by said legislation, because of many critical problems, the more pressing of which are caused by the closing of military installations, slack growth, deficient transportation becoming more critical each day, inadequate water pollution control, high electric power costs, a declining fishing industry, undeveloped natural resources, and unemployment: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress and the United States to enact Senate bill 1648 and Senate bill 812, thereby providing for strong, effective regional development commissions to coordinate an attack on the varied regional problems; and be it further

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts recognizes the importance of regional planning in connection with such legislation, and looks with favor upon the participation by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in a New England regional development commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate May 26, 1965.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,  
"Clerk.

"Attest:  
"KEVIN H. WHITE,  
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. COTTON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1404. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 268).

COLD WAR VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 269)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a favorable report on S. 9, to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, with amendment, together with minority views of Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, DOMINICK, MURPHY, and FANNIN.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed with the report of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this marks the fourth occasion upon which I have stood before this body and announced the favorable action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the cold war GI bill, S. 9. Each successive year that I have come here with the strong sentiments of the majority of the committee and my fellow Members of this body who are cosponsors of the bill there has been a growing tide of public support for prompt enactment of legislation which will provide equal educational opportunity for the dedicated veterans of cold war military service throughout the world. The GI educational bill is before us once again and it is more than evident that the people of America will no longer tolerate our delay or the

delay of the administration in acting upon this necessary measure.

Mr. President, the time for action on the cold war GI bill is now. The American economy is crying for more highly educated citizens—citizens whose dedication to their country in time of peril has established their capacity to become intellectual and cultural assets rather than useless liabilities on the lists of the unemployed. Let us at this session indicate our willingness to extend the hand of confidence to those thousands of men and women who have served their country well and who return to the civilian community without an economic or educational foothold.

Mr. President, I am proud to submit to this great body the cold war GI bill, now sponsored by more than 40 Senators, more Senators than have ever sponsored the measure in the past.

INCREASE BED CAPACITY OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 270)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a favorable report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, which expresses the concern of Congress and declares it shall be the sense of the Congress that the authorized bed capacity limitation of 125,000 for all VA hospitals which was established by President Eisenhower in a letter to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs dated February 26, 1959, should, in view of the present need for additional bed capacity in such hospitals, be increased by the President to a limitation of 130,000. The resolution asks the President to take such action as soon as practicable and it is reported without amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL MCKEE AS ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 271)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I re-

port favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1900) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee—U.S. Air Force, retired—to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators HARTKE and PEARSON.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

REPORT ENTITLED "A STUDY OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 272)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "A Study of the Federal Judicial System" pursuant to Senate Resolution 267, 88th Congress, 2d session, and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of April 1965. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL 1965 AND MARCH 1965, AND PAY, MARCH 1965 AND FEBRUARY 1965

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY  
(See table I, 2)

Information in monthly personnel reports for April 1965 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total <sup>1</sup> .....	2, 477, 653	2, 466, 054	+11, 599	\$1, 498, 683	\$1, 315, 622	+\$183, 061
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense.....	1, 455, 184	1, 448, 045	+7, 139	876, 390	771, 530	+104, 860
Department of Defense.....	1, 022, 469	1, 018, 009	+4, 460	622, 293	544, 092	+78, 201
Inside the United States.....	2, 317, 715	2, 306, 468	+11, 247	.....	.....	.....
Outside the United States.....	159, 938	159, 586	+352	.....	.....	.....
Industrial employment.....	543, 057	538, 310	+4, 747	.....	.....	.....
Foreign nationals.....	131, 361	132, 326	-965	24, 676	23, 538	+1, 138

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.





TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965, and pay for March 1965, and comparison with February 1965—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,156	2,126	30		\$2,140	\$1,882	\$258	
Department of the Army	<sup>10</sup> 361,876	360,607	1,269		215,396	188,882	26,514	
Department of the Navy	<sup>10</sup> 327,504	326,035	1,469		204,917	179,620	25,297	
Department of the Air Force	<sup>10</sup> 292,270	291,635	635		176,187	152,973	23,214	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,044	2,032	12		1,178	1,025	153	
Defense Communications Agency	958	963		5	819	695	124	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,169	2,165	4		1,855	1,613	242	
Defense Supply Agency	<sup>10</sup> 32,953	31,907	1,046		19,447	17,093	2,354	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			42	37	5	
Interdepartmental activities	9	9			6	5	1	
International military activities	55	55			50	43	7	
Armed Forces information and education activities	435	435			256	224	32	
Total, Department of Defense	1,022,469	1,018,009	4,465	5	622,293	544,092	78,201	
Net increase, Department of Defense			4,460				78,201	
Grand total, including Department of Defense <sup>11 12</sup>	2,477,653	2,466,054	16,247	4,648	1,498,683	1,315,622	183,075	\$614
Net increase, including Department of Defense			11,699				183,061	

<sup>1</sup> April figure includes 15,019 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,324 in March and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The April figure includes 3,882 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 4,174.  
<sup>2</sup> April figure includes 1,228 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,193 in March and their pay.  
<sup>3</sup> Revised on basis of later information.  
<sup>4</sup> No employment or pay reported since January 1965. Agency due to expire in June 1965.  
<sup>5</sup> New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11197 dated Feb. 5, 1965.  
<sup>6</sup> New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 89-4.  
<sup>7</sup> Less than \$500.  
<sup>8</sup> Agency abolished pursuant to Executive Order 11209 dated Mar. 25, 1965.  
<sup>9</sup> April figure excludes 4,081 intermittent consultants and attendings (doctors, nurses, dentists, etc.) on the Veterans' Administration rolls who were not paid during the month. The March figure has not been adjusted to exclude such persons. For further information see appendix, p. 13.

<sup>10</sup> In April 1,059 employees were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 680 from the Department of the Army, 89 from the Department of the Navy, and 290 from the Department of the Air Force.  
<sup>11</sup> Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.  
<sup>12</sup> Includes employment in the Job Corps by Federal agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), as follows:

Agency	April	March	Change
Agriculture Department	512	305	+207
Interior Department	546	432	+114
Total	1,058	737	+321

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture	99,608	97,839	1,769		Federal Communications Commission	1,497	1,502		5
Commerce	32,305	31,634	671		Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,432	1,432		
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,255	83,263		8	Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia		8		8
Interior	63,425	61,884	1,541		Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska	1	1		
Justice	32,026	31,992	34		Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,251	1,248	3	
Labor	9,001	8,892	109		Federal Maritime Commission	238	239		1
Post Office	594,927	592,132	2,795		Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	412	415		3
State <sup>1 2</sup>	11,257	11,083	174		Federal Power Commission	1,122	1,122		
Treasury	96,429	92,413	4,016		Federal Radiation Council	4	5		1
Executive Office of the President:					Federal Trade Commission	1,134	1,142		8
White House Office	318	320		2	Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	179	180		1
Bureau of the Budget	483	483			General Accounting Office	4,085	4,097		12
Council of Economic Advisers	40	41		1	General Services Administration	35,225	35,198	27	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	74		1	Government Printing Office	7,308	7,321		13
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	32		2	Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,319	13,312	7	
National Council on the Arts	4	4			Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
National Security Council	39	39			Interstate Commerce Commission	2,393	2,397		4
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,199	1,848	351		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,083	33,081	2	
Office of Emergency Planning	374	364	10		National Capital Housing Authority	422	429		7
Office of Science and Technology	142	85	57		National Capital Planning Commission	55	52	3	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	28		1	National Capital Transportation Agency	32	31	1	
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	11	11			National Commission on Food Marketing	40	40		
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	11			National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	9	19		10
President's Council on Equal Opportunity	10		10		National Gallery of Art	313	303	10	
Independent agencies:					National Labor Relations Board	2,076	2,075	1	
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25			National Mediation Board	135	117	18	
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7			National Science Foundation	998	1,075		77
Appalachian Regional Commission	2		2		Panama Canal	156	155	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,129	7,161		32	President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	1	1		
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	1	1			President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	58	59		1
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	635	639		4	Railroad Retirement Board	1,728	1,737		9
Civil Aeronautics Board	823	928		6	Renegotiation Board	184	185		1
Civil Service Commission	3,728	3,728			St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	158		
Civil War Centennial Commission	4	4			Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,386	5	
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			Selective Service System	7,227	7,200	27	
Commission on Civil Rights	89	91		2	Small Business Administration	3,521	3,495	26	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			Smithsonian Institution	1,882	1,795	87	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	296		1	Soldiers' Home	1,109	1,095	14	
Farm Credit Administration	232	235		3	Subversive Activities Control Board	20	26		6
Federal Aviation Agency	43,668	43,698		30	Tariff Commission	275	275		
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			Tax Court of the United States	151	149	2	
					Tennessee Valley Authority	16,392	16,241	151	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965—Continued

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	De-crease	Department or agency	April	March	Increase	De-crease
<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>					<b>Department of Defense—Continued</b>				
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	162	161	1	-----	Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,044	2,032	12	-----
U.S. Information Agency.....	3,467	3,642	5	-----	Defense Communications Agency.....	906	912	-----	6
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.....	18	18	6	-----	Defense Intelligence Agency.....	2,169	2,165	4	-----
Veterans' Administration.....	166,838	170,841	-----	4,003	Defense Supply Agency.....	32,942	31,906	1,036	-----
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission.....	1	1	-----	-----	U.S. Court of Military Appeals.....	40	40	-----	-----
					Interdepartmental activities.....	9	9	-----	-----
Total, excluding Department of Defense. Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,393,145	1,385,496	11,906	4,257	International military activities.....	34	34	-----	-----
					Armed Forces information and education activities.....	435	435	-----	-----
<b>Department of Defense:</b>					<b>Total, Department of Defense.....</b>				
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,108	2,078	30	-----	Net increase, Department of Defense.....	924,570	920,972	3,604	6
Department of the Army.....	313,192	312,217	975	-----					
Department of the Navy.....	304,018	302,924	1,094	-----	<b>Grand total, including Department of Defense.....</b>				
Department of the Air Force.....	266,673	266,220	453	-----	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....	2,317,715	2,306,468	15,510	4,263
									11,247

<sup>1</sup> April figure includes 3,015 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,976 in March.  
<sup>2</sup> April figure includes 806 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 773 in March.

<sup>3</sup> Revised on basis of later information.  
<sup>4</sup> New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11197 dated Feb. 5, 1965.  
<sup>5</sup> New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 89-4.  
<sup>6</sup> Agency abolished pursuant to Executive Order 11209 dated Mar. 25, 1965.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	De-crease	Department or agency	April	March	Increase	De-crease
<b>Executive departments (except Department of Defense):</b>					<b>Independent agencies—Continued</b>				
Agriculture.....	1,282	1,250	32	-----	Smithsonian Institution.....	23	24	-----	1
Commerce.....	609	607	2	-----	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	3	3	-----	-----
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	660	655	5	-----	United States Information Agency.....	8,142	8,187	-----	45
Interior.....	640	638	2	-----	United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.....	8	6	2	-----
Justice.....	364	363	1	-----	Veterans' Administration.....	983	977	6	-----
Labor.....	77	70	7	-----	Virgin Islands Corporation.....	312	302	10	-----
Post Office.....	1,609	1,620	-----	11					
State <sup>1</sup> .....	29,324	29,642	-----	318	Total, excluding Department of Defense. Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....	62,039	62,549	73	583
Treasury.....	708	706	2	-----					510
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					<b>Department of Defense:</b>				
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	437	433	4	-----	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	48	48	-----	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.....	32	33	-----	1	Department of the Army.....	48,684	48,390	294	-----
Civil Service Commission.....	3	3	-----	-----	Department of the Navy.....	23,486	23,111	375	-----
Federal Aviation Agency.....	1,104	1,121	-----	17	Department of the Air Force.....	25,597	25,415	182	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	5	5	-----	-----	Defense Communications Agency.....	52	51	1	-----
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	2	2	-----	-----	Defense Supply Agency.....	11	1	10	-----
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	11	11	-----	-----	International military activities.....	21	21	-----	-----
General Accounting Office.....	57	57	-----	-----					
General Services Administration.....	30	29	1	-----	Total, Department of Defense.....	97,899	97,037	862	-----
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	209	209	-----	-----	Net increase, Department of Defense.....				862
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	16	16	-----	-----					
National Labor Relations Board.....	34	33	1	-----	<b>Grand total, including Department of Defense.....</b>				
National Science Foundation.....	4	4	-----	-----	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....	159,938	159,856	935	583
Panama Canal.....	15,125	15,310	-----	185					352
Selective Service System.....	156	153	3	-----					
Small Business Administration.....	70	70	-----	-----					

<sup>1</sup> April figure includes 12,004 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,348 in March. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose.

The April figure includes 3,882 of these trust fund employees and the March figure includes 4,174.  
<sup>2</sup> April figures include 422 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 420 in March.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1965, and comparison with March 1965

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	De-crease	Department or agency	April	March	Increase	De-crease
<b>Executive departments (except Department of Defense):</b>					<b>Department of Defense:</b>				
Agriculture.....	3,621	3,629	-----	8	Department of the Army:				
Commerce.....	5,726	6,025	-----	299	Inside the United States.....	<sup>1</sup> 133,245	<sup>2</sup> 130,945	2,300	-----
Interior.....	9,822	9,557	265	-----	Outside the United States.....	<sup>1</sup> 4,408	<sup>2</sup> 3,989	419	-----
Post Office.....	268	264	4	-----	Department of the Navy:				
Treasury.....	5,477	5,483	-----	6	Inside the United States.....	183,921	182,730	1,191	-----
<b>Independent agencies:</b>					Outside the United States.....	1,506	1,273	233	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.....	257	255	2	-----	Department of the Air Force:				
Federal Aviation Agency.....	2,508	2,565	-----	57	Inside the United States.....	125,917	125,581	336	-----
General Services Administration.....	2,223	2,172	51	-----	Outside the United States.....	1,157	865	292	-----
Government Printing Office.....	7,308	7,321	-----	13	Defense Supply Agency:				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	33,099	33,097	2	-----	Inside the United States.....	1,528	1,535	-----	7
Panama Canal.....	7,345	7,503	-----	158					
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	157	157	-----	-----	Total, Department of Defense.....	451,682	46,918	44,771	7
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,252	13,062	190	-----	Net increase, Department of Defense.....				4,764
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	312	302	10	-----					
					<b>Grand total, including Department of Defense.....</b>				
Total, excluding Department of Defense. Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....	91,375	91,392	524	541	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....	543,057	538,310	5,295	548
				17					4,747

<sup>1</sup> Subject to revision.

<sup>2</sup> Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of April 1965 and comparison with March 1965

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	April	March	April	March	April	March	April	March
Crete.....	75	81					75	81
England.....	2,203	2,329	106	102	101	101	1,996	2,126
France.....	14,590	14,751	11,350	11,496	9	10	3,231	3,245
Germany.....	66,265	66,880	55,931	56,442	70	70	10,264	10,368
Greece.....	309	308			39	39	270	269
Japan.....	41,534	41,573	14,139	14,179	12,309	12,314	15,086	15,080
Korea.....	5,434	5,443	5,434	5,443				
Morocco.....	536	543			536	543		
Netherlands.....	52	52					52	52
Trinidad.....	363	366			363	366		
Total.....	131,361	132,326	86,960	87,662	13,427	13,443	30,974	31,221

APPENDIX

The Veterans' Administration has advised the committee that the number of persons in its April 1965 report reflects "activation of new employment reporting procedures" with respect to certain intermittent employment. It also advised that while its reported employment under this new procedure reflects fewer persons, no substantial reduction has been made in actual employment and that there is no reduction in the actual cost of employment.

The Veterans' Administration figure for April reflects employment exclusive of 4,081 intermittent consultants and attendings (doctors, nurses, dentists, etc.) who were not paid during April. The March employment figure has not been adjusted to exclude such persons.

The Veterans' Administration has informed the committee that further adjustments will be made in such employment figures in future months under its new reporting procedure.

The committee was advised of this situation in a letter dated May 14, 1965, from the Veterans' Administration. The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1965.

The CHAIRMAN,  
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Room 329, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of our "Monthly Report of Federal Civilian Employment" for April 1965.

In April we initiated a modification of our procedures for obtaining employment counts on intermittent consultants and attendings. Previously, all such personnel on Veterans' Administration rolls were reported each month whether or not they actually worked or were paid in a particular month. Through automatic data processing methods we have found it feasible, with a very minimum additional administrative workload, to exclude from the month-end employment count intermittent consultants and attendings not paid during the report month. This is, in effect, a further refinement of our PAID system for personnel and fiscal operations from which data is generated for both internal and external reports purposes.

As a result of the initial activation of new employment reporting procedures for consultants and attendings, the line 1 count in the current SF 113-A report is substantially below that shown in our prior report—for March. A further decrease is anticipated for the May report when the new system is fully implemented.

The drop in overall VA employment figures does not reflect any substantial change in actual VA staffing or basic staffing needs; nor will it result in any actual cost reductions.

This "decline" does not affect in any way the employment count of the continuing work force of full-time employees and regularly scheduled part-time employees. In summary the change in our employment figure stems merely from a refinement in employment reporting procedures for intermittently employed consultants and attendings who are carried on VA rolls primarily to augment on an "as needed basis" the regular staff in our medical program.

Sincerely,

A. H. MONK,  
Associate Deputy Administrator.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of April totaling 2,477,653. This was a net increase of 11,599 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1965, which began July 1, 1964, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1964.....	2,492,061	10,479	
August.....	2,495,606	3,545	
September.....	2,461,376		34,230
October.....	2,470,330	8,954	
November.....	2,493,837	23,507	
December.....	2,485,771		8,066
January 1965.....	2,464,012		21,759
February.....	2,459,595		4,417
March.....	2,469,054	6,459	
April.....	2,477,653	11,599	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of April was 1,455,184, an increase of 7,139 as compared with the March total of 1,448,045. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,022,469, an increase of 4,460 as compared with 1,018,009 in March.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Treasury Department with 4,018, Post Office Department with 2,784, Agriculture Department with 1,801, and Interior Department with 1,544. The Veterans' Administration reported the largest decrease with 3,997. The increases in Treasury, Agriculture, and Interior Departments were largely seasonal, and the decrease in Veterans' Administration reflects new reporting procedures (see committee report).

In the Department of Defense the largest increases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 1,469, Army with 1,269, Defense Supply Agency with 1,046, and Air Force with 635.

Total employment inside the United States in April was 2,317,715, an increase of 11,247 as compared with March. Total employment outside the United States in April was 159,938, an increase of 352 as compared with

March. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in April totaled 543,057, an increase of 4,747.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,477,653 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 131,361 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during April who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in March was 132,326. A breakdown of this employment for April follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Crete.....	75			75
England.....	2,203	106	101	1,996
France.....	14,590	11,350	9	3,231
Germany.....	66,265	55,931	70	10,264
Greece.....	309		39	270
Japan.....	41,534	14,139	12,309	15,086
Korea.....	5,434	5,434		
Morocco.....	536		536	
Netherlands.....	52			52
Trinidad.....	363		363	
Total.....	131,361	86,960	13,427	30,974

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John M. Leddy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Ridgway B. Knight, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium;

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund;

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development;

Marshall Green, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Indonesia;

Joseph J. Jova, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Honduras; and

Mrs. Patricia Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MONTROYA:

S. 2055. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pham Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2056. A bill for the relief of Spyridon and Ekaterini Kallimanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 2057. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2058. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

S. 2059. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949;

S. 2060. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 2061. A bill to authorize the establishment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a Youth Council as an agency of the Government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2062. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2063. A bill for the relief of Sixto M. Paganan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2064. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2065. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. 2066. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YARBROUGH):

S. 2067. A bill to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, of title 38, United States Code, so as to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE ORGANIC ACTS OF GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Organic Acts of Guam and the Virgin Islands in order to provide for the payment of the legislative salaries and expenses by the governments of those two territories.

The bills are being introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior as a result of an Executive communication dated May 26, 1965. I request that the letter to the Vice President setting forth the justification for this legislation, together with the text of the bills, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and,

without objection, the bills and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2065. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (e) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d(e)), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Each member of the legislature shall be paid such compensation and shall receive such additional allowances or benefits as may be fixed under the laws of Guam. Such compensation, allowances or benefits, together with all other legislative expenses shall be appropriated by, and paid out of funds of, the government of Guam."

S. 2066. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (e) of section 6 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 499), as amended (73 Stat. 563; 48 U.S.C. 1572(e)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(e) Each member of the legislature shall be paid such compensation and shall receive such additional allowances or benefits as may be fixed under the laws of the Virgin Islands. Such compensation, allowances or benefits, together with all other legislative expenses shall be appropriated by, and paid out of funds of, the government of the Virgin Islands."

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1965.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is the draft of a proposed bill "to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam," together with the draft of a proposed bill, intended as a companion proposal to the first, "to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands."

This Department has urged in the past, and continues to urge, the enactment of legislation intended to grant to the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands the degree of autonomy and self-government which we believe is warranted by the demonstrated development and political maturity of these territories. The enclosed proposals are in furtherance of that policy. The proposals authorize the government of Guam and the government of the Virgin Islands to pay such legislative salaries and expenses as may be fixed by the laws of the respective territories. The federally imposed limitation on such salaries and expenses is eliminated, and the United States is relieved of its obligation to pay those salaries and certain of the expenses—an obligation which has necessitated the Federal expenditure of approximately \$37,000 per year. In our judgment, the enactment of these proposals would be a useful step toward the ultimate achievement

of territorial home rule, which we know is the common goal of all of those in the Federal establishment who share the obligation and responsibility for the welfare and development of these territories of the United States.

Apart from the matter of home rule and the substantial question of policy which that matter involves, we believe that a persuasive argument for the enactment of this legislation can be made premised on a recognition of the substantial local responsibilities of the territorial legislatures, and, simultaneously, of the prerogatives and privileges which they should, but do not, possess.

Under existing provisions of Federal law, specifically 48 U.S.C. 1421(e) in the case of Guam, and 48 U.S.C. 1572(e) in the case of the Virgin Islands, the basic compensation of members of the territorial legislatures is fixed by statute and provision is made for the payment of that compensation by the United States. In the case of Guam all other legislative expenses, whatever they may be, are appropriated by, and paid out of, funds of the government of Guam. In the case of the Virgin Islands, additional provision is made for per diem and travel expenses, both to be paid by the United States, and for the legislature to provide for the payment of travel expenses and per diem for its members traveling on official business outside the Virgin Islands, subject to the limitation that the latter payments shall not be in excess of those that would be allowed Federal employees similarly situated.

In each of the two territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands the Congress has provided for a legislative body independent of the executive and judicial branches with true legislative authority extending to all subjects of local application and subject only to those limitations made necessary by, and consistent with, the relationship between the territories and the United States. The exercise of this legislative authority has extended to, among a multitude of other subjects, the consideration of the territorial budgets and to the appropriation of the funds necessary for the operation of the local government. Thus, with the exception of the few Federal employees in each of the territories whose salaries are fixed by Federal law, the territorial legislatures find themselves able to fix the salaries of the officers and employees of the local governments, and to appropriate from the funds of the territories the amounts necessary to pay those salaries, but, because of the Federal law noted above, are unable to act with respect to their own salaries and expenses. Here we believe it is significant to note, without denying or attempting to minimize certain substantial Federal assistance, that neither Guam nor the Virgin Islands come before the Congress with requests for direct appropriations to support the administration of the territories except in the most extraordinary of circumstances, as, for example, the Guam Rehabilitation Act, and the appropriations requested pursuant thereto. Therefore, the expression "funds of the government of the Virgin Islands" or "funds of the government of Guam" have a significance which should not be overlooked.

When it is remembered that the members of the territorial legislatures are the popularly elected representatives of the people of the territory and are not in any way Federal officers or employees, we submit that the limitation upon the legislatures with which we are concerned is wholly unnecessary and, further, is demeaning to the extent that such limitation can and has been construed as evidencing Federal mistrust as well as the precautionary retention by the Federal Government of a substantial degree of potential leverage should the need arise in connection with the activities of the legislatures. We know that while initially the existing provisions of law may have been the product of

considerable paternalism, the foregoing construction could not be more untrue today. Nevertheless, it is an allegation which we are called upon to rebut from time to time and which is of real concern to the territorial government as well as to the people of the territories and to this Department. In view of this situation, and the state of the law, the solution we suggest seems most appropriate. Considering the very substantial responsibilities of the territorial legislatures of both Guam and the Virgin Islands and what we consider to be the nature and responsible way in which those responsibilities are discharged, it seems a small thing indeed to suggest that these legislative bodies, which have been given the legislative responsibility for so much, could and should be empowered to fix their own salaries and expenses and to provide for the payment thereof, subject of course to the normal legislative procedures and the concurrence of the Governor.

The enactment of the enclosed proposals is urged by this Department upon the basis of our independent and carefully considered opinion that such enactment would be appropriate and just. At the same time, however, these proposals are urged for enactment by the Honorable Manuel F. L. Guerrero, Governor of Guam, the Honorable Ralph M. Palewosky, Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Legislature of Guam, the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, and the ad hoc constitutional convention which was convened in the Virgin Islands to consider the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands and to recommend, in connection therewith, changes, amendments or deletions which the convention believed to be in the best interests of the territory and necessary to the welfare and development thereof, yet consistent with the relationship which exists between the territory and the United States.

When Governor Guerrero was asked for his views concerning this proposal, he responded in a radiogram as follows: "I support such legislation on grounds that present stipend is unrealistic and that those who enact local laws should be financially supported by local government. The Governor's organic powers would be sufficient to avoid any abuse as to level of salaries set."

Governor Palewosky, with whom the matter frequently has been discussed, has in every instance argued the need for this legislation and urged its introduction and enactment.

The constitutional convention also turned to that section of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands which provides for the payment of compensation of the members of the legislature. While the proposed amendment is perhaps unnecessarily detailed, for which reason we have suggested the somewhat different language in the enclosed bill, it clearly evidences the wishes of the delegates to the convention. The convention's suggested amendment is as follows:

"Compensation and allowances: Each member of the legislature shall be paid such compensation as shall be fixed by enactment of the legislature and approved by the Governor; provided that such compensation after it has first been fixed shall not be changed except by legislative enactment for the next legislature. Each member of the legislature who is away from the island of his residence shall also receive a per diem, fixed by the legislature, for each day's attendance while the legislature is actually in session, in lieu of his expenses for subsistence, and shall be reimbursed for his actual travel expenses in going to and returning from each session, or period thereof. The salaries, per diem, and travel allowances of the members of the legislature shall be paid by the government of the Virgin Islands."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this legislative proposal is in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

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

#### AMENDMENT OF WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators CLARK, FANNIN, JAVITS, MORSE, MURPHY, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PELL, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH a bill to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. This bill will increase the monthly educational benefits that are available to the children of American servicemen who have lost their lives during past wars or those hostile actions in which U.S. forces have been involved since 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for additional cosponsors for a period of 10 days.

Mr. President, the War Orphans' Act currently provides monthly educational benefits of up to \$110 for the children of American soldiers who were killed, or later died from permanent injuries, as a result of the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, or hostile "cold war" actions. Included in this last category are such involvements as the Berlin crisis, the 1958 landing in Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, Cuba, the current Vietnam engagement and Dominican Republic action. Also covered are the children of American servicemen who have died from extrahazardous duty during this period.

These students, between the ages of 18 and 23, receive their benefits for 18 months while attending higher educational institutions, while participating in vocational education programs or special restorative training for the disabled.

This bill is introduced in recognition of the inadequacy of the current educational benefits for war orphans. There is no doubt that there are economic hardships facing the surviving families of our servicemen. There is also no doubt that the Nation has a special responsibility to ease their plight. For these basic reasons the bill would increase the educational benefits for these children from \$110 to \$150 a month.

Mr. President, the average cost of higher education in public institutions today is \$174 a month; in private colleges and universities it is \$263 a month. This represents increases of 65 to 75 percent over 1956 when the War Orphans' Act was passed. The purpose of the War Orphans' Act was one of aiding "children in attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the disability or death of (their) parent."

The time has come to reaffirm this purpose by raising the children's benefits in keeping with the school expenses they face.

I need not point out that both young and seasoned servicemen are losing their lives in growing numbers each day in southeast Asia. Surely, if we can af-

ford the large sums necessary to prepare these men for the ultimate effort, we can afford the small outlays necessary to prepare their children, through education, for a full and productive life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 2067) to amend chapter 35, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, of title 38, United States Code, so as to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### REFERRAL OF FIREARMS LEGISLATION TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following bills, each presently pending before the Senate Commerce Committee, be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee:

S. 14, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act;

S. 1180, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the importation of a firearm into the United States without a license; and

S. 1965, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

S. 14 and S. 1180 were introduced by me; S. 1965 by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Judiciary Committee's Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is in the process of holding hearings on S. 1592, the administration bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

It is appropriate that we take testimony on the full range of firearms legislation presently before the Senate during these hearings and I appreciate the fact that the chairmen of the two committees, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], have agreed to permit the referral of these three bills.

Hearings on firearms legislation will resume this week, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, June 2, 3, and 4.

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

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

##### AMENDMENT NO. 218

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 6675, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

**AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 219)**

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965 (AMENDMENTS NOS. 220 THROUGH 225)**

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk six amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965—S. 1837—ask that they be printed and lie at the desk, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate places in my remarks.

At the appropriate time I shall discuss each of these amendments at greater length. My sole purpose in introducing them today is so that there may be an opportunity to study them before they are called up.

At a later date I shall discuss generally the U.S. economic and military assistance programs and the deficits I see in those programs which can be corrected by legislative action.

Today I shall only describe each amendment briefly.

My first amendment—No. 220—which I ask be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to the period for which authorizations would be approved for the foreign aid program. As reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, S. 1837 provides for a 2-year authorization. H.R. 7750, as passed by the other body, continues the practice of annual reviews of the program and of annual authorizations.

This amendment would continue that practice. As I shall show in later remarks, the sole purpose of this change to 2-year authorizations is to limit congressional review of the program. It can serve no other use.

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

On page 3, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive.

On page 3, line 13, strike out "(b) Amend section 205" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 102. Section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

On page 3, line 14, after the comma insert "is amended".

On page 4, strike out lines 12 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "by striking out '1965' and '\$215,000,000' and

substituting '1966' and '\$210,000,000', respectively."

On page 4, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) Amend subsection (c) by striking out '1965, \$18,000,000' and substituting '1966, \$7,000,000'."

On page 5, line 19, strike out "1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1967".

On page 8, line 19, strike out "1968" and insert in lieu thereof "1967".

On page 8, beginning with line 20, strike out through line 2 on page 9.

On page 9, line 4, strike out "Sec. 106" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 105".

On page 9, strike out lines 6 to 13, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "is amended by striking out 'and \$85,000,000 in fiscal year 1965' and substituting ', \$85,000,000 in fiscal year 1965, and \$70,000,000 in fiscal year 1966'."

On page 9, line 16, strike out "Sec. 107" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 106".

On page 10, lines 6 and 7, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 10, line 11, strike out "Sec. 108" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 107".

On page 10, strike out lines 13 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "amended by striking out '1965' and '\$405,000,000' and substituting '1966' and '\$350,000,000', respectively."

On page 10, line 21, strike out "Sec. 109" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 108".

On page 10, line 24, beginning with the word "each" strike out through line 2 on page 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal year 1966, not to exceed \$50,000,000."

On page 11, line 12, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1966".

On page 11, line 13, strike out ", which".

On page 11, line 14, strike out "in each such fiscal year, which sums".

On page 14, line 10, strike out "years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "year 1966".

On page 14, lines 12 and 13, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1966".

On page 14, line 19, strike out "years 1966 and 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "year 1966".

On page 14, strike out lines 20 and 21.

On page 18, line 22, strike out "June 30, 1967" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1966".

On page 21, line 1, beginning with the word "inserting" strike out through "1967" in line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "substituting 'for the fiscal year 1966 not to exceed \$55,240,000'."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my second amendment—No. 221—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to the declaration contained in S. 1837, as reported, that it is the policy of the Congress that an increasing portion of assistance be distributed on a multilateral basis. This again, as I shall point out at a later time, is an attempt to diminish congressional control over the foreign aid program.

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

On page 2, lines 11-13, delete the following words: "United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis and the."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my third amendment—No. 222—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks,

relates to foreign economic assistance to Indonesia. This too I shall explain at greater length in the days ahead. However, anyone who has followed the press reports from Indonesia is well aware of the fact that the country has scorned our aid. If that be so, there is good reason for a congressional prohibition against any further aid to that country.

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

On page 18, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(2) Amend subsection (j) to read as follows:

"(j) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, and no sales shall be made under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to Indonesia. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

On page 18, line 19, strike out "(2)" and substitute "(3)".

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my fourth amendment—No. 223—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to further economic assistance to the United Arab Republic. My amendment would ban such aid unconditionally. I have spoken often on this subject. I shall speak on it again at length when I call up my amendment. The present Foreign Assistance Act bans foreign economic assistance to nations which practice or threaten aggression against nations aided by the United States. There can be no doubt—judged by its actions against Cyprus, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and the Congo—that the United Arab Republic is acting as the aggressor in those areas. However, there does not seem to be any disposition on the part of the administration to cut off economic aid to the United Arab Republic, despite the fact that it is our aid which enables that country to continue its aggression. Therefore, my amendment would constitute an absolute bar to any further aid to the United Arab Republic.

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

On page 18, after line 22, insert the following:

"(3) Add the following new subsection: "(n) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, and no sales shall be made under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to the United Arab Republic. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my fifth amendment—No. 224—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, relates to the authority which would be given by the bill as reported to the President to shift up to 20 percent of the amount made available for the Development Loan Fund to the International Development Association, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation. This again is an attempt to remove congressional control over the

foreign aid program. For example, the adoption of this provision would remove the transferred funds from the restrictions of the Hickenlooper amendment governing the expropriation of U.S. owned industries. On this provision I shall also talk at length when the amendment is called up.

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

On pages 3 and 4, delete subsection (b).

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my sixth and final amendment relates to interest charges on development loans. My amendment—No. 225—which I ask to be printed at this point in my remarks, would change the minimum interest rates from 1 percent for the first 10 years to 2½ percent and from 2½ percent thereafter to the cost of money thereafter. I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the Senate that the present minimum interest rates amount to an indirect grant rather than the much publicized loans which they purportedly are. On this point I shall also speak at length when I call up my amendment.

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

Between lines 4 and 5 on page 4 add the following new subsection:

"(c) Amend section 201(d) which relates to interest rates, as follows:

"(1) Strike out '2½ per centum per annum' and insert in lieu thereof: 'the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum';

"(2) Strike out '1 per centum' and insert in lieu thereof: '2½ per centum.'"

So that section 201(d) would read as follows:

"Funds made available for this title shall not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest excessive or unreasonable for the borrower and in no event shall such funds (except funds loaned under section 205 and funds which prior to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 were authorized or committed to be loaned upon terms which do not meet the minimum terms set forth herein) be loaned at a rate of interest arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than 2½ per centum per annum, nor higher than the applicable legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

#### PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 226)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for Mr. MILLER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to 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, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 25, line 13, insert the following: add a new subsection (6) as follows:

"(6) those additional areas in which the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture,

"(A) agriculture is the major industry,

"(B) there has been a substantial decrease (or continuing marked decrease) in the number of persons engaged in agriculture as a major source of their income or livelihood,

"(C) there is a substantial migration out of the area of such persons, and

"(D) such migration has caused or is contributing to a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in other areas."

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1877) to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch, which I introduced on May 3, 1965.

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

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

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

Authority of May 13, 1965:

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 with respect to entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and charges authorized thereunder: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. THURMOND.

Authority of May 18, 1965:

S. 1985. A bill to authorize hearings and judicial review in connection with applications for certificates to commence business by associations organized under the national banking laws, and for other purposes: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. THURMOND.

S. 1991. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, to provide for matching grants for excess benefit costs, to extend coverage, to establish Federal requirements with respect to unemployment compensation, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax and to provide for a Federal contribution, to establish a Federal adjustment account in the Unem-

ployment Trust Fund, to change the annual certification date under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, to provide for a research program and for a Special Advisory Commission, and for other purposes: Mr. CASE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of May 24, 1965:

S. 2019. A bill to establish an Auto Burial and Beautification Fund in the Treasury of the United States consisting of certain tax revenues derived under section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on passenger automobiles and trailers) to finance a program for the alleviation of blight along the Nation's highways and in open spaces caused by aged or wrecked motor vehicles which have been abandoned or relegated to scrap or salvage: Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. NELSON.

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT NO. 194

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 19, 1965, the names of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. PELL were added as additional cosponsors of amendment No. 194, intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (S. 600) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators) on May 19, 1965.

#### NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions has now held 4 days of hearings on S. 1698, my bill to amend the Bank Merger Act, and we have heard from 12 witnesses. While we have heard from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board as our opening witness, in support of the bill, we have not heard from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. On May 27, I wrote identical letters to each of them, reading as follows:

The testimony of outside witnesses on my bank merger bill, S. 1698, has been concluded. Before we close the hearings, I am writing to say that if you desire to be heard on this bill, either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, that privilege will be gladly afforded to you.

I have now received replies from them. I ask unanimous consent that these replies may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. In view of these replies, there appears to be no need for further testimony, and I have scheduled an executive session of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to consider the bill.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965.  
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 27 stating that if I desire to be heard on the bank merger bill, S. 1698, either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week that the privilege will be afforded to me.

I have no present desire to be heard on this bill at this time but appreciate very much the opportunity you have kindly offered.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY  
ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of May 27 according him the opportunity to appear before your committee on June 1 or 2 to testify on S. 1698.

Since the Attorney General will be unable to appear, we will submit a written report on the bill instead.

I trust this will be satisfactory.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,  
Deputy Attorney General.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE  
CORPORATION,  
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1965.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Thank you for your letter of May 27, 1965. I am very sorry that the schedule of your subcommittee and my prior commitments make it impossible for me to appear either Tuesday or Wednesday to testify respecting the bank merger bill, S. 1698.

I hope that events permit a further opportunity for me to appear before the subcommittee in the near future. I am sure that you know my personal views concerning the need for this legislation.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

K. A. RANDALL,  
Chairman.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 1, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled 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.

#### CONNECTICUT DEDICATES A BUILDING TO THE LATE SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO UNESCO

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 23, the University of Connecticut dedicated a building and plaque to commemorate the memory of a dis-

tinguished public servant, the late Senator Brien McMahon.

Chosen to make the dedicatory speech was Senator William Benton, now Ambassador from the United States to UNESCO in Paris. Senator Benton served as Senator McMahon's colleague from Connecticut and was chosen to make this address by the University of Connecticut because of his close association with Senator McMahon during several of his years in the Senate.

At the dedication of Brien McMahon Hall, Senator Benton detailed the foresight of Senator McMahon in fostering, as a freshman Senator, the far-reaching Atomic Energy Act, which brought our atomic armaments and peaceful development of atomic energy under civilian control. His constant watchfulness during the program's early years made possible the outstanding record of this Nation in atomic matters.

Senator Benton's address shows the care and follow-up on the diplomatic front used by Senator McMahon. He pioneered in ways to pierce the Iron Curtain with America's earliest offers of a workable program under world supervision of atomic weapons control.

It is interesting to note that after all these years, the original legislation conceived by Senator McMahon has proved to be so sound that basic amendments have not been needed to keep it modern in a changing world.

I commend this excellent address by Senator Benton to all Members of the Congress because of its historic recital of the enactment of one of this Nation's greatest legislative acts and of the further amplification of Senator McMahon's actions in the field of international diplomacy as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

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

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON AT THE CEREMONY IN MEMORY OF SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, MAY 23, 1965

#### BRIEN McMAHON—A RETROSPECT

Mr. Chairman, for some years, in a manner somewhat out of the ordinary, Brien McMahon's public career and mine touched at many points. We were colleagues in the Senate during a stirring time in the Nation's history.

I am back less than 48 hours from my present duties as U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO in Paris. Brien McMahon would have approved my decision to serve UNESCO. He saw that, ultimately, peace and justice must rest on intellectual and moral progress, not on force.

Brien McMahon charted the basic policy on nuclear weapons adopted by the Government of the United States, a policy so founded in wisdom that it remains fundamentally unchanged some 15 turbulent years later. His proposal for civilian control did not seem obvious when he made it. On a first vote, his committee stood 10 to 1 against the idea—and remember, McMahon was just a freshman Senator. But he stood by his convictions, and it turned out that his vote of one created a majority. A few ripples of public opinion began to break the surface. Suddenly a tidal wave of public support for the Mc-

Mahon proposal burst over Washington. The McMahon Act became law. Senator McMahon became chairman of the Joint Committee of the Congress on Atomic Energy.

But Senator McMahon did not rest on this accomplishment. He was among the first to point out that mere supremacy in weapons-building would not solve the dangers brought about by the proliferation of mass destructive weapons. He was among the first to point out that, while retooling its military arsenal, the free world must overhaul completely its arsenal of moral weapons, its weapons for peace.

Five thousand years of recorded history, he warned his fellow Senators, have taught the lesson that armaments races end in war.

In recalling Senator McMahon's public career, I like to look upon it not only as the growth of a man but as the growth of an idea.

Trained in the law, young Brien early felt the pull of public life. While setting up his law practice he found time to take part in local politics. When the New Deal came to power, he sought and obtained from the U.S. Attorney General, Connecticut's own Homer Cummings, a minor legal post in the Department of Justice. But his time in obscurity was short. His abilities soon became apparent. Shortly he was promoted—and when he was only 31—to the high post of Assistant Attorney General. He was the youngest man ever to be so honored. He became head of the criminal division. Organized gangsterism was a national problem. McMahon soon fashioned for himself an enviable record in the successful prosecution of the gangsters.

In 1944, when you seniors in the audience were being born, he was elected to the U.S. Senate. He took his seat in January of 1945.

You know the next fateful step. In August of that same year, the bomb of Hiroshima revealed that a new and potentially horrible era had opened in human affairs. Brien McMahon might have pondered the awful implications for a while and then shied away. He might have consoled himself with the thought that in senatorial ranks, he was a novice and not a key policymaker in military or foreign affairs.

He did no such thing. He met the challenge head on. He applied his intellectual and legal talents to the problem of this unprecedented test of the workability of democratic institutions. And he never let up. This is what I meant when I said that the growth of McMahon was in a sense the growth of an idea.

As a first-termer, and in his first 2 years, the young Senator from Connecticut drafted and guided through Congress, by his resolute will, the organic act which ordained that control of the awesome power of atomic energy should rest with civilian authority and not with the military. Just as Clemenceau knew that war was too important for the generals, so Senator McMahon knew that our democratic institutions demanded civilian control of atomic energy.

For a newcomer it was an unprecedented exploit. Many students of history assume that this was his major contribution. It was not. On the contrary it was merely the first act in a continuing political drama. Ever since the formation of the first Army, and the first Navy, professional military men have resisted the introduction of new weapons. The classic illustration occurred during the first phases of World War II when the free nations went down to humiliating defeat because their military leaders, unlike the upstart Nazis, had refused to learn the lesson of the airplane and the mobile tank division.

The paradox persisted even after Hiroshima. There was strong resistance among conventional military thinkers to the building of an adequate atomic stockpile. But Brien McMahon was determined that the free



world should not be caught a second or a third time. Against stubborn opposition, he set to work. He saw to it that America had the biggest stockpile; and then, in his final months, still dissatisfied, while he was wracked by the pains of a cruel disease, he sponsored and pushed to completion a major expansion of the original program.

The American stockpile of nuclear weapons has been, for the past 15 years, the shield of the United States and the shield of the entire free world against Communist aggression. Brien McMahon was the principal architect of that shield—a proud memorial for any man. It is another anomaly of history that the man who set out to be a lawyer and a public officeholder became the greatest weapons builder of all time.

With characteristic energy Brien McMahon prepared for the next step. He was persuaded that war was inevitable unless the civilized nations found a viable way to outlaw finally and forever, these monstrous weapons which he had helped to fashion. He took on the job of redesigning and retooling the moral weapons of the West. Without new methods and new direction, he saw little hope of avoiding a military collision with the Communist world. To meet the challenge, he saw that changes must be made in conventional diplomacy, and in conventional economics as well.

I believe this to be the most inspiring and the most appealing period of Brien McMahon's public life. He set out on his own journey toward the Holy Grail, to seek a formula by which the free world could turn back the tide of Communist aggression without resorting to war or risking the loss of its democratic institutions. He was never discouraged by the magnitude of the task.

He saw clearly that moral weapons held top priority in urgency even over atomic weapons. He thus sponsored his famous resolution of friendship for the Russian people, with its direct challenge to Stalin to make known its contents to the Russian people. There have been many declarations of war by Congress but this, to the best of my knowledge, was the first declaration of peace. One proof of the effectiveness of the idea was proven when Stalin obediently made its contents known to all the Russians. A moral weapon had been fired through the Iron Curtain.

When the United States later decided to go ahead with the fabrication of the dreaded hydrogen bomb, it was Brien McMahon's foresight which prevented worldwide misunderstanding of why this decision had to be made. In an inspired Senate speech, he proposed that this country expend \$10 billion per year for 5 years to help the economic development of other nations, including Soviet Russia, if the Kremlin would agree to an ironclad plan for outlawing atomic weapons. By this simple gesture, he made it plain, once again, that the goal of our Nation is world peace and world progress.

Had he lived, I believe Brien McMahon, a member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, would have been a pioneer in establishing new forms of diplomacy, just as he was a pioneer in the establishment of atomic policy.

It is fitting that the University of Connecticut should dedicate this plaque and this building to keep Brien McMahon's memory green among the students of this great university and the citizens of our State. But it is my hope that this dedication may serve another purpose also.

In this thrilling age of missiles and computers and space flights, young men and women may gain the impression that politics is a dead art, without comparable challenge, excitement, or promise. On the contrary, there is no field in which creative thought is so urgently needed, or its exercise so rewarding. Aristotle tells us that politics is the noblest of the arts. It was Albert Einstein who pointed out that politics is more diffi-

cult than science. It is not only more difficult, but more challenging and more exciting. I call upon you young people here today to join in its pursuit so that you may gain some mastery of it.

We honor Brien McMahon today because, at a time of challenge, he had the vision, and the practical wisdom, to create new political forms to serve the Nation's needs. I trust that his accomplishments will serve as an inspiration and an example to the students of this university.

#### VETERANS' REOPENED INSURANCE FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 235, H.R. 7597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7597) to establish the Veterans' Reopened Insurance Fund in the Treasury and to authorize initial capital to operate insurance programs under title 38, United States Code, section 725.

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 246), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

#### BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This proposal authorizes the Veterans' Administration to transfer up to \$1,650,000 from the veterans special term insurance fund, for the purpose of providing administrative expenses in connection with the reopening of national service life insurance. The veterans special term insurance fund is a revolving fund into which premiums from the so-called W insurance are paid. This type of insurance was first authorized by Public Law 23, 82d Congress. The insurance is nonparticipating and any excess of receipts over claims and the requirements of reserves is paid into the Treasury. At the present time approximately \$10 million in excess of the needs of this fund have accumulated. Any amounts so transferred will be repaid, with interest. The veterans reopened insurance program, authorized by Public Law 88-664, is to be self-sustaining and the Administrator must include the cost of administration in premiums and has authority to raise and lower premiums as experience may dictate. The present authorization should be sufficient to provide initial capital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7597) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DANIEL WALTER MILES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 250, H.R. 1867.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1867) for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles.

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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 260), 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 pay Daniel Walter Miles, of Brockton, Mass., \$1,000 for property losses he sustained in the Philippine Islands during World War II involving the same matters which were the subject of an adverse determination of the Philippine War Damage Commission.

Mr. Daniel Walter Miles, of Brockton, Mass., is a former civilian internee who was interned by the Japanese for 3½ years in the Philippines during World War II. Mr. Miles arrived in the Philippines approximately 5 months prior to the outbreak of hostilities. He was sent to the Philippines as an employee of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. in connection with contract work of the U.S. Government. The claim with which H.R. 1867 is concerned relates to personal property losses suffered by Mr. Miles resulting from the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1867) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### I. W. ABEL, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, today I. W. Abel will be sworn in as president of the United Steelworkers of America. This is indeed a fitting honor for one of the outstanding labor leaders in the Nation who has devoted his life to bettering the lot of American working men and women. I. W. Abel is not only a leading trade unionist, he is also a national statesman. I am indeed proud to call him my close personal friend.

He was born at Magnolia, Ohio, in 1908 and later moved to Canton, Ohio, where from his early manhood he was employed in the steel mills of that community. He was a pioneer in the industrial union movement.

As a volunteer organizer in 1936, I. W. Abel helped establish the first local union in the Timken Roller Bearing plant at Canton and served successively as financial secretary, vice president, and president. In 1942, the late great Philip

Murray, founder of the United Steelworkers of America, appointed him director of district 27, the Canton area. In that capacity he proved his great administrative ability which was recognized by his fellow steelworkers when they elected him secretary-treasurer of their union in 1952. This year they gave him their highest honor, the presidency of their union.

I. W. Abel climbed virtually every step on the traditional ladder of union promotion. Along the way he acquired an intimate understanding of union work, including organizing, grievance handling, contract negotiating, political action, community service, and human relations. He has acquired extensive bargaining knowledge at all levels of negotiations. His experience, coupled with his broad background as a millhand and widespread knowledge of the industries in which the United Steelworkers of America has jurisdiction, has prepared him well to lead America's third largest union.

The new USWA president also stresses the need to participate enthusiastically in the affairs of the labor movement generally, pointing out that the USWA must play its rightful role in promoting the basic goals and programs of the AFL-CIO and in the free trade movement of the world. He likewise has a strong interest in developing better relations between the union and the communities where steelworkers live. He believes that union members can and should assert their rightful roles in all phases of civic life, particularly in the areas of education, housing, civil rights, and welfare activities.

In my State of Ohio and throughout the Nation members of labor unions such as that headed by I. W. Abel walk with dignity and love of country. They are the envy of workers throughout the entire world. They raise their families on the "right side of the railroad tracks," to use a common expression.

Mr. President, I. W. Abel's election to the presidency of the United Steelworkers of America will benefit not only the members of his union but all American working men and women. Trade unionism today is a vital and integral part of our economy and way of life. In that sense, I. W. Abel's election will be of great benefit to the entire Nation.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Patents, Trade Marks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow, June 1 and 2, 1965.

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

#### VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the May 26 Philadelphia Inquirer, there appeared a clear and cogent dispatch

on Vietnam by Jack Foisie. He reports that the conviction is growing in Saigon that even heightened pressure on Hanoi will not end the war in the south. He reports as well that the military situation within South Vietnam itself is quite serious.

This sort of reporting—straightforward, unemotional, factual—is of immense value to the public in understanding the situation that confronts the President as he strives to contribute to a reasoned peace in Vietnam. That has never been a simple question and it is, obviously, not getting any easier.

The article referred to points up clearly the grim choices which are looming in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### VIET WAR MUST BE WON IN SOUTH, EXPERTS SAY

(By Jack Foisie, special to the Inquirer and Los Angeles Times)

SAIGON, May 25.—The belief grows here that even all-out bombing of North Vietnam will not force the Communists to cease their war in the south.

Nor are the 45,000 American military men presently in South Vietnam going to be enough to win the war on the ground. Many thousands of combat troops will be needed, and even then the war will continue for years if it is to be kept nonnuclear.

This gloomy appraisal is common here. It may be due to the traditional impatience of the American, who, having been raised in a society where massive effort gets immediate results, cannot understand why it can't apply in Vietnam against the Communist concept of guerrilla warfare.

But the pessimism is evident not only among the Americans. Thoughtful Vietnamese and foreign military men here are coming to the same conclusion. They are convinced the war can end only when the Vietcong guerrillas are whipped in the south. So strong is the enemy hold now on many regions that it will take a protracted effort involving tens of thousands of American troops to root them out of the jungles.

To have Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese leader, cry "uncle" and call off his attempt to take over the south, can never be done even by bombing Hanoi and other northern cities now inviolate under the American concept of slow escalation of air attacks.

Only the diehard airpower enthusiast believes the Communist will to resist can be broken, short of nuclear bombing. Most military men are convinced that land invasion of North Vietnam would be necessary. Even South Vietnam's leading airman, Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, advocates land invasion.

But this would put the United States in a position somewhat akin to the Russian planting of missiles in Cuba. President John F. Kennedy was willing to go to war if a hostile force remained at his doorstep. Red China's reaction certainly would be the same if Americans occupied North Vietnamese territory adjacent to China's southern border.

The bombings up north, so far restricted to the unimportant lower half, have failed appreciably to reduce infiltration of Communist-trained guerrillas. Even regular units of the North Vietnam Army now are showing up, either inside South Vietnam or just across the border in Laos. Elements of two regular North Vietnam divisions—10,000

or more men each, if at full strength—have been identified as being in the mountainous midnorthern area around Kontum.

We have bombed 27 sizable bridges and made 7 propaganda pamphlet drops in North Vietnam. The cost of these and scores of other missions conducted since the bombings began February 7 has been 43 planes lost and 25 pilots dead or captured.

But the Vietcong, losing hardly a man, have blown up as many bridges in South Vietnam in half that time. In the last 3 days they blew up four, according to the tally kept by the American military. And the foe's own propaganda efforts have been intensified to increase terrorist strikes at Government villages. There have been 200 civilian officials killed and 364 kidnaped since January 1, according to the American tally.

#### NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR—REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT MOSES AT REOPENING OF MEXICAN PAVILION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the address delivered by Hon. Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964-65, at the inauguration of the art exhibition and reopening of the Mexican pavilion, on May 25, 1965.

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

#### REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964-65, CORP., AT THE INAUGURATION OF THE ART EXHIBITION AND REOPENING OF THE MEXICAN PAVILION, FLUSHING MEADOW, MAY 25, 1965

The Spaniards set a deep seal on every country on which her navigators and adventurers set foot in the days of discovery and colonialism. Language is only one of the heritages of their conquests. Mixed with native culture, extraordinary civilizations developed. In Mexico this tradition has been persistent, growing, and proliferating. Here at the fair the artifacts, arts, agriculture, and burgeoning industries of Mexico mark an entirely new civilization built upon an old and a medieval one. You have leaped from primitive to Renaissance to the most advanced and sophisticated modern. Your Briareus has reached out a hundred arms to exploit all of your resources. Democracy and the social revolution have been slow to come, but now they are here in all of their enormous implications.

On the opening of this exhibit of artistic genius we offer our profound respects to a friendly neighbor on the continent we share, whose prosperity is ours, a country which has remained aloof from world wars, and whose ways are the ways of peace. We hail the priceless opportunity you offer our people to share in your institutions and progress.

In this spirit I now present to Señora de Diaz Ordaz, the wife of your distinguished President, Gustavo de Diaz Ordaz, who has done so much to usher in a new day for Mexico, a gold Unisphere charm, and our silver medallions with the symbols of our globe and of our city, as it enters its fourth century; to Prof. Fernando Gamboa, who assembled this remarkable exhibit; and to Mr. Alfonso Corona del Rosal, Secretary of National Resources. To Mr. Octaviano Campos Salas, Secretary of Industry and Commerce, and Mr. Agustin Salvat, Minister of Tourism, I present our plaques.

I now declare the exhibit officially opened.

**CHIEF OF ARMY ENGINEERS LT. GEN. WALTER K. WILSON, JR., TO RETIRE**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is appropriate to devote a few moments at this time to observing the retirement from public life of a man whose career has contributed to the well-being of every American and the growth and prosperity of every 1 of our 50 States—Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., the U.S. Army's Chief of Engineers.

General Wilson retires from the Army on July 1 after 36 years of truly distinguished service in war and peace. In these brief remarks I propose to touch only on the last 4 years of that service, his tenure as Chief of Engineers.

We in West Virginia have ample cause to be grateful that a man like General Wilson has been in charge of the Nation's foremost water resource development agency during those years. This is a time when we have been seeking a way out of the grip of a spiral of depression; and we have found in General Wilson and his agency a major force for hope and progress. They have not simply worked in our area, but have always tried to make their work meaningful and cooperative and responsive to our needs and our own endeavors.

Under General Wilson, the modernization of the Ohio River waterway has been pushed forward with great energy. Various major reservoirs similarly have been moved forward. A number of important studies have been advanced, notably a restudy of the Guyandot River and Justice Reservoir. Recreational developments, which we expect to be a major factor in our programs for stimulating economic growth, have been given especial impetus. Last year the Corps of Engineers asked for and received from Congress a supplemental appropriation to accelerate project work in the Appalachian region; and this appropriation included provision for the expenditure of some \$900,000 for recreational improvements at just two major West Virginia projects—Sutton Dam and Reservoir, and Gallipolis lock and dam—plus more than \$2 million for the acceleration of work at seven or more other West Virginia projects. Finally, in response to the Appalachian Regional Development Act the Corps of Engineers under General Wilson has established a special Office of Appalachian Studies to work out programs through which the development of the water resources of the region can be fitted most effectively into overall programs for the revitalization of the regional economy.

West Virginia's experience with the Corps of Engineers is typical of that shared by all States. I am sure that every Senator here could bring forth many examples in his own State of the highly practical concern shown by the Corps of Engineers for the water problems of the American people, and General Wilson's effectiveness in translating that concern into action. One measure of this effectiveness is the fact that when General Wilson became Chief of Engineers, the Corps of Engineers' civil works construction program was about \$700 million per year; whereas now it is more

than \$1 billion—a 40-percent increase in just 4 years—and this in a period of economy and retrenchment during which many Government programs were being cut back. This is a most impressive testimonial of the confidence felt by this whole Congress, representing as it does all the States of the Union, in the practical worth and the moral integrity of the Army's Corps of Engineers.

While carrying out these programs on the Nation's river basins, harbors, and sea coasts, the corps, under General Wilson, has also maintained its military construction program, which included the construction of a network of missile sites all over the Nation; has carried out unprecedented construction programs at Cape Kennedy and elsewhere in support of the national space program; and has played a leading role in recovery and reconstruction activities after several great natural disasters, including the Alaskan earthquake of last year and great floods this year.

One concluding observation: In commending the career of General Wilson as one of the Nation's great engineers and planners and executives, I have had at the same time to commend the corps which he has led. The fact is that the corps, under his leadership, has worthily carried forward a tradition of ability and integrity that goes back generations into the past, and is rivaled by few, if any, organization, anywhere in the world—a tradition which, I am confident, will be maintained with equal distinction under his successor, Lt. Gen. William Cassidy. I think sometimes we are inclined to overlook the tremendous value to the Nation of a tradition such as this. We tend to take the Corps of Engineers for granted, as we do our mountains and rivers and other resources; when the fact is that, far from being ordinary or commonplace, the corps is unusual among human institutions for many qualities, not the least of which is the consistency, decade by decade, of the excellence of its leadership, which has been brilliantly exemplified by Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson.

I convey the sentiments of the people of West Virginia, and I think also of the Senate and the Congress, when I express my gratitude to him for his career of public service to us all, and wish him every continued good fortune in his forthcoming endeavors in private life.

**SAM M. LEVINE**

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week brought the death of one of my State's finest citizens, Sam M. Levine, of Pine Bluff, Ark. Following his death, an editorial tribute to him was published in the Pine Bluff Commercial of May 23.

I had admiration and respect for Sam Levine, as did all who came in contact with him. I could pay him no higher accolade than to quote the concluding paragraph of the editorial:

When men want to know the reason for America's strength at its grassroots, let them study the life of Sam M. Levine in Pine Bluff, Ark.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**SAM M. LEVINE**

It is not easy to sum up what the name "Sam Levine" came to mean in this town and in this State, but someone ought to try it. It would be instructive and salutary for future generations to know the breed of man we were able to produce in these times.

Any summation would have to include Senator Levine's rocklike devotion to the law, his deep and active concern with education, and his willingness to rely on reason, of all things, in politics.

He was an advocate—not only at the bar but in the legislature, and in public service.

Eventually, he became so well known as an advocate that his presence alone was enough to make his neighbors weigh their words and reassert their own principles.

Born and raised in south Louisiana, he later moved to Bonham, Tex., where he encountered another young lawyer—Sam Rayburn, who went on to become the venerable Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington. Our Mr. Sam came to Pine Bluff, in 1913 to practice law.

People soon came to know Sam Levine as a force for stability in the community. He not only had a wit of his own, they realized, but he fully appreciated a sense of humor in others.

Sam Levine's gentle eyes became piercingly sharp once you started talking about something he took seriously—the law, for example. Admitted to practice law before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1923, he was on the State board of law examiners from 1942 to 1943, and once served as president of Jefferson County's bar association.

Mr. Sam's interest in education deepened as the years passed. At his death, he was a board member of the Institute of International Education—an organization in which he played an active role for years.

A firm supporter of the liberal arts, he never welcomed the reduction of education to training.

In his three terms as a State senator, Mr. Sam proved himself an activist and a man open to constructive ideas. It was Senator Levine who sponsored the act setting up a State forestry commission and another one establishing a retirement system for State employees.

Politics gave Sam Levine scope to assert his dedication to law, to principle, and to education.

At a time when others were overcome by panic, ambition, or fear, Senator Levine advocated reason.

Arkansas had reached the point where a legislator could win popularity by promising to protect the people against public education. Those were years when a legislator could say, as one representative did on January 28, 1959: "Nothing contained in this bill should be construed to reopen the schools." And this argument, mind you, was being offered in favor of a bill.

The following day, Mr. Sam rose to tell his colleagues in the senate: "In the past, this body has laid stress on mediocrity. Let's put the emphasis on excellence and superiority."

Senator Levine continued his fight down to the wire. He took the floor on February 6, 1959, to oppose scuttling the State's public schools.

First, he attacked the bill on legal grounds, where Mr. Sam was very much at home, by saying that it violated the Arkansas Constitution and "presupposes its own constitutionality."

Senator Levine went on: "This bill," he warned, "strikes at the integrity of the public school system. It can serve no purpose except to agitate, and to detract from the wholesomeness of the public school system."

Instead of destroying public education, he urged his fellow senators to strengthen it: "At this moment, we ought to rededicate ourselves to strengthening the country and to the enlightening of youth. The alternative is to slip into an abyss of oblivion. There can be no other end."

The Associated Press noted that other senators paid little attention to the gentleman from Pine Bluff. "His colleagues," reported the AP, "all but ignored him while drinking soft drinks, munching sandwiches, reading magazines and smoking cigarettes." That did not dismay Mr. Sam. He continued to speak softly on behalf of reason, education and the law. And no matter how virulent the opposition, he spoke out as calmly and as naturally as he walked down Main Street, his Phi Beta Kappa key dangling from his tie pin. And slowly people began to listen.

When future historians want to know why the State was able to shake off panic and fear, they will find one reason in the words of Sam Levine.

Senator Levine's language acquired a natural courtliness over the years. Like the man himself, it was restrained, direct and well mannered.

It has been some time since a candidate for political office began his campaign by reminding the voters of their duties as Senator Levine did in 1960:

"While the candidate for this extremely high office must willingly subject his qualifications to the careful consideration of voters in the course of a strenuous campaign, there is also a corresponding duty imposed on the citizens to evaluate carefully the respective claims advanced by the candidates. I think it well to bear in mind that, particularly where an office of this type is being sought, the need of the candidate for the office is absolutely of no concern to the voters and should be entirely disregarded. On the other hand, the needs and demands of the office are exclusively to be considered."

Senator Levine continued his interest in politics after leaving the legislature, speaking up for improvements that are still needed—like reapportionment. "The unequal distribution of representation is not just," he said in April of 1963. "About 40 percent of the people are running the legislature."

Mr. Sam saw the legislature plain ("Often you could set trees in the chairs and get the same results") but he suggested as well as criticized: "There's nothing more sacred than lawmaking. We should be more deliberate about our legislation—not legislate on the spur of the moment."

Sam Levine pursued even the most important things, like justice and enlightenment, with tranquillity.

He was strong and of good courage. He trained his courage not to defy, but to preserve law and reason.

When men want to know the reason for America's strength at its grassroots, let them study the life of Sam M. Levine in Pine Bluff, Ark.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WISE POLICY IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IS SUCCEEDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Friday, President Johnson delivered an important address on the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree from Baylor University, at Waco, Tex.

He devoted the address to a presentation of his administration's policy and position in the Dominican Republic. It is a position which I have vigorously supported from the beginning.

The charge that is being made at home and abroad—that our landing of marines in the Dominican Republic was

a relapse into, and a resumption of, our "gunboat diplomacy" of the early days of this century—is, in my view, wholly without foundation.

As one who, as a journalist, as managing editor of the Nation from 1920 to 1923, fought against this manifestation of U.S. imperialism, I believe I am qualified to point out that our action in the Dominican Republic is in no sense a recrudescence of the discredited policies that were followed from the late eighteenth nineties until President Franklin D. Roosevelt's enunciation of the good-neighbor policy. It was at President Roosevelt's first venture into Latin American affairs, at the Seventh Inter-American Conference, at Montevideo, in the late fall of 1933, that a foundation was laid for a policy of nonintervention. Secretary of State Cordell Hull headed the delegation. I had been appointed as its advisor.

The interventions into Latin American countries prior to that time, the sending of our Marines into Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, were motivated by American economic interests. Our occupations of these three countries were designed to safeguard the investments of American private interests. It was a policy wholly inconsistent with our national professions, and wholly at variance with Woodrow Wilson's pronouncements for self-determination of small nations, although it was in the Wilson administration that this regrettable policy was most vigorously carried out.

President Johnson's action in the Dominican Republic was motivated first by the desire to save the lives of Americans and other nationals; and, as he pointed out in his Baylor address, that was carried out without the loss of a single life among those who were evacuated. Second, his purpose was to forestall a Castro-Communist takeover and to obviate the falling behind the Iron Curtain of a second nation in the Caribbean. Third, President Johnson wanted to establish a multilateral approach to all future situations of that kind, and to enlist the Organization of American States in that worthwhile objective. It is being done. A month after the first landing of our Marines, there withdrawal has begun. It may require some time to withdraw all except those needed as a part of an inter-American peacekeeping police force but the objective has been made clear, and the process is underway.

If successful, as all of us hope it will be, it will prove to be an epoch-making event in inter-American relations. I have so stated as my view from the beginning, and I now reassert it.

Inasmuch as President Johnson, admirably summed up the whole matter, I ask unanimous consent that his speech at Baylor be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1965]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT BAYLOR

This is a moment that I deeply wish my parents could have lived to share. In the first place, my father would have enjoyed

what you have so generously said of me and my mother would have believed it.

More than that, the honor you pay me is in a real sense honor that's due my mother. All of her life she spoke often of Baylor, a trait that I have found not uncommon among all of your alumni.

Her pride in Baylor and being the granddaughter of a president of Baylor, passed on to me early and influenced the course of my own life more constructively than I could ever describe.

So I am most grateful to you for this moment and for its meaning to me.

Woodrow Wilson once told the men of Princeton that it is not learning but the spirit of service that will give a college a place in the public annals of the Nation.

For 120 years, Baylor University has touched the lives of many generations with an unusual spirit of selfless service. That spirit expressed in the work of ministers and missionaries, of public servants and public school teachers, of devout parents and dedicated citizens has not only won for Baylor a place of esteem in this State and this Nation, it has served the betterment of the condition of man to the remote ends of this earth.

#### HISTORIC HOUR FOR NATION

On this occasion, we meet here today at a historic hour in the life of the American nation. In Washington, leaders of this hemisphere are meeting to work together to open a road to durable peace in the Dominican Republic.

Their efforts will have our full support, for at stake is the future not only of one of our sister republics but the principles and the values of all the American Republics.

We are members of an inter-American system in which large and small nations are partners in the defense of freedom and in the progress of economic welfare and social justice.

That partnership must be constantly strengthened. Our common aim and our combined ability must increase in crisis as well as in calm.

The tragedy of the past 4 weeks in the Dominican Republic renews our common resolution to accept common responsibility in dealing with common dangers.

In that unfortunate nation 4 weeks ago the legacy of dictatorship exploded in fury and anarchy. Hundreds of Dominicans died, leaving thousands of widows and orphans of war. Nineteen of our own American boys lost their lives. The capital city, birthplace of the Western Hemisphere, was split asunder.

Blood and hate drowned ideals. And for days freedom itself stood on the edge of disaster.

#### BOLIVAR ADMONITION RECALLED

In those early terrible hours we did what we had to do, remembering Simon Bolivar's admonition that "to hesitate is destruction." As your President, I did what I had to do.

Since then, working with the Organization of American States and its distinguished Secretary General, José Mora, the forces of democracy have acted. The results are clear.

More than 6,500 men and women and children from 46 different countries have been evacuated and not a single life was lost; a cease-fire was achieved, bringing an end to the threat of wholesale bloodshed; an international zone of refuge was opened as a haven for all men of peace and a safe corridor 17 miles long was established by American men.

More than 8 million pounds of food have been distributed to the Dominican people; a well-trained, disciplined band of Communists was prevented from destroying the hopes of Dominican democracy; political avenues were opened to help the Dominican people find a Dominican solution to their problems.

Today those achievements are guaranteed—guaranteed by the troops of five nations, rep-

representing this hemisphere. They are under the command of the able Brazilian general, General [Hugo Panasco] Alvin, and for the first time in the history of the Organization of American States [it] has created and it has sent to the soil of an American nation an international peacekeeping military force.

That may be the greatest achievement of all.

The United States made its forces a part of that inter-American force and as the contributions of the Latin American nations have been incorporated into the OAS force in the last 2 days, the United States has removed 1,600 troops from the island. I am issuing orders this morning to remove an additional 1,700 men on Saturday.

I have also instructed our commanding General [Bruce] Palmer [Jr.] to discuss possible further withdrawals with General Alvin and such action will be taken when the military commanders believe it is safe and warranted by the arrival of other Latin American forces or by the continued stabilization of the military situation.

So now we ask ourselves this morning what is next.

The answer to that question rests partly with the people of the Dominican Republic, and partly with their neighbors throughout this hemisphere. Already under the distinguished leadership of Secretary General Mora the broad outlines of a reasonable settlement are beginning to emerge, outlines which meet the need and respond to the desires, first of the Dominican people themselves and then of all the people of this hemisphere.

First, the Dominican people and the people of their sister republics do not want government by extremists of either the left or the right, and that is clear. They want to be ruled neither by an old conspiracy of reaction and tyranny nor by a new conspiracy of Communist violence.

Second, they want, as we do, an end to slaughter in the streets and to brutality in the barrios.

Third, they want, as we do, food and work and quiet in the night.

Fourth, they want, as we do, a constitutional government that will represent them all and work for all their hopes.

Fifth, the Dominican people know they need the help of sympathetic neighbors in healing their wounds and negotiating their divisions. But what they want ultimately is the chance to shape their own course. Those are the hopes of the Dominican people. But they are our hopes, too, and they are shared by responsible people in every nation of this hemisphere.

#### STRONGER SHIELD SOUGHT

Out of the Dominican crucible the 20 American nations must now forge a stronger shield against disaster. The opportunity is here now for a new thrust forward to show the world the way to true international cooperation in the cause of peace and in the struggle to win a better life for all of us.

We believe that the new world may most wisely approach this task guided by new realities.

The first reality is that old concepts and old labels are largely obsolete.

In today's world with the enemies of freedom talking about wars of national liberation the old distinction between the civil war and international war has already lost much of its meaning.

Second is the reality that when forces of freedom move slowly, whether on political or economic or military fronts, the forces of slavery and subversion move rapidly and they move rapidly and they move decisively.

Third, we know that when a Communist group seeks to exploit misery the entire free American system is put in deadly danger. We also know that these dangers can be found today in many of our lands.

#### FURTHER ATTEMPTS EXPECTED

There is no trouble anywhere these evil forces will not try to turn to their advantage and we can expect more efforts at triumph by terror and conquest through chaos.

Fourth, we have learned in the Dominican Republic that we can act decisively and we can act together.

Fifth, it is clear that we need new international machinery geared to meet the fast-moving events. When hours can decide the fate of generations, the moment of decision must become the moment of action.

And just as these lessons the past 4 weeks are clear, so are the basic principles which have guided the purpose of the United States of America.

We seek no territory. We do not seek to impose our will on anyone. We intend to work for the self-determination of the peoples of the Americas within the framework of freedom.

In times past, large nations have used their power to impose their will on smaller nations. Today, we have placed our forces at the disposition of the nations of this hemisphere to assure the peoples of those nations the right to exercise their own will in freedom.

#### RESOLUTION CITED

And in accordance with the resolution of the eighth meeting of the ministers at Punta Del Este, Uruguay, we will join with other OAS nations in opposing a Communist takeover in this hemisphere.

And in accordance with the Charter of Punta del Este, we will join with other OAS nations in pressing for change among those who would maintain a feudal system—a feudal system that denies social justice and economic progress to the ordinary peoples of this hemisphere.

We want for the peoples of this hemisphere only what they want for themselves: Liberty, justice, dignity, a better life for all.

More than a few agitators was necessary to bring on the tragic and the cruel bloodshed in the Dominican Republic. They needed additional help and a deeper cause, and they had both.

For the roots of the trouble are found wherever the landless and the despised, the poor and the oppressed stand before the gates of opportunity seeking entry into a brighter land; they can get there only if we narrow the gap between the rich nations and the poor, and between the rich and the poor within each nation.

And this is the heart of the purpose of the United States. Here on the campus of Baylor University we will reaffirm that purpose on June 26 when almost 50 Peace Corps volunteers will begin training for service in the Dominican Republic.

These young men and women will go to the barrios of Santo Domingo and Santiago to work with and to work for the people of the Dominican Republic in attaining a new life and a new hope.

At home, with the strong cooperation of our Congress, we are waging war on poverty; we are opening new paths of learning for all of our children; we are creating new jobs for our workers; we are providing health care for our older citizens; we are eliminating injustice and inequality; we are bringing new economic life to whole regions.

These objectives we will continue to pursue with all of our strength and all of our determination.

As peace returns to the Dominican people and as a broad base is laid for a new Dominican Government responsive to the people's will, the United States will be prepared to join in full measure in the massive task of reconstruction and in the hopeful work of lasting economic progress.

For, in bold ink, our signature is on the charter of the alliance. That charter commands a peaceful, democratic social revolu-

tion across the hemisphere. It asks that unjust privilege be ended and that unfair power be curbed.

#### A PLEA TO OPEN GATES

It asks that we help throw open the gates of opportunity to these millions who stand there now knocking. And just as we have joined in the Dominican Republic to bring peace to a troubled world, we have joined with these forces across the hemisphere who seek to advance their own independence and their own democratic progress.

We work with and for those men and women not because we have to. We work because morality commands it and justice requires it and our own dignity as men depends upon it.

We work not because we fear the unjust wrath of our enemy but because we fear the just wrath of God.

In Santo Domingo the last month has been grim. The storm there is not yet over. But a new sense of hope is beginning. And across the angry arguments of the opposing forces, the voice of good sense is now beginning to be heard.

As the Organization of American States recommit itself to the hard efforts of peace-making, the Government and the people of the United States proudly pledge full support to the peacemakers.

The path ahead is long. The way ahead is hard. So we must, in the words of the Prophet, "mount up on the wings of eagles, run and not grow weary."

Thank you.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, two editorials on this general subject, but dealing especially with the responsibilities and functions of the OAS. The editorials were published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 17 and the San Jose, Calif., Mercury of May 5, 1965.

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

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 17, 1965]

#### OAS SHOULD TAKE FIRM HAND

In the Dominican crisis the Organization of American States has an excellent and unprecedented opportunity to demonstrate its capabilities as an effective instrument for peace in the Western Hemisphere.

Thus far, the OAS performance has been somewhat disappointing.

The cease-fire is not being enforced. Rival factions in the Dominican Republic continue their struggle for power by force of arms. The OAS Peace Commission is slow in exercising authority and making its presence felt in Santo Domingo.

We urge the OAS to be firm. The Organization has the power to end the Dominican chaos by negotiation and persuasion, backed up by whatever police force is necessary. Not only U.S. troops but armed units of several Latin American countries are on the scene.

It is easy to argue in theory that the United States should have kept hands off the Dominican turmoil and should have let the OAS bear the full weight of responsibility right at the outset. The fact is, however, that the OAS has not been very impressive since it was given the authority and support to take decisive action. The OAS is carrying the ball now and should show what it can do.

Most Americans assuredly share President Johnson's hope, expressed in a statement over the weekend, "that the OAS mission presently in the Dominican Republic will rapidly find a solution that will at the same

time assure for the Dominican people the principles of a democratic constitution and a government of national unity able to maintain economic and political stability."

It should be noted, in fairness to the OAS and as some measure of explanation for its difficulty in taking hold of things, that the United Nations is compounding the Dominican troubles. Untimely arrival of the U.N. investigation team in Santo Domingo—headed by an Army officer from India, of all places—serves only to add to the confusion.

The U.N. ought to be encouraging international settlement of disputes by appropriate regional organizations, such as the OAS, instead of intruding undiplomatically and flexing its own muscles.

As we understand it, the Organization of American States is supposed to be in charge in the Dominican Republic. That's the way it ought to be. The OAS should be a little less timid and substantially more positive in getting a firm grip on the situation.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, May 5, 1965]

#### TIME TO TURN POLICY INTO ACTION

The responsibility for the future of the Dominican Republic is now firmly affixed to the Organization of American States. This is as it should be.

President Johnson made this point quite clear Monday when he said American troops would be withdrawn as soon as the OAS could guarantee that a Communist government would not be set up in Santo Domingo. As the President observed:

"The moment that the Organization of American States can present a plan that will bring peace on the island and give us the opportunity to evacuate our people and give some hope of stability of government, we'll be the first to come back home. \* \* \* We don't intend to sit here in our rocking chair with our hands folded and let the Communists set up any government in the Western Hemisphere. \* \* \*"

Cuba is one Communist government too many in the Western Hemisphere. Had the United States acted in timely fashion in Cuba, the pervading threat of Castro communism would not now hang over the Caribbean. The least this country can do now is to insure that the policy of containment actually works.

In principle, the OAS has subscribed to that policy. Now it is time for the OAS to translate policy into action.

#### UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President at the annual convention of the Order of Lafayette held recently in Washington, the members of this widely recognized patriotic society unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

##### RESOLUTION ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives has for 30 years courageously, efficiently and effectively investigated Communist activities in all its various ramifications throughout the United States, and by its constant investigations and turning the searchlight of truth upon the aims, purposes, principles and objectives of the Communist conspiracy

has succeeded in warning the American people of its menace to freedom everywhere; and

Whereas the investigation of Communist and subversive activities by the Un-American Activities Committee has, to a large degree, exposed and smashed communism in the United States before it could spread as it has in France and Italy. All Communists are potential spies, traitors, saboteurs, and enemies from within: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Order of Lafayette at its convention assembled, That adequate funds be provided annually for the investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee of communism and subversive propaganda and activities in our midst, and as long as the Communist conspiracy continues to threaten our free institutions and constitutional form of Government.

#### "BIG BROTHER": COMPUTERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, "big brother" is greatly assisted by automation and the whole current scientific revolution.

One small boost that automation has given to big brotherism is the new use of computers in compiling evidence for criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Sidney E. Zion has written a most interesting piece for the New York Times, entitled "Computers on Trial."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

##### COMPUTERS ON TRIAL—USE IN WINNING GAMBLING INDICTMENTS ATTACKED AS VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Sidney E. Zion)

The pervasive computer swung into action this week in New York and came up with 86 alleged bookmakers.

And, as it probably expected, it also came in for some stinging criticism. Joseph P. Hoey, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York, disclosed on Wednesday for the first time in modern criminology computers were an integral aid in uncovering bookmaking activities. His announcement drew quick fire from some lawyers and civil libertarians, and more is likely to come as the possible implications of the practice become clearer.

The main argument of the critics is that most people today consider computers to be infallible and that therefore the mere announcement that they were used as the basis for indictments could fatally prejudice a defendant's right to a fair trial.

The New York Civil Liberties Union yesterday expressed shock and dismay at Mr. Hoey's announcement. It charged that the announcement violated the restrictions placed on pretrial publicity by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach on April 16.

##### DATA ON TESTS BARRED

Among other things he restricted information regarding investigative procedures such as lie-detector tests, ballistic tests, fingerprints and laboratory tests.

The Civil Liberties Union said that the disclosure of the use of computers clearly falls within the Attorney General's proscriptions.

On this point, a legal observer pointed out yesterday that Mr. Hoey's announcement appeared to have also violated the Attorney General's rule against characterizing defendants. Mr. Hoey had singled out, by name, 4 of the 86 defendants as top-echelon bookmakers.

The Civil Liberties Union also said that significant constitutional problems would be presented if Mr. Hoey's office placed substan-

tial reliance on the computers in obtaining the indictments.

The union said it was studying the question of whether the use of machines that make judgments can be appropriately substituted for human judgments in establishing probable cause to justify the return of indictments.

It is difficult to determine the importance computers had in the New York case.

As Mr. Hoey explained it, the computers were fed with information obtained over a 2-year period from bettors, agents, police, and other sources. This information included bookmakers' worksheets, the movements of bettors and bookmakers, geographical patterns of betting and the methods and amounts of payoffs.

Having digested all of this information, the machines then evaluated it and the indictments followed.

According to the Government's initial announcement the indictments might not have been possible without the computers. The announcement said this was because manual processing of the information would have taken so long the 3-year statute of limitations on the charges could have expired before the vital data had been obtained.

In a telephone interview on Thursday, however, Mr. Hoey said that there was sufficient human evidence before the grand jury to justify the indictments.

##### IMPLICATIONS DISTURBING

In any event, it is the implications of the New York case that disturb many lawyers.

"I find the whole thing revolting and nineteen eighty-fourish," said William Kuntler, a New York civil rights lawyer.

Will a computer's evaluation of a man's guilt ever be permitted into evidence at his trial?

Most lawyers questioned this week said that this evidence would not be admissible.

A few, however, had reservations, pointing out that radar evidence is generally permitted and that computer evidence is generally permitted in civil cases where business records are kept on IBM cards, for example.

The principal legal objections to its use are that a computer cannot be cross-examined, although its programmer can, and that a jury would be unduly swayed by the computer's conclusions.

The last point is the one most often stressed by lawyers. It was widely expressed on Thursday by Connecticut lawyers attending the Greenwich Bar Association's Law Day ceremonies.

"Most people today are prepared to say that the computer is right," said Jack Waltuch, a Norwalk lawyer. "It can tell you where the stars are going to be a million years from now. Do you think a jury is not going to believe that it can tell you where a bookie is in the Bronx? It's just too sacrosanct and that's what scares me."

#### EXPANSION OF TOURISM IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article published in the Sunday Gazette-Mail—Charleston, W. Va.—State magazine on May 30, 1965. This article reports on the sixth annual travel clinic held at Blackwater Falls State Park in West Virginia this spring.

This annual travel clinic is always productive in boosting the morale of West Virginians—their pride and confidence in the future growth of tourism in the Mountain State. It also serves as a forum for emphasizing the wonderful potential of the State as the vacationland of

the East Central United States, and offers an opportunity for representatives of private enterprise and public agencies to work together in planning more and better facilities for the tourist and to tell the story of the State's vacationland to an increasing number of prospects.

I spoke at the third annual travel clinic in 1962, using the opportunity to acquaint West Virginians interested in promoting tourism with the anticipated virtues of the proposed Allegheny Parkway. I stressed the vital necessity of providing major arteries of travel as a means to bring travelers to West Virginia in more economically rewarding numbers. I pointed out the tremendous appeal of the proposed Allegheny Parkway to lovers of natural beauty, for it is designed as a scenic highway through national forests and other areas in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland.

It is my hope that my bill, S. 6, which I again introduced in this session of Congress, will receive early passage. The enactment of this measure establishing the parkway, and also authorizing connecting parkway roads and trails to permit greater utilization of adjacent national forests and resources, will provide a basis for concrete planning by those in attendance at the next travel clinic at Blackwater Falls State Park of means to care for the heavy volume of tourist business which is anticipated in future years as a result of the opening of this proposed Allegheny Parkway.

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

#### BLACKWATER TRAVEL TONIC

At Blackwater you heard a lot about white water.

Alma and Jerry Cowherd, with the help of other Hardy and Grant County residents, have for the past two Aprils mixed white water, blue skies, and red noses (from the brisk spring air) and come up with greenbacks. This magic feat was much applauded at the sixth annual travel clinic which convened April 29-30 at Blackwater Falls State Park.

A convention of travel, recreation, and publicity and promotion experts, the clinic was dedicated to the proposition that tourism in West Virginia has a future which will prove profitable, in a big way, to those who cater to the needs and whims of the anticipated tourists.

The White Water canoe races on the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac, examples of the sort of thing that attracts visitors to the Mountain State, were quite naturally much discussed.

As the White Water canoe races came about, in part, as a result of previous (five before this one) travel clinic discussions, it was understandable that such successful events should be viewed by veteran clinic members with paternalistic pride. The hope was that other seedling ideas, planted and nurtured at the sixth travel clinic, might later flower so successfully.

Discussions were incorporated in a format program consisting of a kickoff luncheon addressed by Mrs. Margot (it rhymes with Wells Fargo) Coley, publicity director of the Greenbrier Hotel; three sessions, devoted to the stimulation of travel in West Virginia, along with an appraisal of current travel enticements and accommodations; a Governor's banquet addressed by Gov. Hulett C. Smith; and a final address by James Gross, of Washington, D.C., executive director of the National Association of Travel Organizations.

Promoters, it may be fairly stated, are neither sociologists, historians, nor objective scientists of any stripe. They are people either selling a product or looking for a product to sell.

The product in this case was tourism in West Virginia, how it could be increased and made more profitable to the businessmen of the State. Sessions at the clinic were made up of panels of experts, some of whom complained that the State government was getting altogether too large a percentage of the tourist dollar.

Frohman Johnson, executive secretary of the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, put the matter in a nutshell. Income from the tourist industry in West Virginia, he said, was approaching \$350 million a year, the bulk of which was going into the voracious coffers of the State treasury and very little going into your tax-producing, grimy little hands.

Johnson issued an impassioned appeal to private-enterprise operators "to get off your keesters and start reaping more and more of this golden harvest."

His audience did not rise as one man. The reason was that not many business people, except for dedicated ones like the Cowherds, were present. Travel and promotion experts on the panels were lecturing other travel and promotion experts on the floor, a fact which was recognized and deplored. The need for more business people at future clinics was stressed.

The clinics could use more people like Alma and Jerry Cowherd, owners for the past 23 years of a hostelry in Petersburg called the Hermitage. They do not merely talk. They act.

The White-Water canoe races are examples of Cowherd initiative. Also, Alma and Jerry are expanding the Hermitage, adding a new, 16-unit motor unit scheduled for occupancy in mid-September. They are risking \$120,000 (locally financed), to demonstrate their faith in the travel future of West Virginia.

Despite its critics, State government was well represented at the clinic. Present were Parks Chief Kermit McKeever; State Road Commissioner Burl Sawyers; Paul Crabtree, of the Office of Economic Development; and Lovell Greathouse and Bob Bowers, both of the West Virginia Department of Commerce.

Governor Smith was present long enough to make a banquet speech emphasizing the positive approach. He said that every Mountaineer has an obligation to see his State first hand. Find out what West Virginia has to offer, he said, then tell others about it. "The spirit of 'we will,'" he declared, "will win hands down."

Kermit McKeever, at the first clinic session, chaired by John Scherlacher, professor of recreation at West Virginia University, spoke informally of planned park improvements and additions.

"Within the next month," said the parks chief, "we hope to advertise for bids for improvements to the Cass Scenic Railroad." Now 4 miles long, the railroad will be extended several more miles to the top of Bald Knob. Outdoor recreation opportunities in this area are virtually limitless.

Work on an entirely new park, built around major waterfalls of the Tygarts Valley near Grafton, will begin soon. Reconstruction of archeological sites—such as the one at Buffalo in Putnam County—is also planned.

E. M. Olliver, forest supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest, perhaps hit the nail on the head not only in this area, but for all of West Virginia, when he said:

"Like Kermit, we've got lots of plans. All we're doing is waiting for the money." It takes capital to get things done, and a lack of money, at the State or private level, has always been a hindrance in the Mountain State.

Olliver spoke of a 70-acre impoundment the Federal Government will build in Randolph

County, and a 53-acre impoundment to be constructed near Richwood. There will also be improvements at Cranberry Glades, partly for the protection of the glades, and partly for the convenience of visitors.

The installation of boardwalks in Cranberry Glades, Olliver pointed out, depends on changing the governmental classification of the bogs. Now a natural area, for the use of students and scholars, the glades, to qualify for improvements such as might entice general tourists would have to be changed to a "scenic area."

It is probably worth mentioning that the only tourist attractions actually in the process of being built in West Virginia (not counting motels) are being financed either by Federal or State Governments. At least no others were mentioned at the travel clinic (a private attraction of merit near Harpers Ferry is actually being closed), unless you want to count the novel farm vacation arrangement of Mrs. Wilson Teets, of Moorefield. And it appears that Mrs. Teets is using, for the most part, facilities which were already in existence.

Mrs. Teets' farm vacation enterprise, as told by Mrs. Teets, was a travel-clinic highlight. She spoke softly and carried a very large travel promotion pitchfork.

Mrs. Teets has built up a brisk tourist business. Out-of-State visitors remain on her three farms for family vacations of a week or longer. Mrs. Teets has developed a small but flourishing business by stressing service, courtesy, and cleanliness with a minimum of ballyhoo—methods others might follow with profit to themselves and credit to West Virginia.

Why is Mrs. Teets in business? Probably to pay her property taxes. She owns 3,000 acres in the Moorefield area.

The second session of the clinic, titled "Wayout Promotions," promised more than it delivered, in terms of earth-shaking developments. Marlane MacLane, as inconspicuous as a fire engine at a funeral, advocated liquor by the drink to lure tourists to West Virginia, as did James Hetzer, a Huntington theatrical agent whose latest effort seems to have been an oriental girlie show from Japan.

Mary Scott, now with a Charleston advertising firm, but for many years a press agent for "Honey in the Rock," did not agree. That is, she said, "I do not think that liquor by the drink is the answer to all our problems," a statement with which the strongest partisan of John Barleycorn could scarcely disagree.

Mrs. Scott further proved her intransigence by making remarks about Marlane MacLane's false eyelashes. This was in a prepared speech, largely detailing Scott's successes in promoting "Honey in the Rock." One of the first things you learn about promotion and publicity people is that they are not shy.

This year, the clinic had intended, by and large, to dispense with speeches by panel members. Answering questions from the floor was to be the primary panel function, with general discussion to follow. But speeches there were, and many of them. Although this was not altogether bad, perhaps the resolve to curb speeches in next year's clinic program might be printed in somewhat larger type.

The 1965 clinic at Blackwater Falls State Park concluded with a dinner address by Gross. His primary message was to "See the U.S.A.," a message combined with a pep talk urging his listeners to sell travel. Said he:

"Everyone selling together blends hearts and minds and spirits, as the musicians in an orchestra harmonize musical tones, to create a mighty symphony of prosperity."

It should be pointed out that the sixth annual travel clinic, and all those preceding, would not have existed without the active support of the Monongahela Power Co.,

which also appears to have a strong role in another supporting organization, the Upper Monongahela Valley Association.

The support of the Monongahela Power Co. has not been merely verbal, but organizational and monetary. C. Samuel Kistler, for example, recreationist for the company, is the retiring president of the travel clinic, and Frohman Johnson, of the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, its retiring secretary-treasurer.

Although it is true that such company activity is no doubt tax-deductible, and redounds in the long run to company benefit (or hopes to), it is also true that such activity benefits the community and State. This enlightened policy is a far cry from that of the utility which considers its duty done when it mails out bills and writes nasty letters to delinquent customers.

Even if the results of the travel clinics, despite their chief sponsor, are not always electrifying, you should attend next year. That is, you should if your welfare is in any way concerned with travel and tourism.

Be there. Spark their imagination with a battery of your own shocking ideas. You'll get a charge out of it.

#### VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS

Mr McGEE. Mr President, writing in today's Washington Post, Edward T. Folliard calls patience and stamina our Nation's most needed requirements in connection with the pursuit of the war in South Vietnam. His reference is to patience and stamina on the part of all the American people.

Other Senators have stated, here on this floor, that Communist governments, particularly those in Hanoi and Peiping, are betting on American's well-known impatience, and believe that we shall tire of the constant demands of pursuing a faraway war. Many of us have regretted the attention given to those who already have tired of the struggle and want our Government to extricate us, for these well-publicized protesters feed the hopes of Hanoi and Peiping.

Most Americans support President Johnson, who has affirmed our intention of staying in South Vietnam and seeing the battle through. Most Americans want to show the Communists that they cannot get away with aggression against their neighbors. As a nation, I am sure, we do possess the patience and stamina that are needed for the task.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Folliard's article, entitled "Patience, Stamina—Vietnam Requirements," printed in the RECORD.

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

PATIENCE, STAMINA—VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS  
(By Edward T. Folliard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn-out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 6, or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775-83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will not be defeated and will not grow tired. Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will, if necessary, carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war a police action.

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military

solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was decadent.

#### DOMINICAN HOPE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the "Inside Report" of reporters Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, which was published in the Washington Post of May 28, does much to clear the air regarding the American hope for the Dominican Republic, and to "give the lie," as they wrote, "to shrill critics who have been spreading the false rumor that President Johnson really favors right-wing military juntas and does not trust the anti-Communist left."

According to their article, the U.S. action in Santo Domingo effectively blocked the possibility of a coup by Communist elements. As it turned out, that was an easier task than the job of gluing together a progressive government with staying power.

I ask unanimous consent that the Evans-Novak article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1965]  
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

#### DOMINICAN HOPE

SANTO DOMINGO.—Having liquidated the undeniable threat of another Cuba in the Caribbean, the United States is now liquidating the threat of a return to strong man, rightwing military rule.

The intense effort going into this work ought once and for all to give the lie to shrill critics who have been spreading the false rumor that President Johnson really favors rightwing military juntas and doesn't trust the anti-Communist left.

The intensity of the effort to rehabilitate the left-of-center leaders still holed up in the cobweb of narrow streets in the old city has not yet been fully reported. Nor, it should be added, has the collateral and perhaps more important effort to deal with that stubborn political primitive, Col. Antonio Imbert Barrera. Tony Imbert now claims (without a shred of proof) to hold the confidence of the whole country except for the revolutionary forces here.

The best place to start the story is in President Johnson's oval office in the White House one day last week. Among those present were Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Thomas Mann. In a voice mixed with sadness and anger, the President said he was being blamed for using the U.S. Marines to establish and support a return to military dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. Nothing could put him in a false light, the President said.

Almost as the President spoke, Tony Imbert's military forces were mopping up the last remaining rebel pockets north of the U.S.-patrolled corridor that separates the rebel forces in the heart of the city from Imbert's. This mopping up, far from proving that the United States was helping Colonel Imbert, was an essential event to permit McGeorge Bundy, the President's eyes and ears here for 10 days, to begin his serious



talks with rebel leaders. Serious talks were impossible while the two sides sniped at each other.

But once the United States had the two sides apart, with 22,000 marines and paratroopers in the middle, the stage was set for serious bargaining. Subtly and ever so gently, Tony Imbert was warned that, if he continues to insist on his claim to be the head of the legitimate government, the United States might find itself unable to locate enough cash to pay Imbert's troops.

Not only that, but the United States might also not come through with budgetary-support funds which Imbert must have to pay the country's Government workers.

In the end, of course, it may be necessary to go much farther to force Imbert to agree on a non-Imbert government.

Along with this no-nonsense maneuver to cut Imbert down to size, the United States has now reappraised Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, with interesting results.

Instead of finding a front for the most dangerous elements in the rebel camp, as Colonel Caamano had been repeatedly characterized in the past, the United States now finds a soldier-politician who is the unquestioned rebel strong arm.

Where before the shadowy figure of Hector Aristy was regarded by the United States as Caamano's gray eminence, today Caamano is described not as a tool of Aristy or of Communist elements within the rebel camp, but as his own man—trustworthy, honorable, and fully capable of keeping any agreement he finally signs.

Thus, the conclusion is inescapable that, having eliminated the possibility of a Communist coup by swift, bold action on April 28, the United States is now promoting a progressive government. The problem is to glue one together out of the wreckage of Dominican politics.

#### THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM—REFLECTIONS ON MEMORIAL DAY, 1965

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Memorial Day, 1965, has come and gone, but the reason for this solemn holiday still haunts the minds of some of us.

On this day, each year, the American people rouse themselves from other thoughts and pursuits, to honor the memory of the thousands of Americans who have given their last full measure of devotion in the defense of our freedom.

From thousands of bunting-draped speakers platforms in villages, hamlets, towns, and cities all over this land, once more came the oft-repeated words: "So, on this Memorial Day, we pause to honor those"—and so forth.

The speakers' words, the sound of muffled drums and taps—echoing over green fields filled with neat white crosses, row on row, soon fade away, and are forgotten as we turn again to the harsh realities which face the living. So, until next Memorial Day most of us will forget the real significance of the day: the fact that without the sacrifices of our honored dead, our free Nation and the world as we know it would not exist.

We also tend to forget the fact that throughout our history there have been extraordinary men—heroes—who have given that extra measure of devotion, and by their example have inspired others to rise to greater heights in defending freedom in its hours of danger.

Most conspicuous among those heroes are the comparative handful of men who

are entitled to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest award for military valor, is given only to those who have acted with supreme courage, with total disregard of their own safety, in the face of the most hazardous conditions. It is bestowed by virtue of an act of Congress, and reflects our Nation's gratitude to those who, in moments of uncommon risk, offered in our defense everything they had including life itself.

Any man who has served in combat knows that many who qualify for decorations do not receive them, because their deeds of valor were not observed, or because there were no survivors to recount them. However, this fact should not detract from the tribute we pay those who did earn our Nation's highest award for heroism.

The Medal of Honor itself is merely a token, a gesture of recognition of "Conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty," and for sacrifices which cannot be measured or repaid in terms of worldly goods.

The harsh fact that we have not always remembered and properly honored our Nation's outstanding heroes was once again forcefully brought to my attention by an article in This Week magazine which was distributed with Sunday newspapers, all over the country, on May 30.

The article, entitled "The High Cost of Heroism," was written by Joe McCarthy, and was particularly timely, coming as it did on Memorial Day.

Mr. McCarthy traced the sad history of the shameful treatment accorded some of our Congressional Medal of Honor winners. Among others, he cited the protracted tax troubles which plagued World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York.

I believe we owe a debt of gratitude to the editors of This Week magazine and author Joe McCarthy for nudging our national conscience about the manner in which some of our Nation's greatest heroes have been ill-treated, ignored, and pushed aside.

I commend this excellent article to all Senators, and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM

(Our Medal of Honor recipients have a brief moment in the sun and unfortunately a long time in the shade.)

(By Joe McCarthy)

On this Memorial Day, as America honors its war dead, it might be well to consider how much honor is paid to our greatest war heroes—the gallant band of 283 surviving recipients of the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award for bravery "above and beyond the call of duty."

Until recently, the ceremonial recognition given regularly by the Government to the wearers of the Medal of Honor was a special red-carpet invitation to the President's inauguration. The medalists were seated in a place of prominence among the dignitaries near the President and treated as VIP's at the inaugural balls. They had to pay for the trip to Washington themselves, or hitch a ride on a military aircraft, one of the few privileges that goes with the medal. Free

living quarters were available at military posts near the Capital.

"Every 4 years they made us feel pretty important," says one aging medal recipient from World War I. "We looked forward to it."

But last January, at President Johnson's inauguration, the red carpet was not rolled out. The invitation sent to Medal of Honor men included no special seats among the top-ranking guests and no tickets to the gala balls. A letter explained, regretfully, that there were no free beds for civilian medal recipients at Fort Myer or Fort McNair. By and large, those who did go to the inauguration were the few men who live near Washington.

It was said, unofficially, that the administration wanted to emphasize achievements of peace rather than the memory of wartime heroics; the medalists singled out for special recognition at the Johnson inauguration were outstanding scientists, artists, educators, and professional people decorated with the civilian Medal of Freedom.

#### THE PRIVILEGES OF A MEDAL HOLDER

Along with the privilege of getting free transportation on military planes, if space and flights are available, a Medal of Honor recipient rates only two special benefits not given to other veterans. He can apply for an optional Government pension of \$100 a month after the age of 40, and, if his sons are qualified, they may obtain appointments to West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy without congressional recommendations.

It is widely assumed by servicemen that veterans wearing the Medal of Honor's blue and white-starred rosette in their lapels are legally entitled to receive a hand salute. But such a courtesy is not required by Army, Navy, or Air Force regulations.

As a matter of fact, the bill awarding the \$100 a month pension was passed by Congress a few years ago, not as a needed financial benefit but simply because the legislators realized that the medal winners were receiving little or no recognition from the Government for their wartime heroism.

The author of the pension measure, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, himself a World War II infantry officer with the Silver Star and the Croix de Guerre, pointed out to Congress that the United States at that time was lagging far behind Britain and France in showing official gratitude to outstanding patriotic heroes. When TEAGUE introduced his pension bill, they were receiving \$10 a month after the age of 65, a pension authorized before World War I.

"The \$100 a month they're getting now isn't enough to live on, of course," a Government official said a few weeks ago. "It's just something to let them know we haven't forgotten them."

The Government official was asked if any further increase in benefits for Medal of Honor recipients was planned for the near future.

"There are no such plans," he said.

#### ROLLCALL OF FAME

Today's living 283 Honor Medalists range in age from 89-year-old Maj. Frank C. Anders, who won his medal in the Philippine insurrection of 1899, to 30-year-old Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, decorated last December by President Johnson for bravery in Vietnam. They include such well-known names as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, cowboy movie star Audie Murphy, Marine flyer Joe Foss, who was elected Governor of South Dakota and is today commissioner of the American Football League, and Charles A. Lindbergh, who was given the medal for his solo flight across the Atlantic in 1927.

Many of the medal holders have stayed on in the armed services until retirement, or are still on active duty waiting to retire, and a large number of them are in modest paying Federal and State Government jobs. There

are 27 medalists working in various cities, for example, as employees of the Veterans' Administration, Department of Veterans' Benefits, the result of an order issued by President Harry S. Truman at the end of World War II directing the VA to hire any Medal of Honor recipient who applied for a job in that Department.

A typical medalist employed by the Veterans' Administration in Newark, N.J., is Nicholas Oresko, who singlehandedly charged and demolished two enemy machinegun positions in Germany in 1945, wiping out the second emplacement with grenades and rifle fire while severely wounded.

Not so typical is Henry E. "Red" Erwin, the only enlisted airman to win the medal in the Pacific in World War II, and now assigned to the VA office in Montgomery, Ala. To make himself presentable enough to hold a job with many contacts, Erwin spent more than 2 years in a veterans' hospital after the war undergoing skin-grafting surgery on his burned and disfigured face. In a B-29 on a bombing mission over Japan a phosphorus bomb caught and ignited in the plane. To save the plane and the other men in its crew, Erwin groped for the burning bomb, picked it up, and carried it forward to the copilot's window with his hands and clothing in flames, and dropped it outside.

Most of the medalholders are members of the Medal of Honor Society, which meets every 2 years at reunions and publishes a quarterly bulletin and newsletter to keep the highly exclusive group informed of each other's doings. The current president of the society is Thomas J. Kelly, a New Yorker who worked his way through law school after winning the Medal of Honor and now serves as an Administrator in the Manhattan office of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Even among the annals of Medal of Honor citations for the past century, which crowd every page with unbelievable stories of selfless daring, the account of Kelly's award-winning exploit under fire stands out.

As a 21-year-old medical aid man, Kelly was attached to an armored infantry platoon which was caught by a surprise attack while crossing an open clearing in Germany. The platoon and Kelly ran from the plateau-like exposed ground to the protection of a downhill slope, leaving dead and wounded Americans behind them.

Going back into the clearing to bring the wounded to safety meant crawling and running under fire from the surrounding woods for a distance of 300 yards, but Kelly decided to try it. On his first trip he led out a group of seven blinded and shocked casualties who were able to walk under his guidance. Then he went back across the exposed terrain again and again, carrying and dragging more wounded soldiers. Two other GI's, who tried to help him, were both killed. Kelly made 10 trips in all, rescuing 17 fallen men from the field of sweeping machinegun fire and exploding mortar shells.

#### "YOU KNOW WHAT'S RIGHT"

"I thought of Sister Saint Peter, one of the nuns who taught me in parochial school," he said recently. "I could feel her gold ring tapping against my forehead, as it did when she was trying to teach me something, and I could hear her saying, 'Tom Kelly, you know what's right and what's wrong. There are wounded men out there—go and get them.'"

As president of the Medal of Honor Society, Kelly hears more about the problems of medal winners than anybody in the Pentagon or the Veterans' Administration. Many of the war heroes in his fraternity feel that they get too much recognition—of the wrong kind.

"Wearing the Medal of Honor can be harder than winning it," Kelly said. "A medalholder sometimes finds his commanding offi-

cer, or his boss in civilian life, leaning over backward, making sure he isn't treated any better than anybody else because of his medal.

"If he makes a mistake, or gets into trouble, he's likely to be given a rougher punishment than he would have gotten if he didn't have the medal. He's always carefully walking a tightrope in the glare of the spotlight."

#### TROUBLE MAKES HEADLINES

An automobile accident or a bankruptcy, a divorce trial or a friendly party turning into a noisy brawl, any of the misfortunes that ordinarily wouldn't be mentioned in the newspapers can make headlines if a Medal of Honor hero is involved.

"The ones you read about are the few who are having personal troubles," Kelly says, "so people think many Medal of Honor men have a terrible time trying to adjust to civilian life. Nobody writes about all the rest of us who are quietly raising families and worrying about the mortgage payments like everybody else."

The Medal of Honor heroes best known by postwar newspaper readers are indeed the ones plagued by the most troubles, such as tobacco-chewing Charles E. "Commando" Kelly, from Pittsburgh, the 36th Division's one-man army in Italy. Chuck Kelly, as he was called in his outfit, has occupied more space in newspapers since the war than during it—thanks to his prolonged struggles with unemployment, illness, and financial woes. Sgt. Alvin C. York, who died last September at the age of 76, became almost as famous in the last 20 years for his income tax litigations as he was for his World War I heroism. Sergeant York's feat of 1918 was hailed by Marshal Foch as the greatest accomplishment of any soldier in all the armies of Europe. In a 4-hour skirmish in the Argonne Forest in 1918, York and a few companions killed 25 Germans and captured the rest of an enemy machinegun battalion, 4 officers and 128 enlisted men.

A modest and unpretentious Tennessee mountaineer, York firmly refused after the war to capitalize on his Medal of Honor. Finally he was persuaded that a movie biography, starring Gary Cooper, could inspire patriotism. For the film rights to his life story, York was paid some \$150,000, most of which he gave away to worthy causes and needy friends.

Then York was hit by an income tax and interest bill for \$172,000. His case dragged through courts for years. The Internal Revenue authorities finally agreed to settle for \$25,000, raised by public donation.

Probably the most shaky postwar readjustment attempted by any Medal of Honor recipient was the one tackled by Audie Murphy. Murphy, who won more decorations than any other soldier in World War II, received his Medal of Honor award for holding a woods attacked by the Germans almost singlehandedly, personally killing or wounding 50 of the enemy. He left his cotton-growing hometown of Farmersville, Tex., after the war and went to Hollywood to become a movie star.

Now 40—he was only 20 when he won the Medal of Honor—Murphy is comfortably and solidly established in filmland and as a millionaire cowboy movie star, the only horse-riding actor still working regularly in motion pictures. He appears in four or five westerns a year, low-budget films that are shown mainly in small-town theaters.

Murphy was regarded as a "hot" prospect when he first came to Hollywood, and Murphy's friends believe that he might have become a glamour star if he had patronized the right people in Hollywood. But he kept the right people at arm's length and never regretted it.

"I have only a nodding acquaintance with Hollywood-type people," Audie once said. "I say nodding to them and they say nodding to me."

Murphy enjoys his role as a western performer. His peaceful existence in Hollywood is marred only by gossip column mentions of a Medal of Honor hero being thrown out of Sunset Strip nightclubs. It is another holder, but everyone thinks the columnists are writing about Murphy, who never goes to nightclubs.

Murphy makes a point of never identifying himself publicly with his Medal of Honor, which he has given, along with his other medals, to his two young sons. He avoids meetings of the Medal of Honor Society and turns down invitations to appear in his reserve uniform at parades. However, he went to a PTA meeting in Gardena, Calif., recently and made a speech on "What the Constitution Means to Me."

#### SALUTE TO GLORY

The most impressive salute ever given to Medal of Honor holders and perhaps from the looks of things, the last one, was a special reception attended by 240 wearers of the award at the White House on May 2, 1963, the largest gathering of the medalists in one place in the history of the United States. As the heroes of six wars filed past President Kennedy, shaking his hand, some in wheelchairs and others on crutches, the President's sister-in-law, Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, made a remark which well described the emotion of the spectators:

"It is like watching a million flags march by."

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when Thomas Paine said, "There are the times that try men's souls," he was describing the pressures of life nearly 200 years ago. That great patriot might be dismayed to find, were he alive today, that the pressures and crises have multiplied; that these times are far more trying, perhaps, than the relatively placid days of the American struggle for independence.

But Tom Paine would be cheered, I believe, by the courage, the patience, the skill, and the fortitude of this Nation's Chief Magistrate, Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am thinking particularly of our President's policy in the Vietnamese conflict: wielding forcefully this country's awesome strength and destructive power, yet always holding out the hand of peace, offering to our adversaries a reasonable and workable settlement, if they will but agree to negotiate.

This, I believe, is statesmanship of a high order; and I believe that in these "times which try men's souls," we can draw strength from our President's conduct in his office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excellent articles, by Michael Padev which reinforce and expand upon these views. The articles were published in the Indianapolis Star of May 5 and 14.

I also commend to other Senators an excellent editorial entitled "Negotiations on Vietnam." It was published in the Washington Evening Star of May 18. I also request that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 5, 1965]

ANALYSIS OF TACTICS: JOHNSON REVOLUTIONIZES FOREIGN POLICY

(By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson has completely revolutionized American foreign policy in the last 3 months—since the beginning of the bombing raids on Communist North Vietnam.

Southeast Asia, and now the Caribbean, are the regions where this new Johnson policy has been tried. But its repercussions are bound to be worldwide, and its effect on the future course of international developments is certain to be decisive.

What Mr. Johnson has done is to put the United States squarely "on the map" as the greatest power—fully aware of its overwhelming strength and willing, as well as able, to use that strength in defense of U.S. national interests and international peace.

In the last 20 years or so Mr. Johnson's predecessors were, in most cases, rather power shy. They were apologetic about America's enormous military strength and tremendous economic and industrial capacity.

Wherever and whenever limited American military strength had to be used—as, for example, in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, Korea, and the Middle East—this was always under the auspices of some "international" sponsorship.

The idea was conveyed that there was something basically wrong in the use of American military strength. Yet the only wrong thing about it was the fact that the idea itself was wrong.

The use of military strength is not "wrong" by itself. It depends on who uses it, how, and for what purpose.

In this field (the use of military strength) the record of the United States is second to none. The United States is not a colonial or imperialistic power, it holds no foreign country in bondage and it never has waged wars for conquest.

Contrary to what leftwingers and "liberals" say, the world is not afraid of American military power. To the contrary—all supporters of freedom and democracy, as well as all enslaved nations—in Europe, in Asia, and everywhere else—always have welcomed and welcome now the display and the exercise of American military power. This is so because they know that American power is their friend and protector.

The quick, forceful, and determined use of American military power in southeast Asia and the Caribbean will—we can be certain—greatly increase American influence throughout the world.

All our true friends will welcome with relief and satisfaction the news that, at long last, the President of the United States is following a foreign policy worthy of the leader of the free world—a policy based on the use of adequate U.S. strength where aggressors have to be stopped and where Communist conspiracies have to be defeated.

The success of this policy can best be judged by the angry and desperate howls coming from the Communist camp. The Communists are hurt—badly—and they shriek the louder because they did not expect such a hard blow to come from the United States just now.

For many years, the Reds were accustomed to American inaction in the face of their growing provocations. But now the man in the White House shows that he can act—and how. When shot at, he shoots back right away, without even consulting the United Nations.

And as L.B.J.'s guns are the best in the world, and his aim is deadly accurate, the Reds are beginning to realize they are in the wrong game.

This soon will bring the Communist leaders to an "agonizing reappraisal" of their policy toward the United States.

The one thing that the Communists don't want—and cannot afford to have—is a real showdown (a "confrontation," as Washington diplomats would say) with the United States. They will change their policy when they see that a confrontation might be inevitable. We then shall be on the road toward a more peaceful world.

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J.'S SPEECH WAS EFFECTIVE PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

(By Michael Padev, Star foreign editor)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's speech before the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists yesterday was a very skillful and a very effective step of public diplomacy.

The President said things and proposed policies which are meant to—

1. Further deepen the rift between Moscow and Peking.

2. Make the Hanoi Communist regime think twice before agreeing to accept any military help from Red China.

3. Strengthen the "peace party" among North Vietnam's Communist leaders.

Contrary to what liberal experts on Communist affairs predicted, the escalation of the Vietnam war has not drawn Soviet Russia and Red China together. To the contrary, it has moved them further apart.

The Red Chinese press is now full of scornful attacks on the Soviet leaders, who are accused of kowtowing to the American imperialists and of being scared to help the glorious Communist comrades in North Vietnam against the American "paper tigers."

But Red China is not helping North Vietnam either. Though the Soviet press has so far been silent on the matter, Soviet and East European Communist diplomats have been pointing out in talks with Western officials that it is the Red Chinese who seem to be scared, in spite of the bombastic war propaganda.

By stressing that Red China is the only danger to peace in Asia, President Johnson has given a diplomatic "helping hand" to the Soviet leaders in their difficult struggle against Peking.

This is a very clever political move. The United States should do its utmost to worsen the quarrel between Soviet Russia and Red China. Disunited Communists are much less dangerous than united Communists.

It is also obvious that all is not well between Red China and the Hanoi Communist government.

The U.S. bombing offensive against Communist targets in North Vietnam has made Hanoi suffer very dearly for its "war of liberation" in South Vietnam.

Red China also supports this "war of liberation." But there are no Red Chinese casualty lists, no Red Chinese bridges are bombed, and no Red Chinese communication lines are destroyed.

As the U.S. air offensive against Hanoi continues and is extended, the North Vietnam Communist leaders cannot fail to see that their country is the only victim in a war which is supposed to be common Communist property.

The unequal share of sacrifices, hardships and privations is never a good basis for a lasting alliance between states.

Sooner or later the Hanoi Communist leaders will point out to their Chinese comrades that a peaceful settlement with the

United States might prove to be the only way to save North Vietnam from destruction and devastation.

Red Chinese propaganda about the United States being a paper tiger must sound very hollow in Hanoi just now for it is the Hanoi leaders who know, from painful experience, that the paper tiger has very sharp teeth, indeed.

By offering again "unconditional discussions" for peace, coupled with an imaginative and constructive American plan for technical assistance to an international cooperative development project in southeast Asia, President Johnson has appealed directly to the "peace party" among Hanoi's Communist leaders.

There should be no doubt that such a "peace party" does exist in Hanoi. We often believe, mistakenly, that all Communists think and act alike. But this is not true, especially in times of stress, emergency or war.

We can be sure that there is, at present, a very strong group of North Vietnam Communist leaders who doubt, or who begin to doubt, the wisdom of continuing the "liberation war" in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson's speech was meant to strengthen the hand of exactly this group of Hanoi leaders.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 18, 1965]

NEGOTIATIONS ON VIETNAM

President Johnson's call for unconditional peace talks on Vietnam, combined with the idea that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side," is being wildly misinterpreted by some people in this country and abroad.

Critics of administration policy have seized on these two phrases to bolster their hope that a sellout in Vietnam is in the making. If a negotiation can be started, they say, it will be based on our recognition of a military stalemate in Vietnam. Whether or not the Communist Vietcong is accepted as a party to the negotiation, its status as a political power will be conceded.

The United States, these people believe, will be willing to accept participation of the Vietcong as a major element of a coalition government in South Vietnam which will ultimately lead to the reunification of the country under the leadership of Hanoi.

The President, in our opinion, means no such thing. A willingness to negotiate unconditionally does not mean that we are prepared to accept any and all conditions to achieve peace in Vietnam. And to say that no purely military solution is in sight does not mean that the United States is resigned either to a Vietcong victory or an indefinite stalemate.

The President, in short, is not seeking a negotiation in order to consecrate a defeat. Much of his speech last Thursday was devoted to the task of pointing out that the struggle against the Vietcong is being waged on political, economic, and social levels which are concurrent and complementary to the military war. Nothing that he has said could be interpreted to mean that this struggle against Communist domination will not be ultimately successful.

No negotiation undertaken under the present circumstances is likely in any event to produce a final settlement of the Vietnamese problem. The United States, as the President has made clear many times, cannot accept any formula which compromises the freedom and independence of South Vietnam.

What may be negotiable are the terms for a cease-fire in the south, together with an end to infiltration of men and arms from North Vietnam and the bombing of North Vietnamese installations.

It is possible also that the groundwork could be laid for elections in South Vietnam within a reasonable time after a ceasefire. Such elections held under international supervision would determine the role of the Vietcong in any future South Vietnamese government. It would also, very probably, determine the issue of reunification according to the wishes of a majority of South Vietnamese.

It is quite understandable that a solution along these lines should satisfy neither the Communists nor those who would like to see a surrender of South Vietnam. The reaction from Hanoi and Peiping so far indicates that the Communists for their part have by no means abandoned their hopes of conquest. And they at least do not seem to be under the illusion that they can win at the bargaining table what they cannot win on the battlefield.

#### ADJUSTMENTS REQUIRED FOR FULL EQUALITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, James Reston recently devoted his widely read column in the New York Times to an analysis which I commend to the attention of all Senators.

The Senate has just completed action on one of the most decisive bills of this half century—the Voting Rights Act of 1965. With the enactment of this bill, we shall see one phase of the epic struggle for full equality for Negro Americans—indeed, for all Americans—draw to a close. This legislation should, once and for all, bring success to the unflinching determination of our Negro fellow citizens to achieve full equality in the polling place. But, as Mr. Reston has astutely observed, we cannot assume that equality in the polling place will lead to immediate equality in the marketplace and in the social sphere.

We must face the fact that full social, political, and economic equality—the rightful desire of every American citizen—will become an accomplished fact only after a very long and difficult period involving major adjustments in every segment of our national life. As Mr. Reston rightly asserts, that period is about to ensue.

Therefore, I request unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article, entitled "Washington: The Push to the Left," be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON: THE PUSH TO THE LEFT  
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The American Negro's fight for legal equality is in its closing phase, and his push to the left will soon begin. With the passage of the voting rights bill most of the artificial legal barriers will be down, but the major barriers to economic and social equality will remain.

The battle in the courts, beginning in 1954, and the battle in the streets have been spectacularly successful, but they are also highly misleading.

Despite the progress toward desegregation of the public schools, lunch counters, hotels and other places of public accommodation, the economic segregation of the American Negro is in some ways worse than it was 11 years ago.

BETTER OFF, BUT

He is, of course, better off than he was a decade ago, but more Negroes are unem-

ployed today than in 1954. The black slums are not narrowing but expanding. The gap between white and Negro unemployed is increasing. And more Negroes are working at unskilled jobs, highly vulnerable to displacement by automatic machinery, than ever before.

Much has happened in these past 11 years in the legal and political fields. The power of the conservative coalition in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives and the same coalition in the Congress as a whole has been greatly reduced if not broken. The power of the local communities over the Negro has been weakened by the Federal courts and the Federal legislature.

#### MEANS AND ENDS

So much attention has been focused on these struggles, however, that the legal barriers have seemed to be an end in themselves rather than merely the means to an end. In fact, it has been widely asserted that the achievement of legal equality would somehow lead to economic equality, and this highly dubious assumption is what the Negro leaders are now out to destroy.

"The Negro," says Bayard Rustin, a leading tactician of the civil rights movement, writing in "Commentary," "today finds himself stymied by obstacles of far greater magnitude than the legal barriers he was attacking before: automation, urban decay, de facto school segregation. These are problems which, while conditioned by Jim Crow, do not vanish upon its demise. They are more deeply rooted in the socioeconomic order; they are the result of the total society's failure to meet not only the Negro's needs, but human needs generally."

This raises the interesting question of what the Negro will do with his vote when he gets it, and how he will react to President Johnson's domestic policies, and consensus tactics.

The President has always argued that the vote was the key to the Negro's problems in the South. Let him get the vote, Mr. Johnson has said ever since he was in the Senate, and Members of the Congress will gradually see to it that the grievances of the Negroes are removed.

The key word in this doctrine is "gradually," and it is here that the conflict is likely to arise.

Rustin defines the potential conflict between the pace of the President and the urgent demands of the Negro community clearly enough:

"We need to be calling," he says, "for public works and training, for national economic planning, for Federal aid to education, for attractive public housing—all this on a sufficiently massive scale to make a difference.

Rustin is talking about "replacing" the New York slums with public housing at a cost of \$17 billion. He quotes Michael Harrington as estimating the cost of a successful war on poverty in the United States at about \$100 billion.

In short, the Negro revolution in America is likely to go the way of most social and economic revolutions, which do not slow down when they achieve their preliminary goals but increase the tempo with every success.

#### POLITICAL ACTION

The Negro protest movement is now likely to become a much better organized political movement. Its aim will be to create a coalition with labor, liberal, intellectual, and religious leaders that will have a decisive voice not only in presidential and congressional elections but in putting through economic and social programs of a much more radical nature and in a much shorter span of time than anything the Johnson administration has thought about so far.

The conservative "Establishment" in the Congress, as the Negro leaders see it, has been defeated. The legal tools for more effective

political action will soon be in their hands, and an effort will no doubt soon be made to push the President to the left from his favorite political ground in the center.

#### THE WORLD SITUATION AND FUTURE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an address delivered by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, at the 10th anniversary luncheon of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania on May 28. Governor Scranton's speech is a thoughtful analysis of the forces shaping contemporary world events and it suggests several operational premises to guide the formulation of future American foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Scranton's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON AT THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON OF THE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MAY 28, 1965

It is indeed fitting that, on this 10th anniversary of the founding of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, we should offer our congratulations to its director and to all those who have participated in the work of the institute over the last decade. But this day should also be the occasion to attempt to discern more clearly the forces now at work in the world, and to look ahead, to consider policies appropriate to the United States in the years which lie before us. So urged, we turn our thoughts to the changes unfolding in the world around us and to the kind of world in which we as Americans hope to live during the remaining years of the 20th century, and especially during the next decade. Only with a clear vision of the order toward which we aspire can we develop policies and strategies to meet the problems before us.

For a generation now, the United States, as the leader of the free world, has been locked in struggle with the Communists. This struggle has raged in a world swept by convulsive currents of change, the collapse of the old order, the wave of rising expectations in the lands of underprivileged peoples, the explosive growth of populations and the onrush of technology. For the last generation, two power constellations have dominated international politics: the West and the Communist bloc. The stakes of the present struggle within our world are no less than the future organization of mankind.

It is not given to men to foretell the future with any precision. Who in 1935 predicted the shape of events a generation later? Perhaps a generation hence many centers of power will replace bipolarity. In Asia, Europe, and perhaps in other regions, new powers may well contest both the United States or the Soviet Union's right to shape the world of the future. Already disputes have erupted within the Communist and the Western World. Powers presently lesser than the Soviet Union and the United States have developed aspirations to a greater role in world politics.

Nevertheless, the ability to shape the future, if it rests with any one or two powers, remains to a very considerable extent in the hands of these two nations. The side which succeeds in harnessing the revolutionary forces which now sweep across this

planet will place its stamp on generations to come.

The task confronting the United States, therefore, is to design its policy and strategy so as to assure the emergence of a world community compatible with our values. The contest is essentially political, and the crucial question is how best can human society be organized to satisfy the needs and aspirations of people.

Yet the policy and strategy chosen to advance our conception of man must be related to military capabilities. The military posture possessed by both sides influences the action undertaken by each power in every important confrontation. The Soviets appear to have committed themselves in recent years to the achievement of military superiority. We as Americans received an instructive lesson in the importance of military superiority during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. Without the strategic preponderance available to the United States at that time, President Kennedy could hardly have turned back this direct threat to U.S. survival.

Throughout the past those who have mastered the technology of the age have held in their hands the means to forge the history of their times. Superior technology gave the European peoples the advantage over the rest of mankind as Europe emerged from the Middle Ages. Only the Europeans had the means of transportation and the weaponry necessary for the expansion of their Western civilization throughout the globe. Europe remained the power center of the international system so long as technological supremacy rested in European hands. Clearly it is the mastery of advanced technology which gives both the United States and the Soviet Union such powerful voices in world affairs today.

In recent years the notion gained respectability that there exists a "technological plateau"—that regardless of technological innovation the nuclear stalemate between the United States and the Soviet Union will remain basically unaltered. No notion could be more dangerous to the security of the United States. It runs absolutely counter to the history of science and technology, whose forward thrust has been both cumulative and accelerative at a pace almost beyond our comprehension.

Just a decade ago, before the advent of the intercontinental ballistic missile, similar thoughts were expressed. There is little evidence that the Soviets have accepted the notion of a "technological plateau." Their research in space, rocketry, and other fields goes forward at a rapid pace. Soviet efforts to develop antimissile systems and spacecraft which may have military uses continue.

Fortunately, the United States, despite the assertions of those who maintain that a technological stalemate exists between the two leading powers, is still committed to the maintenance of its existing military-technological lead over the Soviets. Yet we must reexamine our programs for long-range research in order to assure the effective utilization of our vast capabilities for technological innovation. We must take stock of the technological resources at our disposal in order to determine whether we as a nation are achieving optimum results.

We in Pennsylvania have a major role to play in this vital area. The electronic data processing age had its start at the University of Pennsylvania where the very first computer was designed. In the long run the computer revolution may well have a more dynamic impact on world affairs than even the unleashing of the atom.

We must attempt to pool the technological resources of our European allies with our own. Europe, the birthplace of the Industrial Revolution and the origin of many of the great technological breakthroughs of the 20th century, is still a leading center of scientific research. Closer collaboration in

technology between the United States and its European allies could assure the West technological supremacy in many important fields for generations to come.

The relationship between the power which technology places at our disposal and the values which inform our thought has always posed one of man's most difficult philosophical problems. It is important, especially since the advent of nuclear weapons, to ask ourselves what are the appropriate objectives for which power should be used?

Obviously, basic among our objectives is to insure the survival of this country and its values. But we are not alone. The United States, in the second half of the 20th century, is the guarantor of the security of scores of nations around the globe. In particular, the United States guards the civilization of the Western World.

Basic to an answer to the question of the uses to which power should be put is an understanding of our spiritual and political heritage. Western civilization has enabled men, more than any civilization before it, to give dignity and meaning to individual lives. Respect for the sanctity of human life, the right to an inviolate personal life, and freedom of speech, of conscience, of opinion, of belief, of religion, and association are values which have been most fully developed and practiced in the modern West.

It is in the Western World that the most impressive advances have been made in political institutions, the conditions of everyday life for the masses of the people have been improved, and modern technology has advanced most rapidly. It is the civilization of the West which, through its contact with peoples in other continents, has aroused dormant civilizations and spurred their peoples to a quest for modernization.

The West, not the Communists, has revolutionized the world. It would be tragic indeed if the Communists were to capture revolutions which have their raison d'être in values transmitted from the West to the slumbering societies of the precolonial period.

The task before the United States, therefore, is to restate in terms intelligible to peoples around the world the common ideal of human progress under freedom. The United States, as leader of the free world, should offer mankind a vision more alluring than that of the Communists. The success of the American experiment, the achievements of the modern West, and the universal ideas embodied in Western civilization hold out to all men a vision of a future which the Communists cannot match.

The purpose of our power should be to establish conditions for a peaceful world in which pluralism and diversity can flourish. Only the United States and its allies, not the Communists, can offer such a promise to the rest of mankind. Such is the relationship between power and values in the nuclear age.

If the United States, in the years ahead, is to realize the kind of world in which its own values may flourish and in which there are diverse opportunities for other peoples, several operational premises must guide our thought in the day-to-day process of policy formulation.

First, we must be prepared to persist in our efforts. All too often we Americans react to each international crisis of and by itself, giving little thought to how it fits in with the longer-range problems which confront us. Having identified the major goals and having established our policy priorities, we should be prepared, if necessary, to persist in a given course of action. A policy that is worth pursuing must be pursued with tenacity if it is to contribute to the realization of the kind of world we wish to build over the next decade and in the remaining years of this century.

To shift policy suddenly and unpredictably does little to gain either the trust of our

allies, the confidence of neutrals in our purposes or the respect of our adversaries. Sudden shifts in strategic doctrine and the changing military demands which we have made upon our NATO allies for a variety of purposes, from the building of conventional forces to the creation of a multilateral nuclear force, have tarnished the image of a nation sure of its goals and of the policies necessary to their attainment.

In sum, we must persevere in advancing long-range policies for the achievement of long-range goals.

Second, we must match power with goals. All too often in the past we have committed ourselves to impressive foreign policy objectives, without building the power or making available the resources necessary to assure their attainment. In an effort to achieve a political objective, conflict may sometimes ensue. Where the stakes are great, we must be prepared to commit military capabilities commensurate with the task. Similarly, if we seek to assist new nations in the formidable task of political and economic development, we must commit economic and other capabilities commensurate with the task.

Third, the United States should make a greater effort than it has in the past to relate its economic, political, and military policies to an integrated strategy designed to achieve long-range objectives. All too often we have viewed economic, political, and military policies as separate instruments of statecraft. Each of these policy categories is fraught with complexity. It is difficult enough to acquire a grasp of the wide range of problems and to develop appropriate policies in any one of these categories. Yet it is crucial to the successful operation of foreign policy that policymakers understand how to weld economic, political, and military actions into an organic whole.

Fourth, the United States should seek the maximum consensus wherever possible with its major allies, especially those in Western Europe.

The United States should begin, as a matter of priority, a search for a consensus with its allies on vital issues which affect the West as a whole. From a new spirit of cooperation new machinery for closer consultation on political, military, and economic questions with America's allies could be fashioned. We should press now for a joint examination with our allies for alternative proposals for strengthening the Atlantic Alliance.

The North Atlantic area remains the world's foremost reservoir of industrial, technological and military power. This great port city of Philadelphia along with London, Amsterdam, and Hamburg and the other great cities on the Atlantic and its adjacent seas link together the most dynamic civilization that history has ever known. This core region of Western civilization possesses the resources adequate to the building of a world in which diversity and pluralism can become the heritage of all men. It would be tragic indeed if the potential benefits of the Atlantic Alliance were to be stillborn.

Yet such a tragedy is possible. In 1969, when NATO will reach its 20th anniversary, member nations can give 1 year's notice of withdrawal. Unless some of the thorny issues which now beset the Alliance are resolved, at least some NATO countries may wish to terminate their membership.

Therefore, it is essential that the NATO countries meet to consider needed changes in the alliance before another year passes.

Finally, we must develop a clearer understanding of the linkage between foreign and domestic policy. It has been suggested, in recent months, that we should center more of our efforts upon the many pressing domestic problems confronting us. Some Americans deplore the expenditure of vast sums of money for a trip to the moon while

domestic programs such as the raising of living standards for underprivileged persons and renewal of our urban areas remain uncompleted. There are other major domestic issues, such as civil rights, which rank high on the agenda. But we must establish a sensible relationship between our domestic and foreign tasks. The men who drafted the Constitution placed the goal of providing for the common defense in its very preamble. We must safeguard our Nation in order to have a Nation in which debate and action on internal problems can continue. If we do not remain powerful we may never have the opportunity to resolve domestic problems to the satisfaction of the majority of our citizens. For the foreseeable future we must simultaneously devote ourselves to the problems which press upon us from abroad, while striving to make our country a better place for every citizen. We can do both.

#### CONCLUSION

The tasks which lie before us are worthy of a great nation. We have at our disposal national power of unprecedented dimensions.

We face a determined opponent who has achieved spectacular gains in the last generation. In no small part, the Communists owe their success to the vision of the future which informs their actions.

But we, too, have a vision, the vision projected by the men who in 1776 met here in Philadelphia. It is a vision of freemen capable of governing themselves. The revolution so begun in this city still challenges all mankind in the second half of the 20th century. To its future success we too pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

#### NEGLECTED SEAPOWER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in his column in Newsweek of May 17, Raymond Moley stressed the continuing importance of seapower in various crisis points around the world. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### NEGLECTED SEAPOWER

(By Raymond Moley)

The decision announced by the South Vietnamese Government to use the U.S. Navy in patrolling the coast of South Vietnam is a hopeful sign that the administration is awakening to a far more effective means of dealing with the aggression from North Vietnam and its support from Red China and the Soviet than has been used up to now.

This patrol will be within a defensive sea area. In making the announcement, the South Vietnamese Government claimed the right to inspect ships within 12 nautical miles of the coast and in some instances to act beyond those limits.

This patrol is not only very late in coming, it is far less than the Navy might do in choking off supplies to the enemy.

It has long been evident that bombing supply lines and fighting jungle war is in a sense locking the door after the horse is stolen. Action is needed to cut off supplies before they reach North Vietnam.

On April 12, Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, of Florida, listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names, nationality, and owners of ships which entered the ports of North Vietnam in the latter part of 1964. There were 153 ships which made 201 trips to those ports. They were flying the flags of our supposed friends in the free world. Those of Japan, Great Britain, and Greece were the most numerous. British ships, mostly Hong

Kong based, numbered 36; Japanese, 28; Greek, 19. There were also ships under the flags of Norway, Lebanon, Italy, Panama, and West Germany. Some of the same ships were active in helping Soviet Russia in its intervention in Cuba in 1962.

#### EXERCISE OF RIGHT

Several groups have been urging the State Department to exert pressure on our allies to stop this trade, with little or no result so far.

Our action in the Cuban crisis points to the use of international law to block off the thousands of tons of material that reach North Vietnam by sea. While the action in the Cuban crisis was called a quarantine, it was, in reality, the exercise of a legal right vested in a country with "command" of the sea to stop and turn back vessels carrying contraband to an inimical destination. It was, moreover, an assertion that the cold war brought into action certain provisions of international law hitherto restricted to hot wars.

Rear Adm. John D. Hayes (retired), in a most significant article in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute in May 1964 clearly specifies our right to stop the traffic into North Vietnam. He points out that apparently Americans do not yet see "the inconsistency in training forces for brush-fire wars and counterinsurgency while falling to resort to age-old methods of sea law to capture and condemn in prize court the arms and transporting ships which make such wars possible."

#### THE LAW

Under sea law, the oldest belligerent right is that of contraband. That was invoked in the Cuban crisis. But the other major belligerent right is that of commercial blockade. In the Korean war and during the Cuban crisis, Hayes says, there was a misconception that a commercial blockade means the sinking of neutral ships. "Such ships are not sunk by naval forces for performing non-neutral services; they are captured and condemned in prize courts. The actions of naval officers are thereby reviewed by civilian judges. Nothing parallels this in the laws of war on land."

If we exercised our clear rights, our Navy might well take these traders with North Vietnam into a prize court and, if advisable, both ship and cargo could be confiscated. That would soon take the profit out of this trade with the enemy.

Admiral Hayes concludes: "A new and more flexible U.S. policy is called for to meet these threats. This new doctrine should clarify the concept of freedom of the seas in a cold war. It should also announce that the United States will assume the rights of a belligerent according to sea law and will exercise those rights when necessary \* \* \* we have pledged ourselves to world order under law. But we have failed and are failing to take advantage of the already existing sea law, which, backed by seapower, can be applied today."

#### DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, June 12, as columnist Doris Fleson points out in an excellent offering in today's Washington Star, will mark a milestone in our foreign aid program. For, on that day, David E. Bell will establish a new record for longevity in his position as Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

For many years one of the problems with our foreign aid program was a lack

of stability at the top level. Since Dave Bell took over in 1962, a great deal of improvement has been noted. Miss Fleson makes an important point in her column when she says employees of the controversial Agency have been touched with a happy effect and will celebrate June 12 fervently. Yes, morale among our AID people is improved. So is their work. As one who made an exhaustive study of personnel administration and operations of the Agency for the Committee on Appropriations, I have been impressed with the administration of Dave Bell. His has been both a difficult and delicate job. But it has been well handled. I hope the new longevity record he is about to establish will be extended on into the future, for Dave Bell has proved himself an able administrator in a tough job. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Doris Fleson's column, "Bell Heading for an AID Record," be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### BELL HEADING FOR AN AID RECORD

(By Doris Fleson)

When President Kennedy suddenly handed the controversial foreign aid program to his brilliant budget director, David Bell, in late December 1962, it was widely classified as the most unwelcome Christmas present of the festive season.

Perhaps it was, but by June 12 Bell will pass all previous AID Administrators in length of service. His 2 years, 5 months and 22 days will exceed even the tenure of Paul Hoffman, who directed most of the expenditure of the \$12 billion Marshall plan in non-Communist Europe, starting in 1948.

Hoffman's was an intoxicating privilege. It aimed to restore economic health to Western Europe, and it was brilliantly successful. Not only U.S. allies in World War II but West Germany and Italy made a dazzling recovery and the march of communism in Europe was halted.

Bell took over an aid program mainly devoted to underdeveloped nations, which are also in the midst of a Communist collision and less able to meet it with their own resources in trained men and materials. His is one of those long-term undertakings where spectacular results, much less a quick cure, cannot be expected.

Vietnam, Cuba and now the Dominican Republic have helped to make clear how the Communist threat operates in such surroundings. But the use of foreign aid to give hope of a better life to people being aided militarily to defend their freedom is still the least understood aspect of our foreign policy.

President Johnson thought it prudent this year to send the Congress a proposal for foreign aid of less than \$400 million, one-third of it for military purposes, the rest economic. The congressional committees, which were hearing their first aid administrator testifying before them for 3 years running, have been on the whole kind.

The House recently approved a slightly modified version of the President's proposal without undue tumult. The Senate has one ready to go with action expected in about a week.

The Senate effort initially was clouded by indications from Foreign Relations Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT that he would not manage the bill on the floor. His objections were mainly tactical. He has long wanted military assistance separated

from economic aid, but his move in committee to do this was defeated.

FULBRIGHT consistently supports foreign aid and he has been one of the leading educators on the importance of giving people economic incentives to fight for a peaceful future. Committee members now expect—and hope—that he will change his mind and take charge again.

Unlike virtually all his predecessors, Bell took on the aid chore without political pipelines into Congress. He came to it via work in the aid field in Pakistan, the Littauer School at Harvard and his success in the demanding role of Budget Director.

Members of Congress, no matter what their complaints, rarely quarrel with his careful, patient expositions of his programs. Liberals note with respect that he discusses the Communist aspect without waving the mailed fist.

The net effect he gives is that he is firmly in charge of a program he understands and approves. The happy effect on employees of the controversial agency goes without saying. They will celebrate June 12 fervently.

#### THE FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PEARSON, Mr. President, the lack of railroad freight cars in the United States has reached a point which can no longer be tolerated. There is every indication that this year the freight-car shortage will be worse than in any year in recent peacetime history.

What was once a seasonal problem suffered in the agricultural United States has become a year-round national crisis, with no sign of improvement.

Today's Wall Street Journal contains a front-page article which clearly states the serious problem created by the lack of freight cars. Shippers around the country are shown to be suffering. Plywood mills in the Northwest are closing. Cement manufacturers, sand and gravel producers, fertilizer firms, and steel plants are struggling with the problem of an inadequate supply of freight cars. Some have switched from railroad transportation to other forms of transportation; but many shippers, particularly the shippers of agricultural products, cannot do this.

The wheat harvest will begin this week, in Texas. Shippers there report a serious shortage of cars already, even before the harvest. It can be predicted with certainty that as the harvest moves north into Oklahoma and Kansas, the lack of boxcars will reach historical proportions. When fall arrives, and other crops are harvested, the boxcar shortage will continue to take its toll. After the fall, as merchandisers try to move their inventories for Christmas sales, another group of shippers will suffer. All year round the freight-car shortage takes its toll.

While these commercial losses are serious, and should not be allowed, perhaps more serious is the threat to our national security. The Wall Street Journal article points out that the U.S. Army "recently found itself short of cars needed to ship ammunition destined for Vietnam."

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

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 1, 1965]  
TRANSPORT PINCH: FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE GETS WORSE, FORCES SOME PLANT CUTBACKS—SHARP PICKUP IN CAR BUYING FAILS TO HELP; LUMBER AND GRAIN FIRMS ARE HARD HIT—SHIPPERS FRET ABOUT THE FALL

(By James R. MacDonald)

CHICAGO.—Railroads and shippers are suffering from one of the severest shortages of freight cars ever experienced at this time of year.

Shippers are demanding about 7,500 more cars daily than the railroads can provide. That's more than double the deficit of a year ago and nearly as bad as last fall when the shortage climbed to a post-Korean war record of 10,000 cars. Shippers fear the shortage will get far more critical as the year goes along, particularly this fall when harvesting is in full swing and Christmas merchandise is moving to retailers.

The car shortage already is severe enough to cause some companies to curtail operations and to boost the shipping costs of many others being forced to shift to more expensive types of transportation. The present pinch partly reflects traffic snarls resulting from floods along the Mississippi River and in the Pacific Northwest. But the shortage, in the main, is a consequence of the biggest peacetime business boom in the Nation's history. The railroads simply have been unable—or in some cases unwilling—to add new cars to their fleets at a fast enough pace to meet rising demand from shippers.

#### WOOD MILLS SUFFER MOST

Plywood mills in the Northwest are among the hardest hit by the car drought. At least six mills have been forced to close down in recent weeks for periods ranging from 1 day to a full week because they couldn't get enough freight cars, reports Edmund Hilton, Jr., traffic manager for the American Plywood Association in Tacoma, Wash. "Countless others came so close to having to shut down that getting just one or two cars at the last minute made the difference," he adds.

But complaints are coming from a wide variety of shippers, including cement manufacturers, sand and gravel producers, fertilizer firms, and even the U.S. Army which recently found itself short of cars needed to ship ammunition destined for Vietnam.

"We've had a terrible time getting cars since the first of the year," says Robert Strange, assistant vice president of sales for Truax-Traer Coal Co. He says the company has been forced to close down two of its strip mines for 3 or 4 days a month because of the shortage.

Phillip M. Corby, traffic manager for Evans Grain Co., Salina, Kans., says one day recently he phoned five railroads in an attempt to obtain 175 boxcars to ship grain from the company's 90 elevators in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Colorado. He was unable to turn up a single car.

#### COSTLIER PHONE BILLS

"The amount of money I'm spending on phone calls to scrounge up some cars would capitalize a small bank," laments L. J. Childs, general traffic manager for Massey-Ferguson, Ltd., Toronto farm equipment maker. Even so, he is having only limited success in solving his transport problems. He says a few days ago he asked a railroad serving one of the company's plants for 75 flatcars to ship 150 grain harvesting combines. "They told me their road didn't have that many empty flatcars on their entire system and the best they could do would be to try and get me 25 within 3 or 4 days," he declares. "This really hurts when dealers are on the phone screaming for delivery."

Some farm machinery makers, attempting to rush new equipment to their dealers as the new growing season gets underway, are switching to other forms of transportation, despite often higher costs. J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis., normally divides its shipments about equally between rail and truck. "Lately, because of the shortage of railroad cars, we've been averaging about 75-percent truck and 25-percent rail," James Pavel, Case traffic manager, says. He notes the cost of those shipments shifted to trucks averages 10-percent higher than by rail.

Similarly, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, reports the company has experienced "a substantial increase in our costs because railroad cars haven't been available when we need them." When this happens, Inland is forced to store the steel and costs are boosted because of the extra handling.

#### RAILS SUFFERING, TOO

Railroads, too, have been hurt by the car shortage. Jervis Langdon, Jr., chairman of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, says the severe shortage of freight cars was "the major factor" in the Rock Island's first quarter earnings decline. The road reported a net loss of \$2,711,073 in the quarter ended March 31, compared with a profit of \$753,676 a year earlier.

Robert S. Macfarlane, Northern Pacific Railway president, says thus far in 1965 his road has turned away roughly \$1.5 million worth of freight "because we didn't have enough freight cars. This really hurts because of the risk that much of this business went over to competing trucklines and we may never get it back again."

The shortage will persist through the summer and grow much more severe in the fall, most railroad men and shippers predict. The peak in rail freight movement usually comes when newly harvested crops and Christmas merchandise are both in transit.

"It's already tough and go as to whether I'll be able to meet my daily car requirements," says Peter Vinsavage, traffic manager at the Herrin, Ill., washing machine plant of the Norge division of Borg-Warner Corp. "We use mostly boxcars so we compete directly with the grain industry for cars. If the shortage is bad now, it probably will be much worse at harvest."

Railroads are spending at a record level for new cars to ease the shortage but can't obtain them fast enough to solve the problem. Capital spending by railroads, mostly for new rolling stock, will reach a record \$1.6 billion this year, the Association of American Railroads estimates. This would top last year's expenditures of \$1,417,000,000, the previous record, and would compare with \$1 billion spent in 1963.

This spending stepup, however, has not been enough to stem the long decline in the size of the U.S. rail car fleet. The railroads placed 68,043 new freight cars in service last year, nearly double the 1963 total, yet there were fewer cars at the end of 1964 than at the beginning. Specifically, the fleet at the close of last year included 1,492,000 cars, down from the 1,512,000 total of a year earlier. A high "retirement" rate on old cars too far deteriorated to be worth repairing accounts for the downtrend.

Even with this year's record capital spending, the car fleet probably will continue to shrink, railmen say. But they note that the trend toward fewer cars—while worrisome—isn't as bad as it first might appear. Many of today's new cars are much larger than earlier models. This is demonstrated by the fact that railroads last year handled 659 billion ton-miles of freight, a 60-percent increase from 1925 when the number of rail cars hit a peak of 2,357,000.

But while the newer cars themselves may be larger, they are far more specialized than ever before and can be used by fewer types

of shippers. A good illustration is the rail trilevel auto rack car. While it can haul three or four times as many new cars as the old boxcar, it's pretty much limited to auto traffic. The old boxcar, however, could unload its autos and pick up a return load of grain. It's mostly these older garden variety boxcars that are being retired.

So shippers generally are critical of the fleet's decline and many railroad officials complain about it, too. The critics contend that part of the downturn can be traced to the relatively low rental rates which railroads pay each other for the use of cars moving over their tracks. The rate structure, they say, is such that it's often cheaper to pay the rental on a car than to purchase new ones and so many lines—particularly the financially pressed ones in the East—have resorted to this tactic.

This is still the case, shippers contend, even though a new rate structure calling for rents ranging from \$2.16 a day for cars valued below \$1,000 to \$12.88 for those worth more than \$35,000 was adopted early last year. Before, the daily rental rate was \$2.88 per car regardless of value. Many argue the new rate still isn't high enough to encourage new car building.

Critics are hoping that some help will come from a bill now being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee. The measure would prod railroads to return empty cars to their owners faster by providing for higher rental rates; this, it is believed, would force car-short roads to step up construction of new cars. In brief, the bill would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to set rental rates at a level which would both fairly compensate the owning railroad and insure an adequate national supply of cars.

But at least one shipping group isn't waiting for congressional action on the car shortage. The Southwest Oregon Shipper's Traffic Association, which has 42 lumber, plywood, and particle board mills in its membership, is threatening to boycott railroads that aren't moving to increase the car supply. "We can easily determine which roads are building cars and have our interests in mind," says O. L. Stewart, executive secretary. "For those that are not, we will simply suggest to our members that they route their traffic around those lines if possible."

Mr. Stewart estimates his group accounts for about 60,000 carloads of traffic annually, with each carload worth an average of \$1,000 in freight revenues to the railroads.

#### THE MESS IN VIETNAM: TEACHERS PLEAD WITH A FORMER TEACHER—PART XVI

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, those to whom we in America entrust the education of our youth exercise a function second to none in importance to the future of our Republic, for the strength of our Nation is based on the character and understanding of its future citizens. Our teachers provide that. When teachers as a body take a position on matters vital to the conscience and conduct of our country, their plea deserves respectful attention.

In last Sunday's New York Times appeared an advertisement addressed by over 1,000 teachers in the New York metropolitan area to President Johnson. They urge negotiation in the Vietnam crisis and a cessation of the bombings. They express a wide and steadily growing sentiment. I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### TO OUR PRESIDENT, A FORMER TEACHER:

We are teachers in Metropolitan New York compelled by conscience to speak out against the American involvement in Vietnam.

While we hold differing opinions about the nature and purpose of our role in Vietnam, we are anguished that the might of America is being used to destroy that tragic land; we are horrified by the slaughter of innocents, by the tragic waste of American and Vietnamese lives; we are concerned that the conflict is widening and can only lead to greater horrors and worldwide destruction.

We support your commitment to negotiate this crisis. For the sake of humanity, we implore you to stop the bombings immediately and initiate a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

Ruth Abrahams, Emil Abrams, Murray Abramsky, Clarence L. Adams, Joseph Adams, Henry Addis, Abram Adelson, Leone Adelson, Sandra Adickes, Donna Adler, Florence C. Adler, Freyda Nacque Adler, Arnold Adoff, Barbara Adolf, Claire Alexander, G. Alperin, Rhoda Altman, Matthew Altschuler, Frank Alweis, Jerome Anger, Jack Annunziata, Claire Antell, Clara Antin, E. K. Antonovsky, T. Areson, Carolina Aretsky, Sarah Aron, Sandra Aronson, Leonard Arpel, Gertrude Asher, Dorothy Astopoe, Shirley Auerbach, Frances Bader, Elaine Bakalian, Mitzl Bales, David Balfour, Roy Balfour, Robert H. Balogh, N. Bancheck, Ann Bander, Irving Barash, Sylvia Barnett, Ben Baron, Sara R. Baron, Albert Barracano, Norman Barrish, Muriel Bartel, W. R. Barton, Priscilla Bassett, Herbert Bassow, Alfred Battaglia, Bernice A. Bauer, H. C. Bauer, Ben Bauman, Zaphirah J. Bauman, George Beauchamp, Jr., Irving Bechky, Norma Becker, Paul Becker, Robert Becker, Shula Beckerman, S. Bell, Vivian Belinson, Teodarina Bello, Arnold Belush, Anne Bender, Alice Benjamin, Carl Benjamin, Lillian Bennett.

S. Berger, Terry Berl, Douglas Berman, Norman Berman, Suzanne Berman, Leonard Bernstein, Janet Berntsen, Maurice R. Berube, Diane Betchen, Sandra Biderman, Madeline Bini, Saul Birnbaum, Leonard Blackman, Edward Blaine, Cynthia Blanchard, Efram I. Blank, Emanuel Blank, Ted Blecker, Barbara Blickstein, Samuel Block, Miriam Bloom, Murray Bloom, Dorothy Bloomfield, Gladys Blount, Ellen Blustein, Leonore Boer, W. Bogan, M. Bogursky, Tell Bookpny, B. Bortan, Joseph Botkin, Augusta Bowles, E. C. Boyce, B. L. Braunstein, Maggie Brill, Jack Brodsky, Janet Brof, Joanne B. Brooke, Albert Bronson, Myrna Bronstein, Leonore Brosius, Alice Brown, Harold Brown, Huntley Brown, Leila Brown, Louise J. Brown, Lyle Brown, Robert F. Brown, Sarah Brown, Jacqueline A. Browne, Lois Bryant, Carroll Buchanan, Walter Buchman, David Budbill, Walter Budhis, Judith Bunche, James E. Burton, Maury Buxbaum, Una Buxenbaum, Bernard Cammarata, Jim Campbell.

Shirley Caplan, Janet Carnay, Marian Carpenter, Pauline Carpenter, Thomas Carpenter, Roger Cartwright, Fred Casden, Bette Cassaro, Thelma Catalano, Al Cavicchi, William Chafe, Lionel Chagrin, Evelyn Chalis, Barbara Chamock, Sam Chapman, Hattie F. Charney, T. Charney, Neil A. Chassman, Wendy Chayette, Helen Cherne, Richard Chernick, Merton Chernoff, Elizabeth Chipura, Margaret Christenson, Fred B. Chunow, Lois T. Clapp,

Marie C. Clapper, Doris Clark, Edwin Cobert, Arthur Cohen, Carl Cohen, Denore Cohen, Maxine Cohen, P. Cohen, Rachel Cohen, Rita Cohen, Rosalyn Cohen, Ruth Cohen, Sylvia Cole, Alice E. Coleman, Goldie Colodny, Lionel Comiser, Palma Conlon, Rose A. Connolly, Edna G. Cohnrad, Louise Consiglio, Louis Conte, Clark Cook, Wm. D. Cook, Melissa T. Cooper, Lill Cooper, Renee Cooper, Raymond I. Coppell, E. L. Cornelius, Jan Cott, Rebecca Coven, Eleanor Cox, Mitchell Crespi, Alan Criswell, Morris S. Csgay, Juana Culhane, Ida Cummings, Norman Curtis, Pat Curtis, Anna Cutler, Evelyn Cutler.

Florane Cyrelson, Adeline E. Davia, Doris Davidson, Esther Davin, Nina Davis, S. Davis, W. A. Davis, Jr., Mary B. De Deka, Ririkri De Diego, F. Delatorre, Joseph F. Demas, Rosalind Derman, Regina Dicker, Grace Ditzian, Carl Doerner, Mary A. Doin, Phyllis Dolgin, Irma Doniger, Jeanne Doran, Deborah Douglas, Lenore Downey, James F. Doyle, Mary Jane Dreyer, Ray Dubin, N. Dunetz, Charles Eckstat, Adele Edelman, Eleanor Edelstein, Mildred N. Ehrlich, Sarah Einstein, Marke Eisenman, Charles Eisenberg, Edith Eisenberg, Justine Eisenberg, Selma Eisenstadt, Judith Eisenstein, Michael Elias, R. Elias, Elizabeth Elliot, Bernice Elkin, Simon Ellison, Walter Elovitch, Frieda W. Emil, N. Charles Emil, Gerald Emmet, Rebecca Epstein, Mae B. Erlichman, Muriel Etlinger, Sampson Erogen, Shirley Evans, Ernest Fabitti, Carolyn Fabricant, S. Farhi, Edwin Farrell, Catherine Fearon, Mary Feeley, Walter Feingersh, Lily Feinstein, Alexander Feldman, Francine Feldman, Frances Fenichel, James Fenner, Herman Ferguson, Edith Ferrara.

Beatrice Fields, Anne L. Filardo, Edgar Fink, Louis Fink, Helen R. Finkel, Laurette Finkel, Frank A. Fimmel, Bennett Fisch, Sadie Fischbein, B. W. Fischer, Stanley Fisher, Edward Fishkind, David Fishman, Shirley Fishman, Mildred Flacks, Rosanne Flaum, Shirley Fleming, Deborah Flynn, Gavin Fogarty, Henry Fohr, Ellen Foreman, Leon Forer, Marion Forer, Joseph P. Forman, Ray Frankel, Jerry Freedman, Irene Freeman, Rema Freiberger, Elizabeth Frellicher, Edith Friedman, Eleanor Friedman, Is Friedman, Chet Frilmer, Leo Frisman, Carl S. Fryburg, Morton Fuhr, L. Furst, Margarita Gaines, Jaclyn Gang, Donald F. Garber, Jewel Garill, Frances Garten, Mildred K. Garvin, Clyde Gatlin, Sheila Geist, Judith Gellarie, Lia Gelb, Maxwell Gelender, Sanford Gelernter, Celia Geller, Sid Gershoren, Ruth Gershowitz, Herman Gersten, Lloyd Gertz, J. Ghoneem, Harold Gilbert, Stephen Gilbert, Charles Gimenthal, Marjorie Gill, Beverly Gingold, Elizabeth Gineberg, Morris Glaser, Doris Glass, Rachel Glasser, Joan Godshalk, Jeanette S. Gold, Sylvia Gold, Etta Goldbaum, F. P. Goldberg, Lucy L. Goldberg, Dan Goldfarb, B. Goldhirsch, Grace S. Goldman, S. S. Goldman, David Goldstein, Philip Goldstein, Philip Goldstein, Ruth M. Goldstein, Shirley Goldzweig, Lois Golipsky, Charles Golodner, Laura Goodman, Richard Goodman, Roger B. Goodman, Ruth Goodman, Alice Gorden, Albert F. Gordon, Bernard Gordon, Leo Gordon, Morris Gordon, Norman Gore, Pegi Goreluck, Leah Gorfein, Stanley Gotlin, Betty Gottlieb, David Gottlieb, Ed Gottlieb, Gordon Gottlieb, Leonard Gottlieb, Oscar Gottlieb, Anne Grant, Joel Green, Lesley Greenberg, Paula



Greenberg, Etta Greenfield, Miriam Greenfield, Vivian Greenfield, Arthur W. Greenstone, Janey P. Greif, Mae Greitzer, Arthur Grenberg, Robert Groff, Betty Gross, Harold Gross, M. S. Gross, Carolyn S. Grossman, Milton Grubstein, Lillian K. Grumette, Diana Guadagnino, Ruth E. Guthader, Lawrence Gutman, Matilda Gutman, Helen Gutstein, Norma R. Hairston, Carol Hallinger, Harriet L. Halpern, Judith Halpern, Stephen M. Halpern, Dorothy I. Halprin.

Irving Halprin, Natalie Halprin, John Halvey, Adele Handlers, Aaron Hankin, Ethel Hanauer, Gilman Hanrahan, Louis Harap, Norman Harenstein, Michael Harlow, Rosalie Harmon, Helen Harris, Jay Harris, Joan H. Harris, Louise Harris, Marjorie Harris, Mary W. Harris, W. L. Harris, Delores Harrison, Priscilla Haslett, Freddie M. Houghton, Ethel B. Hauptman, Nora Hauser, Louis Hay, Joyce Haynes, Philip M. Heary, Pauline Hecker, John Helbok, Harry Helfman, Betty Heller, E. R. Heller, Paul Heller, Irene Henken, Edward L. Herbst, Emanuel Herscher, D. Hercules, B. Herman, Erna Herman, Evelyn Herzfeld, K. Herzig, Joseph Heyman, Dorothy Hibbert, Nancy Higgins, Earl C. Hill, Ruby S. Hill, Carol Hiller, Shulamith Hirsch, Frances Hochberg, Sam Hochberg, B. Hoffman, Richard Hoffman, Sarah Hoffman, Eleanor Holden, Joan Holiber, David Honig, Marlene Honsner, William Horn, Norman Horowitz, Rosalyn Horowitz, Donald Horton, Jessica Howard, Joan M. Howard, Lois Howlett.

Clara Hunt, Elizabeth Hunter, Marlene Hymel, Frank Ilichuk, Grace Cohen Ilichuk, Ellen Imberman, William Isaacs, Frieda Isenberg, Belmont Jabin, Stephen Jablonsky, Milton James, Helen Jackson, Carrie Jacobs, Claire Jacobs, J. Jacobs, Bob Jacobson, Eli Jacobson, Harriet Jacobson, Rosalie Jacobson, Roselyn Jacobson, R. Jalowski, Richard Janda, Davis Jeffrey, Wilhelmina Jenkins, Leslie Johnson, Michele Johnson, Bill Jones, Geraldine Jones, Herbert Jurist, Shulamith Justman, David Kabock, Meyer Kadko, Irwin R. Kafka, Alan Kahn, Barry Kahn, Murray Kahn, Rose Kaiser, Michael Kalin, Walter H. Kall, Joyce Kallir, Henry Kamin, Benjamin H. Kaplan, George Kapp, Miriam Kappalman, Ida Karp, Florence Kaslow, Hubert Katz, Paul Kaufman, Edith S. Kavado, Beverly Kelly, Phyllis Kelvin, S. A. Kempler, Walter Kendra, Jessie Keosian, E. M. Kessler, Gladys Kessler, R. Kessler, Louisa Keyes, Sylvia Kimmelman, Allan Kincher, Ronna Kininis, Howard Kirshner, Ed Kissane, Ronnie Klemmas.

Betty Kletter, Blanche Koenigsberg, Alice Kogan, Morton Kogut, Kate Kolchin, Jules Kolodny, Robert Kolodny, Frances Korins, Sara Kornberg, Wilhelmina Kraber, Julius Kramer, P. Kramer Ruth E. Kramer, A. Krause, Elaine E. Krauss, Peter Krauss, Stan Krefetz, Ellen Kregor, Eileen Krieger, Felix Kreitmar, Flore Krigsman, Sy Krinsky, Lillian Kristol, R. Krouse, Matilda Kruger, Aaron Krumbein, Suzanne Kupfer, Bernard Kurtin, Ralph Kurwein, Davina Kurwitz, Ami Kushul, Tom Laidman, Ira Landess, Lawrence Lane, Patricia Lane, Edward Lansky, Priscilla Lapolla, Judith Lakin, June Laufer, Mark Lavis, Ed Lawrence, Ralph Lawrence, Edward Lawrence, Geraldine Laws, Ida Lebow, Saul Lechtine, Charles Lederer, Eva Lederman, Isabella Lee, Jim Lee, Milton Leff, Hadassa Legatt, Martha Lehman, Robert Lehrer, Robert Leicester, Max

Leive, Marion Leonard, Irma Leibow, David Lerner, Francine Lerner, Lea Lerner, Murray Lerner, Arlene Leven, Miriam Levenson, S. Leventhman, Claire Levine, Joan Levine, Morris Levine, Rae Levine, Ree Levine, Shirley Levine, Isabel Le Vita, B. Levy, Betty Levy, David Levy, Frieda Levy, Harriet Levy, Jane Levy, Mark Levy, David Lewin, Minnie Lewin, John L. Lewine, Carol Lewis, Claudia Lewis, Dorothy Lewis, Emanuel Lewis, Gertrude Lewis, Murray Lewis, Sylvia Lewis, T. Liao, Joan Licht, Anita Lieberman, Saul Lieberman, Malvina Liebert, Mildred Liebowitz, Arthur Linder, Nora Linn, Herbert Lipkin, Carol Lieman, Pearl Lipper, Arthur B. Lipsky, Helen Lipton, Henry Lipton, Roslyn Lipton, Adele S. Lithauer, Elsie Rae Litman, Robert Lokin, J. London, Marion London, Sylvia Louis, Sidney Lovett, Vivian Lowell, Eileen Lubin, Linda Lubow, Frances Lucas, Francis D. Lucas, Vincent D. Luciano, A. Ludwig, George Lunn, Edwin Lurzwil, Steve Lyons, Miguel A. Madrid, Morris Mailman, Rudolph Mainelli, Carl Makower, Frances M. Malden, L. Malkin.

John B. Manbeck, Florence Manda, A. Manheimer, Naomi Maning, George Manley, Arlene B. Mann, Irving Mansfield, Edith Keller Marcus, Samuel C. Marenz, Edna Mark, Nathan Marks, Alice K. Marsh, Calvin Martin, Edward Martinson, Rebecca Martz, Esther Marcus, Beth Margolis, Florence Masler, Seymour Masler, Diane Mason, J. Mass, Oscar Mass, Geraldine Massers, Jennie Mastropaolo, Marjorie A. Mathias, Thelma Matican, Anna R. Matlin, Norma Matzkin, Bernice J. May, Steven Mayer, Ben Mazen, Elnora McCarter, Eugene A. McCoy, Roxanne B. McDowell, Polly McMillan, John Meehan, Ron Mehlman, Alice Meisel, Josephine Merolla, Virginia Mells, Marjorie Meyersohn, Thomas Micklow, Alvin Migdal, Charles Miller, Kenna S. Miller, S. Millman, Carmen Miranda, Martin Mirer, Sara Mitchell, Dagoberto Molerio, Albert Montare, W. E. Moore, James Morris, Peter B. Morris, Raye Morris, Selina Morris, Sidney H. Morrison, Michael C. Moross, Sidney Moskowitz, Mary Jane Multer, Carol Muster, James Nach, Sheila Nacht.

Ethel C. Nagel, Susanne Nagel, M. Natelli, Emily Nathan, Raymond Nazer, M. H. Needleman, Lillian Nekritz, Leonora Nelson, Rose Neufeld, Alice M. Newkirk, Carol Newman, Mr. and Mrs. David Newman, M. L. Newman, Renee K. Newman, Sylvia Newman, Ilene A. Nichols, Anna Nieves, Dorothy Noland, Magda North, Marianne Novak, Martin Novemsky, Jerome Novick, Nita Novick, Maxwell Numberg, T. Nunan, Gladys Nussenbaum, J. P. Ollicker, Oscar Olshansky, John O'Neill, Dorothy Orland, Jeanne Ostriker, Esther Ostroff, Lynn Ostrow, N. L. Ovanin, Joseph Paladino, Frances Panitz, Gloria Paoletta, Marsha Pargman, Helen Parker, Myrtle E. Parker, Barbara Patricola, Saul Pavlow, G. Pearlman, Natalie Pearlstein, Jules A. Peemoeller, Gladiola Peerman, Fill Peltz, M. Penn, Shirley Pentel, Theresa B. Perl, Joseph Perez, Edith Perlman, Joyce Perlman, Maxwell Perlman, S. Perlman, Steven Parris, Barry Pessin, Juanita Peters, Marjorie Peterson, Elsie Pickus, Sidney Pilatsky, Rudolph Pinataro, Laurence Pissner.

Paul Pitluk, Berenice Pliskin, William L. Plummer, Bess Polin, Nancy Polin, Janet Pollack, Lila Pollack, R. Pollak, Henry Pallet, Naomi Pommer, Robert Porterfield, Estelle Posner, Susan Powers, Isadore Powsner, Lucy B. Poyer, Bernice Prendergast, Nan Prener, Ann

Price, Martin Price, Herminia Prieto, Burke Probitsky, Minnie Proctor, John Quinlan, Ellen Rabin, Elizabeth Rabinowitz, G. Radford, Herbert Rahinsky, Marte Ramirez, Sam Lewis Rand, Lawrence Raphael, Shelley Rapp, Doreen Rappaport, I. Rappaport, Shirley Rappaport, Ethel Ratner, Mary Rayburn, Miriam Rayburn, Arthur Razzino, Millie Rachany, Robert Redka, Stephen Reines, Bonnie Reismar, Richard Relyea, Edward Remain, Bernard Reznick, Bertha Rhodes, Julie Rice, Sheila Rice, Sylvia Richman, E. C. Ricken, Eleanor Riklin, Jeanne Ritter, Reuben Rivlin, Rosalie Rivlin, Joseph Rizik, Bernard Roberts, Celia Robinson, Earl Robinson, Jeanne Robinson, S. Robinson, Ella Root, Michael Rosa, J. H. Rosandy.

Gertrude E. Rose, Albert Rosen, Marion Rosen, Miki Rosen, Natalie Rosen, Phyllis Rosen, Sandra Rosen, Eugene Rosenbaum, Rochelle Rosenbaum, Doris Rosenberg, Sylvia Rosenberg, William Rosenberg, Arlene Rosenblatt, D. J. Rosenblum, A. Rosenberg, Erwin Rosenfeld, Riva Rosenfield, Rose Rosenfield, Daniel Rosenstein, Emily Rosenthal, Irving Rosenwasser, Pearl Rosner, Arthur Ross, Lesley Ross, Naomi Rossabi, Martin Rosoff, Madeline Rostker, Pearl Rostov, Carol Roter, Alice Roth, Gladys Roth, Jacob Rothband, David Rothchild, Gussie Rothman, Henry L. Royston, Barbara Lee Rubin, Helen Vogatch Rubin, Morris Rubin, Richard Rubin, Anne Rubenstein, Helen Rugowin, Marianne Russo, Sean Ryder, Morris Sabbeth, Priscilla Sabbeth, F. Sabin, Betty Sacco, Sylvia Saffro, Jerry Safner, Jeane Salamy, M. Salant, Frances Saldinger, Alfred A. Salesky, Lee Saltzman, Morris Salz, Naomi Salz, Jessie Salzman, L. Salwen, Rhea Samaras, Esther A. Samson, Linda Samuels, Judith Sanderoff, David Sanders, O. Sanderoff.

Susan Sandler, I. Santo, Joseph D. Sapienza, Joseph Saspro, Audrey L. Satlin, M. Schachter, Phyllis Schaefer, Beatrice Schaeffer, Virginia Schattle, Charles Scheckner, Irwin Schechter, Samuel Scherek, Florence Scherer, Toni Schiffer, Anne Schiller, Samuel Schindelheim, Lyvia Schlaefer, Berenice Schlakman, Irving Schlein, Bert Schlesing, Charlotte Schlossberg, Steven Schrader, Edith Schrank, Evelyn Schroeder, G. Schulboe, Blanche Schulslaper, Blanche Schundelman, Roy Schunurkopf, Benediceta Schwager, Gloria Schwartz, S. Schwartz, Sol Schwartz, Sarah Schwartz, T. Schwartzbarth, Grace Schwartzman, R. Y. Scott, John Anthony Scott, Maria Scott, Luther W. Seabrook, William H. See, Julian L. Seid, Ruth Selden, Howard Sertan, Lane Serota, Barbara Sewell, David Shaine, Alex Shames, M. R. Shamroy, Sheila Shankman, Jack P. Shapira, Adele Shapiro, Ida Shapiro, Leo Shapiro, Louis Shapiro, Sidney Shapiro, Sidney Shapiro, Florence S. Shaw, Laura Shaw, Pearl Sheltz, Barbara Shepetin, Bella Sherman, Ira Sherman, C. Shimek, Margery Shine, Flora Shore, Sylvia F. Shows, Mildred Sickles, Harvey Siegel, Edward Siegel, Marian Siegel, A. I. Sigal, Charles Sigmund, Donald M. Silber, H. Sillekens, Anita Silver, Myra Silver, Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Silverman, Myron Silverman, Abraham Singer, Barbara Singer, Gertrude Singer, J. Singer, Ann Sirotof, Linda Sklarow, Martha Skulsky, Helene S. Slater, Karen Slavin, Sarah Slotkins, Roslyn Small, Vilet Small, Bernice Smart, Alvin Smith, Betty Smith, Esther Smith,

Geraldine Smith, Irene Smith, Lawrence Smith, Lucille Smith, Sylvia Smith, Jean Smolar, Helen W. H. Snitton, Mildred Snow, Sylvia Sokolow, Henry Solganik, Sidney Solomon, Jacqueline Spears, Lester Speiser, Vivian Speiser, Matthew Spetter, Madelon Spier, Blanche Solomon, Rebecca L. Soyer, Jerry Spitz, Susan Spitz, Richard Springer, J. Spoerri, Lillian Stahl, Elizabeth Starcevic, Alan L. Stein, Lillian D. Stern, Philip Stern, Frances Sternberg, Simon Stanislow, Eva Starfield, Martin Starfield, Ralph Stein.

Nancy Steinberg, Evelyn M. Stimmel, Fred Storfer, Dorothy Stoneman, Martha Stodt, Barbara Straussman, Joseph B. Strum, Kieve Stubenhaus, Norman Stuber, Isabelle Suhl, George Sundel, Nicholas Surdo, Armas Suvanto, Frieda Sverdlow, N. Talbot, Irving Talmuke, Norma Tasman, Russel Tauber, Beatrice Teitel, Lloyd Temes, Harry Tenenberg, Mildred Tenenbaum, Frances Tepper, B. Terry, Mae Terry, Carole Thell, Rachel Tholfsen, F. Thorpe, P. Tholfsen, Lary Titelman, Aaron Toder, Saul Toder, Ellnor Tolbert, Aaron Traister, Susan Traub, Ruth Traub, Shirley Trapido, Abraham Tretin, Rosemarie Trimboli, A. Tucker, Kathleen Tucker, Lynette V. Tucker, Adele Tulman, Muriel Turner, Mark Uebelman, Jo Ubogy, Elizabeth Urani, Milton Underman, Semah Unterman, Gayle Veeder, Dora J. Vernt, Gwen Vetter, Theresa Vigo, Thomas Waber, Carol Wagner, Leo Wagner, Thomas E. Wahn, Gertrude Waldeyer, Gabriel Waldman, Ellis Wallach, Lillian Wallach, Lottie Wallach, William Walters, L. Waltznia, Violet Ward.

Carl V. Warren, Michael Warman, L. G. Watkins, Ernest Waxman, Bernice Webb, Ray Wechsle, Roberta Wedeen, Suzanne Weidberg, Hazel C. Weill, Herschel Weinstat, Irving Weinstein, Suzanne Weinseln, Henry Weinstock, Bernard Weintraub, Joshua Wiesen, Adele F. Weiss, Blanche Weiss, Malvina R. Weiss, Nancy Weiss, Norman Well, Fromma Wellman, Marilyn Weidfeur, Margaret Werthman, Edna Wetler, Evelyn Wexler, Clementene Wheeler, Joel White, Charlene Whittaker, Harvey Widell, Polly Widerman, Hilda Wigder, Natalie Wigler, Jerome Wilkins, Ed Williams, Miriam Wills, Geraldine Wilson, R. Wirtz, R. Witre, Susan Witner, Joseph Wohl, Jerry Wolf, Lois C. Wolf, Miriam Wolf, Helen Wong, Mable S. Wood, Elaine Woodburna, Mildred Woogen, Barbara Wortman, Rosa Wrinfriick, Frances Wunder, Lionel M. Yard, Shirley Yasner, Ann Youdovin, J. Zaddin, Stanley Zelman, Allen Zelon, Stan Zibulsky, Julius Zieger, Eva Ziesk, Alex Zimmerman, Marsha Zimmerman, Frances Zippin, Helen Zirilstein, Esther Zlatchin, J. Zoffin, R. Zucker, Lester Zwicker.

For additional information, contact Teachers Committee for Peace in Vietnam, cochairmen: Sandra Adickes, Norma Becker, 520 East 12th Street, New York, N.Y., 10009.

#### A GOVERNMENT OF MEN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I predicted in this Chamber a year ago that the real meat ax in the 1964 Civil Rights Act was title VI, which enables officials in Washington to determine what constitutes discrimination in any program or facility receiving Federal assistance.

I expressed the opinion then that if the 1964 bill became law it would change the

kind of government the people of Virginia have known, and the kind of government that had its origin at Jamestown in 1618.

I said that under title VI every little bureaucrat could say, "This is my rule on discrimination." Supporters of the bill disagreed with me, pointing out that the President would have to approve all of the rules and regulations.

But, regardless of who makes or approves the regulations, Virginians have found out recently how far reaching title VI is in its application.

For example, the doctors and hospital officials of Virginia and adjoining Southern States were told recently by an official of the Public Health Service how completely they must integrate any hospital receiving Federal funds.

In a separate development, the Augusta County Board of Supervisors recently found it necessary to seek the advice of members of the Virginia congressional delegation in clearing up what they regard as ambiguities in some of the pledges they are being asked by State and Federal officials to sign.

One of the questions raised by the county supervisors was whether they should be required by the State to sign an agreement relating to the use of certain Federal funds for educational purposes which are expended by local school boards. The county supervisors argued that they have been asked by the State to execute an agreement concerning which they would not have full responsibility for compliance.

The county supervisors also contended the wording of the agreement was not clear as to whether it imposed personal liability for compliance on the individual signing it on behalf of the board of supervisors.

A second question raised by the Augusta County Board of Supervisors relates to the renting of office space in county facilities to various Federal agencies, such as the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

I am informed that the county entered into a compliance type of agreement covering such rented space indicating that they do not engage in discriminatory practices. But the supervisors are objecting to additional provisions being placed in the lease in regard to damages in the event of a breach of the compliance agreement.

In regard to hospitals, I have just received a copy of a paper prepared by Assistant Surgeon General Harald M. Graning, chief of the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Public Health Service, in which he outlined to officials of the Carolinas-Virginias Hospital Conference what they must do under title VI of last year's law if they receive any Federal aid funds.

The Public Health official gave the following as examples of some of the questions "you may find useful in examining the facilities with which you are associated":

Are patients admitted without consideration of any factor pertaining to race, color, or national origin?

Are the same entrances, admission offices, waiting rooms and other general service fa-

cilities available to and used by Negro and other patients?

Are patient room assignments made without regard to race, color, or national origin?

Are patients assigned to semiprivate four-bed bedrooms and wards without regard to race, color or national origin of the other patients?

Are all services and facilities available to patients without regard to race, color or national origin?

Are dining spaces and cafeterias available to and used by patients, staff, trainees, and employees without discrimination?

Are all clinics, emergency, and outpatient services available to and used by Negroes and other outpatients?

Are professional qualifications and character the only criteria applied in granting or denying staff privileges?

Do Negro physicians having staff privileges serve on a rotation basis in clinics and emergency and outpatient departments on the same basis as other physicians?

Are trainees, interns, or other trainees assigned to service with patients without regard to their race, color or national origin?

These are only some of the questions which should be asked. As you can readily see from this sampling, every effort should be made to comply with both the spirit and letter of the law.

Mr. President, if these are only "some of the questions" which should be asked, it is difficult to imagine any that were left out.

These recent developments indicate I was not exaggerating when I spoke last year about what would happen under title VI.

#### RETENTION OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have recently received communications from two important chambers of commerce in my State. Both express support for retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. I fully agree with the views expressed by these chambers. In order that other Senators may be advised of the depth of Texas feeling on this subject, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Athens chamber and a newsletter from the Lamar County chamber.

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

ATHENS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Athens, Tex., May 25, 1965.

Senator JOHN TOWER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TOWER: The Board of Directors of the Athens Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record opposing any change in section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We object to any proposals that will either delete this section from the act or to any change that will destroy its effectiveness.

It is our feeling that this section adds materially to the freedom of choice by American working men and women. We do not believe that membership in any organization should be a requirement in getting a job just as we do not believe that membership in a chamber of commerce should be a requirement for operating a business.

We respectfully bring this to your attention and ask that you oppose any changes in this section.

Very sincerely,

LINDEN R. LEWIS,  
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF  
LAMAR COUNTY,  
Paris, Tex., May 1965.

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would eliminate the right-to-work law in Texas, and force any man or woman getting a job with a business in which employees are represented by a union, to join the union and pay the initiation fees and dues; or to look for work somewhere else. Under the existing law he has the choice to join or not join and his job cannot be taken from him because of his decision.

How can unions give service to members when their membership is compulsory, and there will be no need to prove that they can serve the people?

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act could lessen the desire of large firms to locate in Lamar County or Texas because the right-to-work law makes for better working conditions.

Repeal of section 14(b) is contrary to section 703(a) of the Civil Rights Act which states that you cannot have unlawful employment practices that discriminate against any individual with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Irving News Texan recently published a strong and reasonable editorial advocating retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. This editorial has been called to my attention by a number of distinguished Texans, including Mr. Phillip Reid, chairman, of the board and president of the Irving Bank & Trust Co.

In order that other Senators may share the views expressed by the News Texan, I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

PRESIDENT IS PAYING ONLY LIPSERVICE TO  
FREEDOM IF SECTION 14(b) IS REPEALED

A great deal of lipservice is paid to freedom by the present administration. But President Johnson's recent declaration favoring the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law certainly should make voters wonder just who all this freedom is for.

Apparently, it is for those groups and organizations which make the most monetary contributions to campaign funds.

Repeal of section 14(b) would write off the books the right-to-work laws of 19 States, including Texas. But even more unjust, it would force into labor unions thousands of workers who do not desire membership. It, in essence, gives American workers the choice of either going union or not working at all.

The public has given President Johnson strong support in committing this country's Armed Forces to the preservation of freedom throughout the world. But here at home, the President evidently gives a different definition to the word freedom.

Compulsory "anything" is not a cornerstone for strength. It is a license for abuse.

Just how strongly the President feels about the abolishment of the right-to-work section in the Taft-Hartley law is really not known. He made only passing reference to it in Tuesday's labor message to Congress. However, the "Johnson treatment" of Congressmen does not always involve loud public proclamations. What the President is doing behind the scenes is much more important.

The reason behind the request for repeal, of course, is the Democratic Party's obligation to labor for support in the past national election. It is the shame that a political party must tamper with the freedom of thousands of American workers just to remain in power. But this is what is happening.

One union publication recently referred to the retention of section 14(b) as "com-

pulsory open shop." This is like saying the compulsory right to vote or the compulsory right to bear arms or the compulsory freedom of religion. Even under the hated section, anytime a worker gets tired of non-unionism he may join a union.

Compulsory unionism relieves labor leaders of the responsibility of making their unions and the union benefits attractive. Under compulsory unionism, the worker is not guaranteed anything in return for his union dues. He is only guaranteed that there will be union dues. In short, compulsory unionism destroys the incentive of labor leaders.

Also it must be recalled that given the conditions of a closed shop, it is easier to maintain the coercive discipline on which militant unions depend in time of strikes.

Trade unions have been a dynamic force in the development of the United States. During the early days of the industrial revolution, unions did cure many inflicted labor wounds by management. But in recent years, the main function of unions has been to push the wage-price spiral further upward. Since businessmen cannot combine forces like unions, there would be nothing to stop labor leaders from accelerating the spiral, and with it, inflation, under closed shops.

The arguments against compulsory unionism are many, but one may be considered basic. And this argument is the cornerstone to our entire society. Is this to be a truly free country, or must a man under duress, need a union card to earn a living and support a family?

If President Johnson and the Democrats intend to pursue the repeal of section 14(b), then let them do it under some label other than "liberalism." It is pure and simple tyranny.

Mr. President, I have received a most important letter from the employees of the Roy Klossner Co., of San Antonio. In it they most emphatically support retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

I am in full agreement with them, and in order that other Senators may be advised of the urgency with which concerned Texans view this matter, I ask that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE ROY KLOSSNER CO.,  
San Antonio, Tex., May 21, 1965.

HON. JOHN TOWER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We urgently recommend that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act remain as it now stands.

We as employees of the Roy Klossner Co. feel that the repeal of this act would take away one of our precious liberties. Anything that you can do to help retain this law will certainly be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

THE EMPLOYEES OF THE ROY  
KLOSSNER CO.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE  
TREASURY ENTITLED "UTILIZATION  
OF U.S. GOVERNMENT FOREIGN  
CURRENCY BALANCES"

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, entitled "Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances."

The report is in response to an inquiry I made on March 1, 1965, as to whether,

in view of the U.S. balance of payments and outflow of gold problem, it would be useful to review the treaties, contracts and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies.

The inquiry was made to the Secretaries of Treasury and State, and a copy was sent to the President. The Treasury report, received under a letter dated May 27, 1965, is self-explanatory.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report and the preliminary correspondence published as part of these remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report "Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances" supplements the material provided by the Secretary of the Treasury in his letter to you on March 12. It was prepared in cooperation with the Departments of State-AID, Defense, Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget.

You will note that the actions underway are not in terms of final accomplishment but rather involve continued search at all levels for further progress.

I know that you will welcome the efforts to effectively use our foreign currency balances to benefit our international payments position in ways which will not involve an adverse withdrawal of resources from countries in whose economic development we have a great interest and to which we extend foreign assistance.

I deeply appreciate your concern and value most highly your active cooperation in our efforts to further strengthen our international payments position.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

UTILIZATION OF U.S. GOVERNMENT FOREIGN  
CURRENCY BALANCES  
NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

How can our foreign currency balances be used to provide additional benefit to our balance of payments?

On December 31, 1964, the U.S. Government owned the equivalent of \$2,937 million in foreign currencies. Of this total, \$1,556 million is committed under our foreign aid program for use by the aid recipient countries for economic development and for the common defense. The balance, \$1,381 million, is designated for U.S. Government use; and, of this balance, \$1,239 million is in the currencies of the eight so-called excess currency countries: Burma, Guinea, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia. This concentration of \$1,239 million of excess currencies is further accentuated by the fact that 85 percent of it is held in three of these countries—India, Pakistan, and Poland. In contrast to our expenditures in the Western European countries, which greatly exceed our supply of their currencies, it is in the eight countries listed above that our balances are in excess of the normal operating expenditures of the Government.

These foreign currency balances have accrued primarily under our food-for-peace program and have increased in total as the program has continued over the years. Sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 contribute substantially to the total U.S. overseas aid effort which, in turn, is designed to strengthen the economies of recipient countries and hasten the day when

they can finance their import requirements on commercial terms. Meanwhile, sales are made for payment in foreign currency to countries which cannot pay for their needed food requirements in dollars. Most of these countries are recipients of dollar assistance.

#### OBJECTIVES OF UTILIZATION OF LOCAL CURRENCY

The essential problem we face is one of finding means by which to utilize the foreign currencies we own so as to further save overseas expenditures in dollars, strengthen the economic position of aid recipients, harmonize usage of the currencies with other U.S. aid programs and advance our foreign policy objectives.

Basic to consideration of the problem of increased U.S. use of foreign currencies is the fact that under the food-for-peace program the United States utilizes the foreign currency proceeds by agreement with the country whose currency is involved. Against this background our reexamination shows that although some further progress is possible it will be modest even with modification of both existing U.S. legal requirements governing certain types of expenditures and our agreements with other countries. The economic position of the developing countries is not strong or rich enough to warrant their agreement to extensive use of U.S. holdings of their currencies in ways which would deprive them of foreign exchange receipts or affect stability of their economies.

The direct and immediate benefit to our balance of payments of use of foreign currencies received under food for peace and other aid programs has amounted to more than \$2.5 billion over the past 10 years; such savings amounted to about \$300 million in fiscal year 1964. However, recognizing the importance of increasing this balance-of-payments benefit wherever feasible, the major categories of U.S. use of its foreign currency holdings have been reexamined.

#### UTILIZATION FOR OFFICIAL U.S. GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

The operating expenses of all U.S. missions abroad as a matter of policy are being paid in U.S.-owned foreign currency wherever such currency is available. All exceptions to this policy are being reviewed to determine whether or not they are still justified and whether satisfactory alternative arrangements can be made. A notable exception to this policy is in the payment of quarters and other statutory allowances for military personnel which under U.S. law must be paid in dollars even though in some countries the United States has an ample supply of foreign currency.

Current U.S. Government regulations require that payment for official travel and transportation be made with excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies whenever such currencies are available for such purposes, even when only a brief stopover in an excess currency country is involved. While we have been successful in including a provision for such travel and transportation payments in many agreements, some difficulties have arisen with respect to the burden imposed on the foreign country's foreign exchange position by the subsequent conversion for U.S. airlines of these payments into U.S. dollars.

#### UTILIZATION FOR PROCUREMENT

U.S. procurement abroad financed with U.S. foreign currency holdings is being expanded. Government-owned furnished housing acquired with foreign currency is being increased so as to save the cost of transporting household effects of U.S. Government civilian personnel stationed abroad. Also, Department of Defense nonappropriated fund activities, including post exchange and service stores, have made substantial use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies for the purchase of goods and merchandise for resale for dollars through their outlets. Efforts are being made to identify exports of goods and

services that could be purchased with U.S.-owned foreign currency at competitive prices and without creating a foreign exchange loss or inflationary pressure in the exporting country which would prejudice the achievement of other important U.S. foreign policy objectives. Such exports are being sought not only for U.S. use in third countries but also for use as U.S. financed aid to third countries. For example, allocations of U.S.-held Indian rupees for use in the AID program in Nepal totaled \$41 million from 1960 through 1964.

One problem which we are seeking to resolve is that of expanding official procurement in excess currency countries with benefit to the U.S. balance of payments and without excessive cost in relation to available dollar appropriations. An AID group has recently visited several of the excess currency countries to explore the possibilities of procurement there for AID programs in third countries. As a result, plans are being made for such procurement in Israel and Pakistan, and negotiations are in process to arrange for it in several other countries.

In most of these inconvertible currency areas where we hold excess currencies, there are opportunities for some increased procurement, but only at higher cost to the agency's appropriation. Under current established policy requiring acceptance of the lowest competitive bid, awards usually go to the hard currency countries, primarily because the prices in those countries are more attractive when converted into dollars than are those in the soft currency areas.

It is anticipated that greater uses of U.S.-owned foreign currencies can be found if the Congress authorizes the use of foreign currencies without charge to appropriated funds as requested in the President's 1966 budget proposals. Under this plan it is proposed that the President be authorized to spend, for additional special activities of authorized programs, up to 5 percent of each excess foreign currency. This experimental proposal would promote for all activities increased uses of these currencies in addition to the programs which are financed from special foreign currency program appropriations, and could in particular provide an incentive toward offshore procurement with benefit to the U.S. balance of payments.

#### USES BY U.S. TOURISTS AND BUSINESSMEN

In future guidance to businessmen on the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program, the Commerce Department will point out the availability of certain U.S.-owned foreign currencies for use in lieu of dollars either through purchase or through Cooley loans. Sales of local currency for business purposes are being made in Israel and India, while sales to tourists are in effect in Israel, India, and the United Arab Republic. To extend the potential effectiveness of the program of sales of U.S.-owned foreign currencies in those countries where agreements to do so exist, the Secretary of the Treasury is revising the present criteria for determining which currencies are available for sale to U.S. citizens under section 104 (s) or (t) of Public Law 480 so that additional amounts will become available. Sections 104(s) and 104(t) have been included in all title I Public Law 480 agreements since section 104(t) was added to the Public Law 480 legislation last October and are being included in all new title I agreements.

#### UTILIZATION OF COOLEY LOAN FUNDS

AID, which is responsible for the management of Cooley funds, has established a "Businessmen's Information Center" to get information on the Cooley loan program to American business firms. It also issues periodic press releases listing the countries where Cooley funds are available.

As of February 28, some 287 loans had been made and 69 percent of the funds presently allocated for this purpose have been

lent. The rate of usage of Cooley loan funds varies from region to region on the basis of U.S. investor interest. In the Latin American region 90 percent of the funds allocated for Cooley loans had been lent as of February 28.

AID is examining its policies and procedures with respect to Cooley loans to see how they can be simplified and expedited, especially as regards applications covering expenditures abroad which U.S. companies originally planned to make in dollars out of their own resources.

Moreover, in order to obtain an immediate balance-of-payments benefit from foreign currency balances held for Cooley loan purposes for which there is no prospect of early utilization, approaches are being made to the various foreign countries concerned to obtain their agreement to including Cooley balances in those covered by the "unfunding procedure" authorized by the last session of the U.S. Congress. By the unfunding procedure, foreign currency balances formerly restricted for particular uses are unrestricted and made available for expenditure without affecting in any way the programs or obligations for which the funds were originally earmarked. This unfunding will increase the amount of foreign currency available for immediate use for U.S. operating expenses and will thus reduce U.S. dollar expenditures in the nonexcess currency countries.

#### UTILIZATION OF OTHER COUNTRY USE FUNDS

A careful check has been made of the status of other undisbursed "country use" Public Law 480 proceeds (104(g) loan funds). This indicated that with few exceptions such balances have been committed under the terms of the agreements for agreed project purposes. These projects are the outcome of intensive bilateral planning and often have required legislative action. It would, therefore, be inappropriate and impractical to try to revise the agreements to switch these country use proceeds to U.S. use. Efforts are underway where possible to unfund those country use balances which are not expected to be disbursed in the near future.

#### PRESENT STATUS OF RESTRICTED U.S. USE BALANCES

All formerly restricted U.S. use foreign currency balances being held for specific purposes were unfunded as of March 31, except for \$27.4 million, of which \$25 million in Japanese yen was acquired under the GARIOA settlement (not related to Public Law 480) and is committed by special agreement for cultural and educational purposes in Japan. It is on deposit in American banks in Japan and in Japanese banks at 5½ percent interest, providing earnings of \$1,375,000 annually, which will be used for regular U.S. operating expenses in Japan. The annual cultural program will be covered out of the principal. Unfunding U.S.-use foreign currency accounts in calendar 1964 saved our balance of payments about \$105.2 million.

#### HIGHER U.S. USE PERCENTAGES AND CONVERSIONS

During the last year the percentage of Public Law 480 sales proceeds for "U.S. uses" has generally been increased except in the agreements with the excess currency countries and special cases such as Vietnam where other factors are involved. Over the past year there have been numerous instances of 30 to 35 percent for U.S. use, and two agreements provided for 50 percent U.S. use. The present policy is to increase this percentage within overall U.S. foreign policy objectives wherever it will benefit the U.S. balance of payments. Although there is a limit to the extent to which the terms for Public Law 480 title I sales can be hardened without jeopardizing potential sales, in some countries it has been possible to obtain agree-

ment to the conversion of a portion of the Public Law 480 sales proceeds into other currencies. Efforts will be continued to increase the magnitude and scope of these conversions and to require the payment of interest on sales proceeds held in U.S. accounts where possible.

#### TITLE IV PROGRAMS

Title IV sales of surplus agricultural commodities are made for dollar repayment and are, therefore, a direct benefit to our balance of payments. It is the purpose of title IV, Public Law 480, to stimulate and increase the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for dollars and to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist the economic development of friendly nations. In recognition of this, most sales agreements provide that the local currency proceeds of the sale of title IV commodities within the country will be used for economic and social development programs as agreed upon by the United States and the borrowing government.

The financing of local costs is highly important in many AID programs. To the extent that title IV local currency can be used in lieu of currency generated through AID dollar expenditures in financing such programs there is a potential beneficial effect upon the U.S. balance of payments. Such additional balance-of-payments benefits are, of course, limited since AID is already employing devices which assure that virtually all of the dollars used to generate local currency are spent to finance exports from the United States. However, AID is continuously studying the more systematic treatment of title IV local currency and it is possible that as a result of this effort the beneficial effects of title IV upon the U.S. balance of payments may be enhanced.

An important additional factor with regard to title IV programs has been the recent emphasis given to larger initial payments under the program. Since the beginning of the current fiscal year 6 of the 14 government-to-government title IV agreements signed provided for larger initial payments amounting to 20 to 25 percent of the value of the agreement. This trend toward larger initial payments will continue to be emphasized under title IV programs.

#### CONCLUSION

Our reexamination reveals that while some further tightening up of food-for-peace terms and provision for increased U.S. utilization of foreign currencies is possible, the resulting increase in U.S. balance-of-payments benefit is likely to be modest. Determined effort has already exhausted most of the possible means of using the currencies to that end. This stems from the fact that U.S. requirements are small in most of the areas in which excess currencies are held.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The correspondence relative to the advisability, in view of the U.S. balance of payments and gold situation, of reexamining the treaties, contracts, and arrangements under which the United States owns, generates, and uses foreign currencies follows:

MARCH 1, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
*President of the United States.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please find enclosed a self-explanatory letter relative to the balance of payments and outflow of gold, which I have sent today to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury. Copies of these letters are forwarded to you for your information.

With warmest personal regards and my very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

MARCH 1, 1965.

HON. DEAN RUSK,  
*Secretary of State,*  
and

HON. DOUGLAS DILLON,  
*Secretary of the Treasury.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You know of my long-standing and continuing concern over our balance-of-payments deficits and the outflow of our gold.

If it has not been done, would it serve a worthwhile purpose to review all of the treaties, contracts, and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies with a view to renegotiation for more constructive use under current circumstances?

It is not my intention here to be critical of earlier policies which were involved. The fact is that conditions have changed, and if it would help, renegotiation may be justified and acceptable.

You have my very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
March 3, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for sending me copies of your letters of March 1 to Secretary Rusk and Secretary Dillon suggesting that consideration be given to the advisability and usefulness of renegotiating treaties, contracts, and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies as a means of lessening the balance-of-payments deficit.

I appreciate your thoughtful suggestion and assure you that it will be thoroughly explored.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
March 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: This is a further answer to your good letter of March 1 about foreign currencies. I want you to know that I have personally ordered an intensive reexamination of the agreements under which we carry out the Public Law 480 programs, the source of most of the money. I am determined that we shall make the best possible use of these funds.

We have already made some progress. The agreements negotiated during the past year, mostly involving currencies not in excess supply, provide for a general increase in the share reserved for U.S. use. Further, some of the money will be available for sale to American tourists and nonprofit institutions. Since 1960 annual U.S. expenditure of local currency has risen by \$100 million, to \$333 million in fiscal year 1964.

As you know, however, a good part of this money consists of the currency of poor countries, desperately short of the resources they need to get their own economies growing. India and Pakistan are the most important examples. We have an important stake in their security and development. When we demand payment from them in dollars, or spend our holdings of their currency in lieu of dollars, we take away with one hand resources we give them with the other, through our assistance programs.

By selling developing countries our farm products for local currency, we provide essential support for their development efforts. They simply could not afford to buy these goods on commercial terms without stunting their growth.

Another significant part of our balances is in Polish currency. All of this is already subject to conversion and repayment in dollars on a fixed time schedule.

On the other hand, and as suggested in your letter, there may well be situations where it would be possible to improve our arrangements. I intend to find those situations and act accordingly.

In sum, we must continue both to make dollar savings and to use our agricultural abundance to advance our interests in the developing world.

During the early part of next week you will be receiving a more detailed report about the overall foreign currency situation from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

MARCH 10, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
*President of the United States.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for your response to my letter of March 1 relative to the advisability, in view of our balance-of-payments situation, of reexamining the treaties, contracts and arrangements under which the United States owns, generates and uses foreign currencies. May I commend you for the promptness of your action, and express my appreciation for it?

I know you have shared our concern over the continuing deficits in our balance of payments and withdrawal of our gold since these developments first came under examination by the Finance Committee in 1957.

This is a deep and serious problem. Turning the use of currencies in our accounts abroad into more positive effect on our balance in itself, of course, would not solve the problem. But if it is feasible it would be a needed step in the right direction which would be beneficial to both the United States and friendly nations.

Your reference to currencies generated under Public Law 480, for example, brings to mind the provision in that law for the sale of these currencies to tourists which might be made more useful to mutual advantage.

I hope the more detailed responses from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury will find merit in the suggestion. Meanwhile, I am among those who are grateful for your active interest.

You have my very best wishes.

Faithfully,

HARRY F. BYRD.

#### RULE OF REASON SHOULD BE FOLLOWED IN CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Legislature is concluding its current session with passage of a bill on congressional redistricting that should give new dimensions to the word "gerrymander." That word is not strong enough to describe what has been done to the new Texas congressional districts. It is a new example of "salami" tactics, of slicing a metropolitan area into as many pieces as possible, combined with a taffy pull, stretching a district with city suburbs at one end as far as possible toward an area having such differing occupations, geography, and trade interests as to have no similar interest with the remote dismembered county.

I have some reluctance to criticize the actions of another legislative body, for it is all too easy to find fault with the work of many weeks of hard work done under the most intense pressures. Yet the Texas Legislature has produced a congressional redistricting plan that has been greeted by few shouts of enthusiasm and a great many cries of "take it to court." The new plan will undoubtedly be taken to the Federal courts. We may validly ask whether a redistricting plan that immediately draws such a response

does in fact represent a reasonable exercise of the legislature's power. The adoption of plans as unsound basically as the new Texas congressional districts is a new invitation to abdicate redistricting to the Federal courts, where citizens observe that some standard of reason and fairness applies.

I have supposed that there might be some good reasons for violating a rule of population equality in legislative districts if the purpose were to put in one district a cohesive area based on social, geographical, and historical considerations where that area fairly should be entitled to send a distinctive regional representative to the legislative body. I even see no great vice in seeking to assure the continuity of service of a distinguished legislator who has accumulated valuable seniority. But what can be said of a redistricting plan which tosses out these principles and, while achieving a superficial mathematical equality, attached metropolitan suburbs to a district stretching away for hundreds of miles? Should not one principle of redistricting be to keep metropolitan trade areas under as few districts as possible, rather than carving them into as many segments as possible?

Look at the new congressional districts in Texas: one suburb of Dallas in Dallas County has been attached to a district reaching 250 miles to the west almost to Lubbock, while another Dallas suburb also in Dallas County is attached to a district going 200 miles south to the outskirts of Houston. The northern part of Bexar County and San Antonio is made the heavy end of a strip going over 300 miles almost to New Mexico, while the southern part of San Antonio in Bexar County goes to a district going almost 200 miles to Old Mexico. In southeast Texas, two major competing port cities a hundred miles apart, Galveston and Beaumont, are put in one coastal strip district, while their respective natural trade areas are stripped away to make other districts. The Texas Legislature has carved up counties and cities and attached small pieces of counties and cities to such remote areas as to make the word "gerrymander" obsolete. This is such a governmental disaster that nothing but the word "Texaster" can describe what has been done in Texas by the Texas Legislature. One 11-county district resembles a giant fishhook in shape; shoestring districts are common, the dismemberment of cities and counties reduced to a butcher's art.

When a proposal can be analyzed on its face as a deliberate striped, or an awkward cookie-cutter pattern, or a long-reaching arm to pull in noncontiguous territory, then it is obvious that no attempt was made to protect the democratic interests of the people, nor the interests of democracy.

The interest of the people cannot be best served if an elected legislator represents varying territory having no geographical propinquity to his own residence.

If a State legislature cannot logically or fairly decide apportionment districts, a serious doubt is cast as to whether they

should be trusted with this responsibility if the interests of good government are blinded by self-interest.

The Senate now has before it a meritorious bill that would make it possible for such monstrosities as this Texas plan to be tested by fair and reasonable standards in the courts. H.R. 5505, the Celler bill, in addition to other provisions, directs that congressional districts "shall at all times be composed of contiguous territory, in as compact form as practicable," and directs that the districts can vary no more than 15 percent in population from the State average. This is a highly desirable bill; I strongly urge its passage by the Senate. It would provide standards by which the irresponsible acts of the State legislature can be tested in an impartial forum. I am reluctant to admit it, but today I and a great many other Texans are thinking more and more highly of judicial review of congressional and legislative redistricting.

#### TUNISIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today the Republic of Tunisia is celebrating its independence day. All Americans should join in saluting this brave little country which, less than a decade ago, regained its freedom from colonial domination.

During a written history dating back to the 12th century B.C., Tunisia has been occupied and overrun many times, but she has maintained her identity as a nation.

The modern Republic of Tunisia, under the leadership of President Habib Bourguiba is now embarking on a bold 4-year plan of economic development at home, and undertaking a unique initiative in her relations with her neighbors in north Africa and the Middle East. President Bourguiba, leader of a country which is a member of the Arab League, has urged progress toward a Middle Eastern settlement under which the Arab countries and Israel could live side by side in peace.

The United States should give all possible support both to Tunisia's efforts to bring peace to the troubled Middle East, and to her programs to develop her own economy and provide jobs for her people.

#### RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., published in its May 26, 1965, issue a very discerning editorial analysis of the administration's opposition to the right-to-work laws. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, May 26, 1965]

**REAL MOTIVE SHOWN ABOUT RIGHT TO WORK**  
Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, probably unwittingly, has identified the most basic motive in big labor's drive against the right-to-work law.

It is to brunt the dynamic industrial growth of the Southland.

Not much interpretation is needed to discover this meaning in Wirtz' comments to Congress.

He said that State right-to-work laws cause disruptive industrial competition among the States.

What competition is there for industry today that could be defined as disruptive? That which attracts companies to new locations.

The South in recent years has become a vigorous competitor for the industrial prosperity which has long been the good fortune of the North.

Mr. Wirtz' view is all the more striking when you define further the meaning of his phrase.

Who is disrupted by this competition for industry?

Of course, no community likes to lose a plant and the job opportunities it provides. Spartanburg, when seeking to have a company locate in this county, surely doesn't enjoy seeing it decide to go to Greenville, much less to North Carolina or Georgia.

When a firm is going to build a new facility in one of two communities, one of the two is going to be happy and one of them disrupted, in the Secretary's word.

Presumably, the Federal Government holds no favorites among the communities which make up its Nation. Why should the Department of Labor concern itself with obstructing one town from attracting an industry which might otherwise build elsewhere?

The Nation will gain the same number of jobs, whether the plant goes in Ohio or in South Carolina. Secretary Wirtz should be as happy for South Carolina as he would be for Ohio.

But there are some people who would be considerably more disrupted than others by a management decision to come South.

These are the moguls of big labor, who have squeezed the goose unmercifully in the highly industrialized areas of the North.

They don't want to see business migrate to the South. If it remains where they have virtually complete control, they have no worry about maintaining union membership. It is nearly automatic. The man who wants to work joins the union.

The independent-minded southerner hasn't capitulated to this type of subservient membership without free choice. Many southerners do belong to unions, but they have their own personal choice in the matter. It is this choice that President Johnson, Secretary Wirtz, and big labor want to declare undemocratic.

There are 19 States in the Union which have right-to-work laws. Which means that 31 do not have.

The 19 do not suggest it to be the right of Federal Government to impose these laws on the 31. Why do you think the 31 propose to enforce their view on the 19?

Not for the benefit of the 19, you can be sure.

#### THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Friday, the Washington Post published an editorial which complimented the Banking and Currency Committee of the House for its improvements on the administration's housing bill. I join in these sentiments, and say that once again the House Banking and Currency Committee has demonstrated its fine sense of workmanship and diligent devotion to the public interest.

I call particular attention to the elimination of the income floor from the administration's proposed rent subsidy plan. Under the administration's original proposal, the plan would apply only

to families with incomes too high for admission into public housing. This provision thus would automatically exclude the vast majority of poor families who are in the most desperate need of such assistance.

I commend the leadership of the House Banking and Currency Committee for its removal of the income floor. It is also noteworthy that the bill reported by the House subcommittee has achieved broad bipartisan support. Only one Republican member of the subcommittee voted against the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Post editorial be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

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

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1965]

#### HOPE FOR HOUSING

Solid workmanship, rather than creative brilliance, is the House Banking Committee's style. It has, characteristically, greatly strengthened the weakest aspects of the administration's housing bill. But it has simultaneously dulled one of its most interesting innovations, the new towns proposal.

Perhaps the committee may be correct in thinking that the country is not yet ready for new towns; certainly the old cities are not, for they sent their mayors to the Capitol with tears in their eyes to plead that the new towns constitute unfair competition. The committee kindly deleted that inflammatory phrase, "new town," to pacify the mayors. But it substituted Federal land mortgage insurance up to \$12.5 million for a single development; mortgages for undeveloped land have never before been insurable. Since \$12.5 million is nearly the cost of the land on which Reston is being built, the committee can hardly be said to have abandoned the idea of a Federal new towns policy altogether.

The bill will, no doubt, be attacked chiefly on its courageous proposal to subsidize the rents of families with low incomes. The administration had originally intended to give subsidies only to families with too much income to live in public housing, but the absurdity of that policy is obvious in a country where the volume of public housing falls fearfully short of the need. The committee has, very sensibly, proposed subsidies to the very poor as well as to their comparatively more fortunate neighbors.

A series of new departures in public housing will permit local authorities to buy or rent existing homes for families who can pay only part of their rent. Through an ingenious system of pooling mortgages, the committee expects to increase the amount of private money invested at low rates in non-profit housing. The administration has apparently been persuaded not to give up its program of housing through low-interest mortgages, a program that is only now beginning to pick up momentum.

On balance, the bill is stronger now than when the committee took it up. It gives great promise of becoming a landmark in the development of a broad and imaginative Federal housing policy.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I had occasion to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor, and an editorial from the *Bel Air Aegis*, concerning the saving of the United Nations.

At that time I indicated that I was dismayed that so little discussion of the

United Nations grave plight was taking place.

On other occasions I have risen on this floor to point out the growing concern of the American people for the fate of the United Nations. Daily editorials and letters to the editor reveal the anguish with which Americans view the creeping rigor mortis facing the United Nations.

I wish to have printed in the RECORD this very thoughtful editorial from the *Baltimore Evening Sun* and a letter to the editor from one of Maryland's most distinguished doctors, Palmer Futcher.

These expressions of concern for the United Nations are part of an increasing awareness on the part of the American people that we must do something affirmative to save this vital world organization.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have these two items printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Mar. 25, 1965]

#### SHORING UP THE U.N.

The United States has decided, news stories from Washington say, to contribute some \$200 million to the United Nations and its various agencies this year despite the long continuing controversy over the refusal of Russia, France, and a number of other countries to pay their assessments for peace-keeping missions. It is a decision wisely taken. No doubt it will meet with some criticism but it is in keeping with the belief to which this country has been committed for 20 years. The belief is that the United Nations, despite its defects and failures, is the best hope the world has for preventing war and that support of it is very much in our own national interests. On the whole the record over the past two decades justifies the belief.

This year is a critical one for the organization that now counts 115 members, 3 times the number that brought it into being in San Francisco in 1945. The General Assembly is in recess until fall. The efforts to reach an agreement with Russia on the special assessments for the operations in the Congo and the Middle East offer small prospect of a settlement. The organization faces severe financial difficulties which, if unsolved, could seriously curtail all its activities and perhaps cause a gradual withering of such effectiveness as it has had and of such reliance as its members have upon it. The reduction of it to a feeble shadow of a collection of states at this time would not only deprive the world of a useful if imperfect instrument of international conciliation but would probably undermine other modes of cooperation. Certainly it would be extremely unwise to let it die simply for lack of money.

Earlier this month the United States reversed its position on withholding its share of the amount needed to keep the program of technical assistance in operation. Now it is once again ready to put up its full share of the regular budget and other funds. Because this is a large share—about a third of the United Nations' expenses—it is an important prop. Moreover, it expresses this country's continuing determination to try to keep the organization alive and functioning; it sets an example that should hearten other members to renew their support of it and their faith in it. At least for the time being the money can be counted as soundly invested.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 26, 1965]

#### PEACEKEEPING FUNCTION

SIR: In this time of world crisis, the United Nations is incapacitated in the political area, while a 33-nation committee reviews one of its most important functions, that of peace-keeping.

The United States was sufficiently aware of defects in the operation of the United Nations to spearhead the action which led to the present impasse over payments for peacekeeping activities. It is imperative that President Johnson give frequent affirmation that this action emanated from a desire to improve the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations rather than to impair it. Yet more than a month has passed since the adjournment of the Assembly without a forceful indication from the administration that it will take leadership in support of a greater role for the United Nations in maintaining peace.

Does President Johnson now disavow the protestations by him and his presidential predecessors that the development of the United Nations is necessary to the rule of law in the world and is hence of supreme importance to the United States? Or will he reaffirm this conviction, preferably by calling for a conference of foreign ministers to review the organization and authority of the United Nations with the goal of making it a more effective instrument of world order?

PALMER H. FUTCHER.

BALTIMORE, March 23.

#### BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on April 10, a letter to the editor, written by Dr. Edwin G. Riley, was published in the *Baltimore Sun*. In his letter, Dr. Riley asked this question:

If it is considered immoral to give a woman birth-control materials and information, and thereby prevent or take a life, in one sector of our society, why is it moral to take a life, in another sector of our society, without question, simply because accepted reasons exist?

I ask other Senators to read Dr. Riley's letter and to look deeply into their own consciences, in the light of today's world population problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Riley's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Apr. 10, 1965]

#### MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

SIR: The moral problem of whether to give birth-control materials to unmarried women is not one of the morals of the women, but rather the moral responsibility of society toward these women and the problems created by their actions.

No one questions the desirability of the moral stricture on fornication. It would seem that after almost 2,000 years of moral preaching, far too many of our people have not seen fit to follow this precept. The problem of illegitimacy has been with us and will continue to be with us. The community spends much time, money, effort, and concern with its unfortunate results.

From much of the material that has appeared in the press it appears that not giving the control is moral and giving it is immoral. This is not the case. The choice is between two immoralities. By giving we

contribute to the immorality of the mother. By not giving we forgo our moral responsibility to every child that it have the opportunity to be wanted, cared for, loved by his mother.

Certain results of immoral sexual relations are less punishable than others. No one questions the treatment of syphilis, which in almost all cases arises from irregular sexual relations. It would even be more moral to allow this, since both partners of the act could suffer the consequences. This, of course, is ridiculous. By the same token, why should just the woman suffer this other result of her immorality which is a burden on her and a worse burden on the innocent child?

There is no question that this is a matter of preventing or taking a life, which is not within the right of humans. It is done in other segments of our society without question where accepted reasons exist.

Above all the other tenets of Christianity is that of love. Allowing unwanted, unloved, neglected children to come into the world is not an act of love on the part of society and is not moral since the child is foreordained to punishment through no fault of his own. This is an Old Testament concept which is not repeated in the New. It is cruel.

The idea of birth control with the present easy methods is new. It must be remembered that at one time Christian authorities took the position that nothing should be done to save life since it interfered with the will of God. Later these authorities disapproved of easing pain in childbirth since it was the will of God that a child be brought into the world amid travail. Even today we read of certain sects that refuse blood transfusion because it is "against the will of God."

It is only by a very limited line of moral thought that withholding birth control methods can be justified. If a woman is less burdened with the products of her misdoing, even she may have an opportunity to learn a better moral level of conduct.

EDWIN G. RILEY, M.D.

DENTON, April 5.

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

MAY 4, 1965.

Maj. Gen. W. C. GARRISON,  
Commanding General,  
Headquarters, X U.S. Army Corps,  
Fort Lawton, Wash.

DEAR GENERAL GARRISON: I deeply regret that, due to a longtime commitment to participate in the dedication of the Everett port facility, it will not be possible for me to be on hand for the ceremonies in connection with the U.S. Army Reserve Center at Bellingham, Wash., on Sunday, May 9.

I do wish to take this opportunity to say how pleased I am by the decision of the commanding general of the 6th U.S. Army to name the new facility "Stevens Hall" in memory of Gov. Isaac Ingalls Stevens, the first Governor of Washington Territory, and of his son, Brig. Gen. Hazard Stevens, Medal of Honor winner during the Civil War. All of us can be proud of the great contribution this family has made to our country from the inception of the Republic. The record of the family accomplishments is one without parallel in American history. The contributions of the family are legion, both in the military field and the area of statecraft. We in the State of Washington are especially honored to have Robert T. Stevens, former Secretary of the Army, present to represent his illustrious family. Secretary Stevens is a personal friend of mine, a man I have admired and respected not only for his distinguished service to our Nation in peace and war, but for his great integrity and devotion to his country.

The Stevens name will be a continuous reminder to the men who utilize Stevens Hall of the great responsibilities of American citizenship. It is an example that I hope and trust the members of the Armed Forces who train there will endeavor to emulate at all times.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
U.S. Senator.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ISAAC INGALLS STEVENS

Isaac Ingalls Stevens was born on March 25, 1818, in the State of Massachusetts. He was an honor graduate from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, class of 1839, receiving a commission in the Corps of Engineers. He served with distinction in the Mexican War rising to the rank of brevet major; he was credited with developing the plan that successfully breached the defenses of Mexico City during that campaign.

Following the Mexican War, President Franklin Pierce appointed Stevens to three positions simultaneously: Governor of the Territory of Washington, Chief of the Northern Pacific Railway Survey, and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Territory. He was eminently successful in each of the three positions, including negotiations with the British on boundary disputes, arrangement of treaties with the Indians, and as the result of his popularity as Governor, was elected Delegate to Congress for Washington Territory in 1857 where he served until the outbreak of the Civil War.

Following his resignation from Congress, Governor Stevens was appointed a colonel by President Lincoln and assumed command of the 79th Highlanders of New York. By July 1862 he was promoted to major general. On September 1, 1862, General Stevens was killed in action while leading a charge against greatly superior forces under the command of Gen. Stonewall Jackson during the Second Battle of Bull Run.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HAZARD STEVENS

Hazard Stevens was born in Newport, R.I., and entered the service at Olympia, Washington Territory. He was appointed 1st lieutenant, 79th New York Infantry, in August 1861; and was promoted to captain and assistant adjutant general on October 16, 1861. While serving in this capacity he was awarded the Medal of Honor on June 13, 1864, for gallantry in action in leading a party that assaulted and captured Fort Huger, Va., on April 19, 1863. He was promoted to major on October 13, 1864; to brevet lieutenant colonel, U.S. Volunteers, on August 1, 1864; to colonel on October 19, 1864, and to brigadier general on April 2, 1865. He was honorably mustered out of the service on September 19, 1865.

REMARKS BY ROBERT T. STEVENS, PRESIDENT OF J. P. STEVENS & Co., INC., AT DEDICATION OF STEVENS HALL, BELLINGHAM, WASH., MAY 9, 1965

Last month, at Appomattox Courthouse in Virginia, descendants of Generals Grant and Lee took part in marking the 100th anniversary of the end of the American Civil War. Not far from Appomattox, one of the men we honor here today lost his life in the Battle of Chantilly on September 1, 1862.

Here in Bellingham, nearly 103 years after his death, we dedicate this armory, Stevens Hall, in honor of Gen. Isaac I. Stevens, and his only son, Gen. Hazard Stevens.

Gen. Isaac Stevens, first cousin of mine, twice removed, was the first Governor of the Territory of Washington, a soldier, engineer and diplomat, a true pioneer of the great Northwest and a brave officer of the Union Army, who gave his life to a cause in which he stoutly believed.

During his short life of 44 years, Isaac Stevens accomplished far more than most men accomplish during twice that time. He had a brilliant record in the Mexican War of 1847. His trips overland to Puget Sound, his two appointive terms as territorial Governor, his two elections as first territorial Delegate to Congress and his efforts in this outstanding area of our young Nation, including his negotiations with the Indians, contributed an important chapter in the history and early knowledge of our Northwest Pacific frontier.

Hazard Stevens, a fine son and heroic officer of the Army, is remembered as a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, awarded him on June 13, 1864, for gallantry in action in leading a party that assaulted and captured Fort Huger, Va., during the devastating Civil War.

Along with you, those of us who are descendants of these gallant men take great pride in their accomplishments. Like others of uncommon valor, they are the inspiration of brave men everywhere and, personally, my own interest in military affairs, including service in both World Wars and as Secretary of the Army, stems in part from the accomplishments of these two Stevens generals, father and son. I cannot forget that your first territorial Governor stood first in his class at West Point.

Today, in farflung outposts of the world, brave Americans continue to carry forth the honor of America. Each of us is grateful that our men in uniform, supported by the vast majority of American people, under the leadership of a resolute President, are on the job in full support of freedom and an honorable peace.

Both Generals Stevens were prodigious writers and readers and, in his second year at West Point, Isaac also displayed a keen sense of devilish wit. In a letter to his cousin, Charles, he wrote: "The professor's cherries are now dead ripe and by some means or other, quantities of them disappear every night—in such things as these,



you know it is wicked to call names, but this I can say that last night I ate a fine lot of them."

In his final minutes of life, Isaac Stevens was to die as he had lived—a brave man dedicated to the code of West Point—duty, honor, country. The official files reveal that. "The colorbearer being shot, Stevens seized the colors, regardless of the wounded Highlanders at his feet who exclaimed, 'For God's sake, don't you take the colors, General, they'll shoot you if you do,' and, leading his men to the charge, thus he fell in the hour of victory. His body was found after the battle; his hands closely grasped the staff, and the flag had fallen over his head and shoulders."

These early pioneers and defenders of the Nation have been honored in many places, among them Stevensville, Mont., Stevens County and elsewhere in Washington. On behalf of each General Stevens' descendants, I am certain they would, as I am, be proud of the designation of this new U.S. Army Reserve Center as Stevens Hall. I am very proud to represent the Stevens family on this memorable occasion and very proud that the name Stevens means so much in this great State of Washington.

Thank you very much.

### HIGHWAY DEATHS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, more than 460 Americans died this weekend on our highways. We have become numb to statistics such as these; but I, for one, mourn the loss of each single life. We could have prevented many of these deaths.

A life lost on the highway is a life wasted. Accidents can be prevented. Lives can be saved. It is time for the people of this country to stop wringing their hands in despair, and to take positive action to implement proven programs of highway safety. We who serve in Congress must have the courage to do what is necessary in order to make our highways as safe as possible.

More than half the people who died this weekend would be alive now if Congress had done what it had the power to do. Proposed legislation now before us can reduce thousands of highway death zones, can improve automobile safety standards, and can eliminate the hazards of unsafe tires. Each of these proposals can save precious lives.

The greatest lifesaver ever instituted is the interstate highway program. The death rate on these roads is less than half that on older highways. Thousands of lives have already been saved. This is a step in the right direction; but we cannot rest here. We must plan now to extend the interstate system; and the Hartke highway bill would do just this. My bill would add 19,000 miles to the presently projected 41,000-mile system. Based on current statistics, this increase will save 3,800 lives a year. The saving in property damage alone would amount to several billion dollars a year.

The past weekend, American motorists traveled some 12 billion vehicle-miles; but almost 85 percent of that travel was on old, unsafe rural roads. It was on these roads that most of the 460 lost their lives.

More lives were lost this weekend than those lost in the entire course of the war in Vietnam. We are shocked and saddened at the loss of even one pilot in

southeast Asia; but a life lost on the highway is an everyday occurrence.

The tragedy is that this loss need not be. Our Nation's abundant resources can be focused on highway—safety programs. We have the power to cut the toll in half. Let us now resolve to do everything within our power to make our roads as safe as humanly possible.

### THE KEPPEL GUIDELINES FOR INTEGRATING SOUTHERN SCHOOLS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., has published another excellent editorial on the subject of the Keppel guidelines for integrating southern schools under title VI of the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964. On May 19, 1965, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 10997, an editorial, from the Greenville News, on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Keppel Versus Law and Commonsense," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, May 25, 1965]

#### KEPPEL VERSUS LAW AND COMMONSENSE

It may be possible that the request of nine southern Governors through their Senators and Representatives in Washington for modification or a reasonable interpretation of the Federal guidelines for desegregation to qualify for Federal aid for the public schools will bear fruit.

Commissioner Francis Keppel, of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, however, has his bureaucratic back up and says he will not bow to political pressure.

He does not deny that his rules and regulations which under the general precedents have the effect of law, go beyond the prevailing court decrees.

But he says they are perfectly legal under titles IV and VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1963-64 which forbid racial discrimination in public facilities and permit the Attorney General to initiate suits where discrimination is charged in the public schools.

If so, and if Mr. Keppel succeeds in holding his ground, then the Civil Rights Act is worse even than we thought. The Commissioner himself is employing both political and economic pressure and refusing to listen to reason.

For, as we pointed out at some length here a few days ago, the Keppel "guidelines" go far beyond even the most extreme of the Federal court decrees. They go beyond the language of the Civil Rights Act.

The courts have forbidden the schools to discriminate against individuals on grounds of race in assigning pupils to schools and classrooms, or to discriminate in considering requests for transfer from one school to another.

The Civil Rights Act, likewise, stops at the point of forbidding discrimination. Although it may be interpreted as compelling deliberate integration, such an intention is not spelled out in the language used by Congress. That, goodness knows, goes far enough in invading property rights and personal privacy and interfering with the right of individuals to choose their associates.

The distinction here is that the Civil Rights Act and the Federal court decrees are aimed at ending discrimination by for-

bidding denial of certain individual rights as defined in Supreme Court decisions.

The HEW Federal aid guidelines would discriminate in the opposite direction by compelling the schools to mix the races deliberately for the sake of achieving integration (called desegregation, which is not in any dictionary). Integration is the primary objective and assistance to education is given second place.

A clear legal light is provided by the most recent court decisions on the subject. On April 7 the U.S. Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the "freedom of choice" plan of the Richmond, Va., schools whereby children are permitted to attend any school they choose anywhere in the city.

It also upheld the Hopewell, Va., plan whereby children are assigned to the schools in or nearest their residential neighborhoods.

In the Richmond case the Negro plaintiffs argued that many Negro parents prefer to have their children attend predominantly or entirely Negro schools and that this results in a continuance of segregation.

On this point the second highest court in the land for this region said:

"To that extent, they (the plaintiffs) say that, under any freedom-of-choice system, the State permits segregation if it does not deprive Negro parents of a right of choice.

"It has been held again and again, however, that the 14th amendment prohibition is not against segregation as such. The proscription is against discrimination. Everyone of every race has a right to be free of discrimination by the State by reason of his race.

"There is nothing in the Constitution which prevents his voluntary association with others of his race or which would strike down any State law which permits such association. The present suggestion that a Negro's right to be free from discrimination requires that the State deprive him of his volition is incongruous."

The Court having gone so far, it is reasonable to add that it also is incongruous to deprive whites of "freedom of choice" in the matter of schools and to compel integration of the races when one or the other or both don't want it is downright ridiculous.

The Office of Education, however, is going that far and further. While the courts have repeatedly said that choice of a racially mixed school is an individual right to be individually asserted, Mr. Keppel says the school authorities must take the initiative and completely integrate the schools in a short time, regardless of the preferences of individuals.

The integrationists are given some comfort by the partial dissent in these decisions by Judges Sobeloff and Bell. They said the plans were experimental only and added that the school officials should bear the burden of achieving integration.

In a further statement they seem to be saying that if not enough Negroes go along with those who want to integrate, they can't extricate themselves from segregation, the school officials should transfer enough to keep them company in white schools, or transfer whites to Negro schools.

There is nothing in any of the Supreme Court decisions to justify this. And, certainly, sound school administrative practice doesn't warrant it.

With respect to the assignment of children to schools geographically nearest their homes, the Court said:

"The Constitution does not require the abandonment of neighborhood schools and the transportation of pupils from one area to another solely for the purpose of mixing the races in the schools."

It is notable, too, that while the Keppel guidelines would compel integration of administration and faculty personnel, the circuit court sidestepped the issue. Instead of

ruling on this aspect of the pleadings of the plaintiffs, it said that assignment of teachers could be expected in time to follow the pattern of the assignment of pupils.

This is the law as defined by the courts. Insofar as appears possible at this late date in applying the decisions and laws forbidding segregation by State or local law or administrative practices, it is plain commonsense.

The school districts of South Carolina and other States have agreed to comply with these laws and the courts are ready to step in again if they fail to do so. It is neither legal nor sensible to ask them, or the pupils and their parents, to do more.

#### THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of other Senators an editorial entitled "NCC's Tax Exemption." The editorial was published recently in the Indianapolis Star.

This editorial raises a very pertinent question about the tax-exemption status of the NCC in view of the many political stands that have been taken by the council, including the approval of a resolution recommending withdrawal of armed services from South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

##### NCC'S TAX EXEMPTION

The leadership of the National Council of Churches should stop hiding behind the argument that the council is a religious organization in its successful efforts to avoid paying taxes.

The council professes to represent some 38 million members of more than 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches. The council enjoys tax-exempt status. But organizations not obligated to pay taxes are also not expected to lobby for pending legislation or propagandize for political causes.

Among other movements endorsed by the council have been the recognition of Red China, elimination of right-to-work laws, repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and the barring of featherbed practices in labor. It also urged Congress to strike out the loyalty oath provision of the National Defense Act. Before the 1964 Civil Rights Act passed, the council lobbied in its favor.

In December 1960 the council accepted a report which said, "The fact that (Fidel) Castro took land without paying for it, that he is hostile to American capital, does not necessarily make him a Communist." The report did not add, as it might have by sheer logic, "but it necessarily makes him a thief." One would have thought that the council's governing board would have condemned Castro in the "thou shalt not steal" basis, if on no other grounds.

The council denies being either Red-tinged or the consistent patsy for Communists. It once actually called for immunity from criticism as if it were some sacred institution created by divine will of God. On February 26, 1959, the council's governing board proclaimed that it is the right of church groups "to discuss freely and to express judgments without exposure to attacks upon motive or integrity for daring to exercise the right to do so."

No one who believes in a society of free men can deny the council's right to "discuss freely and express judgments." But no one who believes in a free society can go along with the council's belief that its motives or judgments should be immune to attack. The

judgments and motives of even the President of the United States are open to question and to criticism.

The councils most recent resolution put its 38 million members on record as being for withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. This is, of course, exactly the same stand being taken by Mao Tse-tung as well as the Daily Worker, a New York Communist newspaper.

Whether the leadership truly represents its 38 million members is up to the membership to decide. But whether the council should continue to have tax exemption while it propagandizes for changes in the Nation's laws, adding new burdens on our taxpayers, is a matter for the Internal Revenue Department to decide.

#### OUTSTANDING MEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the phrase "distinguished son of a distinguished father" has, perhaps, never been more aptly applied than it was in Ruth Montgomery's recent article on the Justice Department. It is a bright day, indeed, when such intelligent young men, inspired by parental public service, decide to serve their country. The Justice Department is properly proud of the fine names these young men bear, and of the excellent work for which they are well known.

I ask unanimous consent that Ruth Montgomery's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Journal American, May 16, 1965]

##### L.B.J. DEALS ACES TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT (By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—A good many sons have followed famous fathers into distinguished public service since the days of the Adamases, but the Justice Department could well lay claim now to some kind of a record in that category.

Starting right at the top, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the U.S. Attorney General, is the son of an attorney general of the State of New Jersey, the late Edward L. Katzenbach. And four of his top aids similarly are sons of men who have made their marks on American history.

The four aids have something else in common—their fathers were long-time friends or colleagues of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark turned an ice cream freezer for the neighborly Johnson as a lad, Assistant Attorney General Edwin L. Weisl, Jr.'s first recollection of the future President was sharing his bedroom with the rangy Texan at the age of five.

L.B.J. kept a friendly eye on another future Assistant Attorney General while Fred Vinson, Jr. copped eight letters in college sports.

Clark, Weisl, and Vinson were recently appointed to their posts by Johnson, who also elevated Katzenbach from Deputy Attorney General to Attorney General. The fifth member of this unusual group is Assistant Attorney General John W. Douglas, whose father, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, served with Johnson in the Senate. The younger Douglas, a star Princeton athlete, World War II Navy veteran and Rhodes scholar, was a Kennedy appointee.

The fathers of the three Johnson appointees were not only friends of L.B.J. but distinguished in the law. Ramsey's father, Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, was Attorney General under President Truman.

The late Fred Vinson, Sr., was Secretary of the Treasury when Truman appointed him Chief Justice of the United States, Edwin L. Weisl, Sr., of New York, L.B.J.'s longtime personal lawyer and adviser, served as assistant attorney and special assistant attorney general in Chicago during the late twenties, later on the War Manpower Board, and in 1957-59 as chief counsel for the Johnson Preparedness Committee, a senatorial group which performed such an outstanding job that it started L.B.J. toward the Vice Presidency. Weisl is now Democratic national committeeman for New York.

The younger Weisl recalls his first meeting with the future President this way: "I was about 5 years old when I saw a big Texan talking politics with my father in the living room of our New York apartment, and discovered that he was planning to sleep in my bedroom.

"He has the same man then as now. He never stopped talking politics and the national lights, even after he went to bed and the lights were out. He taught me all I know about politics."

Young Weisl worked as an assistant counsel to his father on the Preparedness Committee, after graduating from Yale, taking his law degree at Columbia, and serving a 2-year stint in the Navy as a lieutenant. He then went into private law practice in New York, and as a Democratic delegate twice voted for L.B.J. for President, in 1960 and 1964.

His only child, Angela, was born the day before President Kennedy's assassination. One of L.B.J.'s first acts after he returned to Washington as the heavily burdened new President was to telephone congratulations, send flowers, and write a letter to the 2-day-old baby.

The nominations of Weisl and Vinson as assistant attorney generals await Senate confirmation, but both are starting to work under interim appointments.

Ramsey Clark, the No. 2 man at Justice, is a tall Texan like the President, but considerably more laconic. After swearing in the 37-year-old man he has known for three decades, L.B.J. asked Ramsey's 11-year-old son whether he'd had any "best days" recently. Young Tom promptly replied that this was his best one.

It was an old family joke. Once, after spending the day at the Johnsons, the youngster told the then Vice President that it was his "second best day." The best, he added solemnly, was when his grandfather let him drive an electric cart around a golf course.

The President considers that it was among the country's "best" days when the bright sons of old friends were lured into public service.

#### INDEPENDENCE OF TUNISIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on this day, June 1, the North African state of Tunisia celebrates its national holiday. I think it appropriate that we recognize and acknowledge the progressive and pragmatic way in which this country, under the leadership of Habib Bourguiba, is creating its own solutions to the problems which it still faces.

President Bourguiba, the man who is largely responsible for the fact that Tunisia is today an independent state, has, for over three decades, now, been concerned with the welfare of his country. In 1934, he founded the Neo-Destour—New Constitution—Party, which was the primary vehicle for bringing about Tunisia's independence from France in 1956, and for the extensive

series of reforms which have been carried out in Tunisia since that date.

President Bourguiba has stated that his goal is "to raise the level of man, increase production, insure its distribution in the most equitable manner, and—in a word—build a better society."

In line with this goal, he proposed and implemented a wide ranging series of reforms and programs for the development of nearly every facet of Tunisian life. Once again, the moderation and pragmatism of the Tunisian method of achieving results is evident: Discussion, accommodation with different viewpoints, and a realistic approach which lacks the coercion and the violence so often associated with progress in other lands.

In fact, pragmatism and moderation have become so characteristic of President Bourguiba's style that they have given birth to an "ism"—Bourguibism. "Bourguibism" is a realistic approach to political problems, a progressive pragmatism, a conscientious striving to prevent a confrontation with the opposition from becoming a permanent rupture. However, it should not be thought that this entails a weak will or a willingness to sacrifice principle.

President Bourguiba's attitude toward the independence of his country during World War II is a good example. Despite the fact that he had spent many years in French jails for his activities on behalf of Tunisia, Bourguiba ignored the Nazis, who sought his cooperation in North Africa in return for promises of future independence. First, he simply could not accept the ideological premises and the methods of the Nazis; second, he felt that real independence for Tunisia could be obtained only from a free France, once again ready to discuss rationally the gains for both sides which would be the result of such independence.

Now, in 1965, we see, once again the impeccable logic behind Bourguiba's thinking: if one were to cut oneself off completely from all discussion with one's opposition, no positive results could ever be anticipated. Rather, both sides would then sit alone; their grievances against each other would fester and grow in magnitude; and imaginary insults and complaints would take on the shape of reality. Bourguiba alone, among the Arab leaders, has been willing to state publicly that Arab and Israeli differences should be discussed in hope that the outcome could or would result in a rational solution. Clearly, without discussions, without debate, without contact, a peaceful settlement would be impossible.

I believe that many of our world's developing nations would do well to follow the example of President Bourguiba. One of the most painful, and yet obvious, lessons which the past has to offer is that a lack of reasonable discussion between opposing forces has caused more misunderstanding and bloodshed than was ever necessary. Keeping open a "dialog," as Bourguiba himself terms it, presents an alternative.

I therefore take this opportunity to congratulate the Tunisians on the occasion of their national holiday. I hope that under Habib Bourguiba, the remarkable progress which Tunisia has already

made will continue, and that the practices and programs of Tunisia will become models for other nations to follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### W. J. B. DANIEL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 243, S. 304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 304) for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

#### S. 304

*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 W. J. B. Daniel, of Pelahatchie, Mississippi, the sum of \$1,600. The payment of such sum shall be for actual medical expenses incurred by W. J. B. Daniel as a result of injuries received by W. J. B. Daniel during World War II while serving as a civilian radar technician with the United States Army Signal Corps: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by, any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a 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. 253), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to W. J. B. Daniel, of Pelahatchie, Miss., the sum of \$1,600, said amount representing actual medical expenses incurred by him as a result of injuries received during and as a result of World War II service as a civilian radar technician with the U.S. Army Signal Corps.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT obtained the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, how much time is allotted to the Senator from Utah?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, there will be approximately 3½ hours remaining on the bill, and 1 hour on each amendment that may be proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

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. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator in charge of the bill yield me 12 minutes on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

#### NEW NAME—SAME OLD BOONDOGGLE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote on S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Because of the time limitations, I shall not attempt to discuss specific segments of the bill or amendments suggested by the minority members of the Banking and Currency Committee on sections 2 and 4 which we considered.

This is another of those bills whose stated purpose none of us can oppose. The purpose is to reduce persistent local pockets of unemployment by using resources of the Federal Government to create local job opportunities that could not come into being without such help. How does the bill propose to do this? By continuing, under a new name, the program that has been operated for nearly 4 years now by the Area Redevelopment Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Before we face this decision and with 4 years of records to check, we should have been given a clear picture as to how well the old program has worked. But

since all local projects were labeled with a political billboard, I suppose that is too much to expect. The only measure of success on which we can check is found in the claim, made in the agency's March report, that the program had created 70,000 jobs and even this does not hold up under scrutiny.

As I understand it, if we were taking all the projects that actually got underway and total up all the job estimates that appeared on the original applications for those projects, we would get this 70,000 figure. However, when the Comptroller General made a sample check on 80 of these projects, he found the jobs were overstated by some 98 percent. In other words, if that were true for all projects, there would have been only about 35,000 jobs, or half of the 70,000 estimate.

#### CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT DIFFERS

Have we any other employment figures against which to measure this accomplishment? Fortunately, we have the increase in civilian employment generated without this special Government help during those same 4 years. This figure is 3½ million jobs—100 times greater than the deflated ARA figure of 35,000.

Even 35,000 new jobs is an impressive accomplishment if they have really been created. But can we depend on this figure? Several questions remain unanswered. Are these 35,000 jobs permanent or only temporary? Are the companies supplying them operating successfully or are they still running in the red, paying out borrowed money for wages? When I have raised this question, I have been told that it is improper to give out such information about specific projects because it might damage them. This sounds to me like a significant admission that a very high proportion of all projects are in trouble—an impression that has been borne out by such specific information as I have been able to get on the outside.

There is another unanswered question which is of basic importance. In spite of all pious declarations against "pirating," how many, if any, of these jobs represent a net gain in employment, or how many of the 35,000 simply represent a transfer of activity and income from people already employed in the same industry? Of course, this goes on constantly between competitors in a free market, but these switches are not claimed as new jobs created.

#### UTAH EXAMPLE CITED

My doubts on this score have been confirmed, in part, by what has happened in my own State—and this experience has become for me the symbol of ARA in action. We have a coal mining area in Utah whose capacity is much greater than its market, and whose most efficient operators have not been able for years to provide full weeks of work for their miners. ARA provided funds to reopen two smaller mines that had dropped out of competition years ago. One of these apparently went through all its new Government capital without really getting into production and the account is being liquidated. I can only guess what is happening to the other one, or to other local situations where a new competitor,

sponsored and subsidized by Government comes into a community to divide rather than increase the existing market whether it be for lumber, recreation, or motel rooms.

What about these jobs? Are they really new and are they permanent?

Mr. President, I realize this bill will pass. It will be adopted because all of us support its stated purpose, and promise of more jobs i. smaller, less industrialized communities, and because it fits into the sociopolitical framework of the Great Society. But it will continue to fail to reach this goal because some of its basic premises are unsound.

#### SLIGHT DIFFERENCES ONLY

It differs only slightly from the 1961 ARA bill. Some of the conditions and standards have actually been lowered to bring in more marginal applications with less chance for ultimate success. I am reminded of the old story of the man who claimed to lose money on every sale, but made up his loss by increasing his volume. Stripped to its essentials this bill proposes to solve the problem of local unemployment in only one way—by distributing Federal money through grants and loans and do it over broader areas, on easier terms, and with interest rates directly subsidized to a level that could go below the cost of money to the Government. Discussion of the bill also produced the concept that "social" considerations will be injected into the lender-borrower relationship.

Of course, this basic "social" credit idea is not new. But in this bill it means several things to me. It is an admission that many present loans are going bad and sponsors want to have an explanation ready when it will be needed. It is a tipoff to the borrower that the administration will not be a stern collector and that part of the burden of repayment can be avoided if he can have a list of "social" benefits handy.

But there is a new twist to social values in this program. The bill is offered as a means of protecting existing social capital. That is to say that if a small community already has paved streets, water systems, libraries, and schools, not now being used to their optimum capacity due to a drop in population caused by lack of employment opportunity, the funds and forces of the Federal Government must be brought to bear to restore the population to its proper size, and thus protect its "social capital."

#### GUARANTEES OF GHOST TOWNS?

I wonder if anyone in ARA or any Government agency has thought that one through. Is the Great Society to be created by freezing the status quo and making every village like Henry Ford's Deerfield Village? Do we want Government guarantees against ghost towns?

Can a sound flourishing future be built on such a philosophy? Should we ignore the process that in 4 years created 100 times as many jobs as this one did? If easy money is the key to job creation, why have not the smart, successful American business executives rushed in to seize this golden opportunity? Could there possibly be other foundation stones on which to base a decision of where to locate a new enterprise? Even though the philosophy

of this bill ignores them, such factors as climate, water, and power supplies, accessibility to raw materials, labor supply, and to markets—and many other factors must be considered together and given proper weight. Access to private money is seldom denied to men or companies with records of proven judgment. How do such men look at the bait this bill holds out?

Listen to an excerpt from the testimony before the Banking and Currency subcommittee of a company president who has recently faced and made a plant location decision:

My personal business experience has provided me with a background concerning industrial plant location decisions and problems involving the relationships of these decisions to industrial development programs. At the moment, we are completing a study which will result in our building a sizable plant in Grand Island, Nebraska. Through a consulting firm, we have carefully studied the special inducements offered by the Area Redevelopment Administration and many individual localities across the country and have come to the conclusion that our decision should be based on unsubsidized economics rather than on special artificial inducements.

Mr. President, I am sure if we could check the actual performance of the program against the promise of its purpose, we would want to get much more information on its present success—or lack of it—before we extend and broaden it.

Fortunately, an expiration date has been included in the bill, and maybe by the time Congress votes on it again, I hope we will be able to have a clearer picture of its weaknesses. Because I see them clearly now, I must, as I did 4 years ago—vote "No" on this particular bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Area Redevelopment Administration Revisited—or the Quest for Truth in Spending," prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee.

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

#### AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION REVISITED—OR THE QUEST FOR TRUTH IN SPENDING

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee; **BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER**, chairman, Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., staff director, May 1965)

#### PREFACE

President Johnson, in his March 25, 1965, economic development message, announced the functions and powers of the Area Redevelopment Administration are being transferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce.

In his panegyric to the glory that was ARA, Mr. Johnson looked to the bright side of things, observing:

"Our experience with various forms of assistance under ARA and the accelerated public works program has shown us ways to improve our techniques and our tools for providing economic growth."

Perhaps. But new agencies, like young twigs, must be so bent as to grow in the paths Congress intends. The following pages are a summary of four General Accounting Office reports on ARA's management of the accelerated public works program. They provide an object lesson on how to divert a program in directions quite

different from the intent of Congress when it passed the Public Works Acceleration Act. These GAO reports should be required reading for the new Economic Development Administrator and the new Secretary of Commerce.

The 1961 Area Redevelopment Act was the first of the Kennedy-Johnson pump-priming experiments, followed in 1962 by the second big one—the accelerated public works program. The Area Redevelopment Act was designed to give new direction to the economically stagnant sections of the country; accelerated public works was to provide the shoulder on which to lean until the depressed areas were moving again.

Original taxpayer investment in accelerated public works was \$900 million. To handle this money, the program was turned over to the Area Redevelopment Administration, which was given authority to formulate policies and promulgate regulations.

The idea behind accelerated public works was to provide immediate, if short-term, employment in areas of the country where existed a continuing hard core—approximately 6 percent or higher—of unemployment.

ARA and its adherents maintained a drum-fire of publicity requesting additional funds for both of its programs. As Congress squares away to consider fiscal 1966 appropriations, the achievements ARA publicists have claimed deserve closer scrutiny with an eye to learning lessons valuable in future handling of public works programs.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has provided a partial review along these lines. In May, June, August, and October 1964, GAO issued a series of four unfavorable reports on ARA practices. Before summarizing the GAO reports, it might prove instructive to consider two private assessments of ARA, both issued after the first three GAO documents were made public.

In a September 11, 1964, editorial, the New York Times expressed great concern that Congress would not appropriate more funds for ARA. It admitted ARA had a problem: "It is not easy to devise workable criteria for loans and grants to revive economically depressed communities, since, by definition, if such communities could meet normal banking standards they would not need special Government help."

Opaque prose such as this in 1961 might have stopped the infant ARA in its tracks. But since that time, the ARA did not let prose of any kind, whether in law or editorial, interfere with its real mission: to spend the money. And basically, the New York Times agrees, when in effect it says Congress must prove its sincerity by giving ARA more money.

The Times cited impressive statistics. ARA, it said, had retrained 35,000 workers and helped create 110,000 new jobs. No mention of any GAO reports to the contrary.

This leads us to a second, earlier report—August 3, 1964—of a group called the National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment. (For the sake of brevity we will refer to this as the PAC report.)

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, hailed the glowing PAC report as a careful and studied evaluation when he inserted the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 17, pages 22191-22195.

The committee proved that ARA had not promoted any pirating of industry from one area to another. How? Merely by saying the law specifically forbids this sin. The committee also noted that ARA had been criticized for loans to new enterprises in fields already overcrowded and suffering from excess capacity, but added soothingly, "ARA has made strenuous efforts to correct this and to develop a definitive policy in this regard."

And if the conclusion here is in the great tradition of committee prose—"this was a

constructive development which needs continued attention"—it also is perhaps the only place in the whole report where the committee hints there is any problem which cannot be solved by larger appropriations from the old miser, Congress.

The committee was also more prudent than the Times as to the number of jobs generated by ARA: "It is estimated that when [the current projects] are in full operation, a total of some 110,000 jobs may be generated—66,500 jobs created directly, and an additional 43,500 indirectly." The committee explained that these estimates were made by "applicants [for loans, who] are expected, subject to a review by ARA, to make reasonable estimates of the number of permanent jobs that would be generated by such financial assistance."

All in all, the committee report found little wrong with ARA that more—much more—money would not correct. It mentioned no serious problems or mistakes.

This is puzzling, indeed, and raises the question as to who composed these congratulatory remarks. The ARA itself perhaps? For, as we mentioned earlier, those persistent watchdogs from the General Accounting Office had already attempted to put truth into the spending argument by issuing critical reports in May, June, and August of 1964. From the PAC report, one could not even find acknowledgment that there is such a watchdog agency as the General Accounting Office. The Times did carry brief notices of the GAO findings but the hard facts of reality did not carry over to the editorial page.

Undismayed by this lack of attention, the GAO issued thereafter another report critical of ARA in October 1964, and January 1965. It is time these reports be given careful attention.

The first four GAO findings concerned the ARA method of administering the accelerated public works program. By way of explanation, the accelerated public works program was designed to provide employment in hard core depressed areas by means of public works programs. The Community Facilities Administration (CFA) was the agency directing important parts of the program, subject at all times to control and policy decisions by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

#### HOW MANY JOBS HAS AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM GENERATED?

In May 1964 GAO completed an investigation of ARA's claims on the number of man-months and man-hours of on-site and off-site employment created by the accelerated public works program.<sup>1</sup> PAC's report had trumpeted, "These (APW) projects are expected by their sponsors to generate an estimated 220,000 man-hours of on-site and off-site employment."

Said GAO:

"We found that the ARA reports contained significant overstatements of jobs estimated to be created by accelerated public works projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration."

"We found also that the reports contained overstatements with respect to the number of actual man-months of work created by Community Facilities Administration approved projects already under construction."<sup>2</sup>

A GAO investigation of 190 projects revealed the Area Redevelopment Administration overstated the man-months of work to be created by 12,261, or about 128 percent.

<sup>1</sup> "Overstatement of Number of Jobs Created Under the Accelerated Public Works Program," report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General of the United States, May 1964.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

GAO found that the Area Redevelopment Administration had estimated 55,300 man-years of work for all projects approved as of November 1, 1963. If the same margin of exaggeration held for all public works projects as for those audited, GAO projected that the Area Redevelopment Administration would have exaggerated the work created by 31,000 man-years.

Lest it be charged that GAO was indulging in mere speculation, this report revealed that on 497 separate projects under construction ARA had overstated man-months worked by 23,000, or about 83 percent. ARA had publicly reported 50,853 man-months worked, whereas GAO had discovered 27,845 actually worked. Again, based on performance, GAO projected that if the same margin of exaggeration held, ARA claims of 131,942 actual man-months worked on projects then under construction or completed were exaggerated by 60,000 man-months.

#### How to overestimate

The General Accounting Office found that ARA had continued to use original estimates either of applicants for funds or of the CFA with no attempt to check actual payroll records. If a project was listed as 60 percent completed, ARA reported actual on-site man-months of work to be 60 percent of the original estimate as to total man-months of work the project was supposed to generate.

#### "OVERESTIMATE"—MORE APPROPRIATIONS

The influence of such grossly erroneous claims is difficult to calculate, but the General Accounting Office points out at least one possibility:

"The data contained in the September 1, 1963, directory of approved APW projects was used extensively in ARA testimony before the House Public Works Committee in October 1963, to demonstrate the progress and accomplishments achieved under the Public Works Acceleration Act with respect to the creation of employment."<sup>3</sup>

#### DID THE MOST DISTRESSED AREAS GET THE MONEY?

In its friendly report PAC said: "The program was aimed to mitigate national conditions of unemployment by helping provide temporary jobs in the areas that need them most."

An article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, appearing in the Washington Post for February 10, 1965, was less complimentary to ARA, but they assert that ARA Director William Batt and his aids "stick to the old formula that good money should flow to the poorest communities."

GAO agreed the intent of the Congress was to provide jobs in areas "which suffer from persistent and chronic unemployment." But GAO reviewed ARA's performance to determine whether or not the intent of Congress was obeyed by ARA. Three investigations cover this matter.

1. In its June 1964 report GAO said:

"Our review disclosed that about \$21 million in APW funds were obligated for 85 projects in areas which were no longer eligible at the time the agreement was consummated or which were due to become ineligible shortly thereafter."<sup>4</sup>

This report pointed out that the Department of Labor determines the eligibility of such areas and when an employment situation has so improved as to render such areas ineligible. Formal announcement of the latter action is always preceded by an early warning system which says the situation is improving. Such warnings, however, seemed merely to stimulate ARA, for

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> "Assistance Under the Public Works Acceleration Act to Areas No Longer Burdened by Substantial Unemployment," report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, June 1964, p. 6.

the GAO reported, "the procedure whereby ARA is informed by the Department of Labor of impending termination of area eligibility appears to have been used to expedite processing of grants to applicants in such areas."<sup>5</sup>

In one instance GAO found projects totaling \$250,000 were cleared 1 full year after the Department of Labor notified ARA an area was no longer eligible. Thus, by such gross maladministration, projects were pushed through in ineligible areas, while other areas with genuine chronic unemployment—truly depressed areas—found their applications could not be acted on because, according to ARA, funds were no longer available.

Base conjecture, perhaps, but this would appear to have been an excellent method to get larger and larger appropriations; process the borderline cases as fast as possible, exhaust the original appropriation, and use the backlog of unfilled applications from the hard core depressed areas as justification for more money.

So it is, the friendly PAC report (that "careful and studied evaluation") could conclude, "because of its limitation in funds, time, and purpose, the accelerated public works program has succeeded only partly in meeting the public facilities needs in the eligible communities."

2. In its August 1964 report GAO found that at least \$7.4 million had been approved by ARA for "projects in seemingly nondepressed areas."<sup>6</sup> Four States whose employment situation was such as to not make them eligible for accelerated public works assistance according to criteria laid down by Congress and applied by the Department of Labor were given grants because ARA felt there should be at least one such project in every State of the Union regardless of how it measured up to depressed conditions elsewhere. Again this meant less money for the genuinely depressed areas.

3. In its October 1964 report, GAO found that \$26 million had been committed to areas after they had recovered from conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment.<sup>7</sup>

#### THE DETROIT STORY

The prize example in GAO's investigation is Detroit, Mich., where we learn:

"Through April 1, 1964, assistance of about \$44,700,000 under the Public Works Acceleration Act has been approved for the Detroit labor market area, although it appears that the area had recovered from its unemployment burdens at the time of the act was passed."<sup>8</sup>

By September 1962 Detroit's unemployment rate dropped below 6 percent and has continued to drop ever since.

We also learn that "exclusive of the State of Michigan, the Detroit area by itself had received approval for more accelerated public works assistance than 47 of the remaining 49 States."<sup>9</sup>

This included projects in such "pockets of poverty" as wealthy Grosse Pointe, Mich.

For reasons of its own, the U.S. Department of Labor would not finally delete the Detroit area from the list of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment until July 1963. Apparently ARA did not get the

message even then, for not until 7 months later, on February 20, 1964, did the Area Redevelopment Administration terminate the Detroit area's eligibility for Area Redevelopment Act or Accelerated Public Works assistance.

Thus, fully \$23,400,000 in projects was scheduled by ARA to start in October 1963 or later, although the Labor Department had declared the Detroit area as no longer eligible in July 1963.<sup>10</sup>

Yet even after the Detroit area was declared ineligible, the city remained eligible under an amendment to ARA regulations dated December 31, 1963, whereby municipalities with populations in 1960 of 250,000 or over could be designated redevelopment areas based on a correlation between the unemployment rate for cities as determined by the Bureau of the Census in 1960, and the area labor market unemployment rate in 1960.<sup>11</sup>

Thus the money continued to flow under this gimmick. The Department of Labor advised ARA in June 1964 that the city of Detroit's unemployment rate was at an 8-year low—3.3 percent in the "area," 4.6 percent in the "city"—and questioned the advisability of continuing Detroit's eligibility. In July 1964 the Department of Labor notified ARA that Detroit's eligibility should be ended. Thereupon ARA saluted smartly, took a reading on the upcoming elections, and roared into action: it announced that if the unemployment drop continued, it would terminate the eligibility of Detroit "on about January 15, 1965."<sup>12</sup>

#### A SUMMING UP

These General Accounting Office investigation reports of June, August, and October, 1964 indicate that at the very minimum about \$50 million of Accelerated Public Works funds were allowed by Area Redevelopment Administration to be expended contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the law. According to the watchdog GAO this meant:

"Numerous areas burdened by unemployment rates of 9 percent or more in February 1964, had applications for accelerated public works projects pending in June 1964. Many of these applications had been fully processed by CFA early in calendar year 1963. Accelerated public works grants to assist these needy areas apparently cannot be made because of insufficient funds."<sup>13</sup>

GAO cited as another specific example Wheeling, W. Va., which has suffered "an unemployment rate of between 6 percent and over 12 percent since September 1962." Said General Accounting Office:

"On June 18, 1964, CFA records showed that seven projects totaling \$3 million were pending for the Wheeling area. Some of these projects had been fully processed as early in the APW program as June 1963."<sup>14</sup>

West Virginia must certainly bear the dubious distinction of having been promised the most, most often, while delivered the least, most often.

One other point. The 1964-65 national debate topic for all colleges and universities was: "Resolved: That the Federal Government Should Establish a National Program of Public Works for the Unemployed." The timing of this national debate topic was especially significant in view of the enormous public works programs pushed by the Johnson administration. It is hoped that all these GAO reports were included in the recommended bibliography for college debate teams. An informed public is equally as important as an informed Congress on this leading question.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., pp. 23-24.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

This legislation means a great deal to sections of my State and to other areas of the country which fail to share fully in the great prosperity our country now enjoys. I believe the tools which it provides for State and local governments, development groups, and private industry are appropriate to the tasks at hand. The bill before us builds on the experience we have gained in the relatively short period of time the Federal Government has been in the business of doing something for the underdeveloped areas of our country.

I would be less than honest if I said that my support for this legislation was not predicated on the substantial benefits which the State of Arkansas has derived from its legislative forerunners—the Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act. Primarily because of the initiative of local leaders in Arkansas, my State has profited from both these programs to an exceptional degree. Twenty-one ARA projects involving \$5,691,850 in public facility loans and grants and \$10,507,770 in industrial loans attest to this fact. The result is well over 4,500 new jobs for Arkansas people.

But the usefulness of the ARA program in Arkansas should not be gaged solely by statistics. These payrolls and their multiplied effect on local economies have brought new hope, new enthusiasm, and even greater initiative to many communities in Arkansas. The ink was hardly dry on the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 when the first project—for the Nation as well as Arkansas—was approved. Through a combination loan and grant for an addition to the water system in Mountain Home, Ark., the Mar-Bax shirt factory was located in that community. Four years later the company employs in the neighborhood of 850 people and the city of Mountain Home has become one of the most successful communities of Arkansas. A large pharmaceutical factory has located in the community of its own initiative, without Federal assistance. Many other towns and cities in Arkansas have benefited from the ARA program and I mention Mountain Home merely because it is a classic example of the stimulating effect of proper Federal investments in local public facilities.

Most of the credit for these successes rests with the leaders in these towns and cities who have shown faith in the futures of their communities. I would like also to pay tribute to the ARA field coordinator in Arkansas, Mr. John Opitz, for the truly remarkable job he has done. Mr. Opitz has shown industry and imagination in working to build his native State and we are grateful to him for the tremendous amount he has accomplished.

Mr. President, there is no point in my reviewing in detail the provisions of this bill. This task has been admirably performed by the chairman of the Public Works Committee and the very able senior Senator from Illinois who is unquestionably the Senate's expert in this field. I think the Senate is indebted to both of them and the committees they represent for bringing to the floor a very good bill.

If our past experience in the field of economic development has taught us anything it is that there are no quick, simple, and effective solutions to the economic ills of the less developed areas of America. The bill before us largely deals with the physical aspects of economic growth—water and sewer facilities, roads, airports, industrial parks, and the like. Earlier this year the Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to more fully provide for the development of the most fundamental of economic resources—our people. The Hill-Burton program for hospital construction, the highway program, the Vocational Education Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act all contribute to the strength of our economy and each has special implications for sections which lack the revenues needed to provide the public services on which private investments depend.

By the enactment of the legislation before us the Congress can add another set of tools to the overall Federal-State-local effort to see that every able American has a skill to sell and a place to sell it.

I strongly support those provisions of this bill which generally modify and extend the ARA program. Several useful changes have been made. I am pleased that this legislation will permit the Secretary of Commerce to enlarge the Federal share of public facility grant projects to a Federal maximum of 80 percent of cost. If properly administered, as I am sure it will be, this provision will mean the difference between life and death for many small communities which did not share in the benefits of the accelerated public works and ARA programs because of their inability to come up with the local matching funds.

This bill provides a solution to one problem which inhibited the ARA program. On several Arkansas projects the companies planning a new plant or an expansion found themselves hard pressed for working capital. The ARA was precluded from making working capital loans. This new legislation will permit Federal guarantees of working capital loans to companies offering new employment in eligible areas. I strongly support this provision.

I am very pleased that title V of the bill authorizes the creation and funding of regional action planning commissions. When the Appalachian regional development bill was considered, I urged the Public Works Committee to include in it funds for further regional planning through Federal-State cooperation and particularly to provide for the creation of a development program for the Ozark mountain region of Arkansas, Oklahoma,

and Missouri. Title V of the pending bill is the fulfillment of a commitment made at that time to satisfy this appeal in separate legislation.

When the pending bill was considered by the committee this year, I was privileged to testify on the prospects for an Ozark regional commission. Testimony was also received from Dr. John Peterson, of the University of Arkansas, and representatives of the States of Oklahoma and Missouri in support of this proposal. I believe the record clearly establishes the general economic condition of this region and provides a base from which a regional action planning commission can begin its work.

The bill does not specify the regions for which commissions will be organized. Rather authority is vested in the Secretary of Commerce to designate such regions in which economic growth can be fostered by this device and which meet the general criteria set forth in section 501. I believe this is a wise course. Those of us who have worked for the creation of an Ozarks commission have not tried to say that "this county is in" or "that county is out." These decisions should be left to the Governors and the Secretary—backed up by sound economic counsel at all levels.

Mr. President, I hope that once this bill is enacted the Secretary will move promptly to develop a regional commission for the Ozarks by the initiation of discussions with the Governors of the States involved. He will find complete cooperation at the State and local levels. It is appropriate to point out that the Arkansas and Oklahoma State Legislatures have both adopted resolutions supporting this concept.

Mr. President, the Public Works and Economic Development Act holds great promise for the Ozarks region, for Arkansas and for less than prosperous areas throughout the country. In truth, this bill is designed to bolster our overall economy which in the final analysis is no stronger than its weakest links. I hope the Senate will give this legislation a substantial vote of approval.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I cannot support S. 1648, the so-called Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Under this proposed act, which we are told is patterned after the Appalachia program, the Department of Commerce would inherit and be directed to expand the ill-fated and much discredited area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs. If we have learned anything from our experience with area redevelopment and accelerated public works, we know that they simply have not worked. We have seen Government-subsidized competition drive out legitimate business, inflated claims of creating new jobs which have never materialized, political juggling with public funds, vast numbers of highly paid Government officials running about the country accomplishing little, and a general waste of your tax money and mine.

Now it is proposed to regroup these two dubious programs under a different name, pattern them after the Appalachia program, which has not yet even tested its bureaucratic wings, and expand the entire pottage.

ARA and APW were just a drop in the bucket compared to this proposed program. This bill would authorize the expenditure of \$2 billion over the next 5 years, just under title I alone. It also would authorize the expenditure of \$265 million per year indefinitely. Thus, the program will cost about \$3.5 billion over the first 5 years and after that it is anyone's guess. But even these figures do not accurately measure the entire cost of this program because the administrative expenses are not included in the bill. These expenses will be picked up by the Department of Commerce through the regular appropriation process. The Committee on Public Works in its report gives us an indication of its thinking on administration of the act on pages 18 and 19. There the committee proposes that the Department of Commerce create a new Assistant Secretary whose sole function would be to assist the Secretary in the administration of this act. The committee also said and I quote:

The committee further is concerned that sufficient supergrades be allotted for the conduct of this program. The committee did not specifically designate the number in the bill but it would be considered inadequate if less than 20 supergrades were assigned to the administration of this program.

This sounds like an open invitation for the administrators of this program to go into competition with the poverty program to see who can hire the most highly paid administrators.

Many of the defects of this bill have already been pointed out in the process of debate. However, a few of these certainly bear repetition and emphasis. For example, there is a provision in the bill authorizing loans with a 2-percent interest subsidy. As I pointed out in the debate, it is entirely possible that, under this provision, one company could come into a depressed area and receive a subsidized interest rate and another company in competition with that company go into another depressed area and not receive a subsidy.

Section 203 establishes an economic development revolving fund to be available for loan assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403. Our past experiences with revolving funds of this nature have been quite unsatisfactory. It has always served as a good coverup as to just how much is being spent on a particular program.

Unlike the Area Redevelopment Act, this bill sets up only an annual rather than monthly review of eligible areas. But the bill does not even mention when the first such annual review shall take place. There is a suggestion made in the committee report but this is certainly not binding on anyone. Nor does the bill provide for the termination of applications after an area becomes ineligible for assistance. This is certainly a loose way to write a law for such a gigantic program.

Mr. President, many of the points that I have covered have been the subjects of reports issued by the Comptroller General over the past several years. His informative and useful report on this bill is contained in the supplemental views at the end of the committee report. And yet the majority report of the Committee on Public Works dealt at great length with refuting or attempting to discredit the Comptroller General's recommendations. As we all know, the Comptroller General, as the head of the General Accounting Office, is an arm of Congress. He is often referred to as the "watchdog of Congress." But what good can a "congressional watchdog" accomplish if we insist on muzzling him at every turn?

Mr. President, this bill is simply a rehash on a grand scale of two of the most discredited programs ever turned out by Congress. The taxpayers of this country do not need and certainly do not deserve another program enlarging the same defects in two such failures.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, we in New Mexico and in the United States have come a long way from the conditions which caused Anatole France to say that, "The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread." But we have not yet come far enough. And the American dream of real individual dignity and real equality of opportunity would be closer to complete fulfillment upon S. 1648—the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—becoming law.

This bill is of great importance to New Mexico, where drought, depressed commodity prices, and unemployment have combined to render local communities unable to make the public improvements which are essential to the restoration of a healthy and viable economy.

S. 1648 combines the best features of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act which have proved their worth to New Mexico. In addition, this bill provides for regional development as outlined in legislation enacted this year for the Appalachian region.

Two constructive amendments were written into the bill before the Senate Public Works Committee acted.

One amendment will insure that five additional Indian reservations in New Mexico, as well as other smaller communities throughout the United States, will be eligible for economic aid under the act. Originally, the benefits were limited to areas of 1,500 or more population. That would have eliminated the Jemez, Jicarilla, Mescalero, Ramah, and Santo Domingo reservations in New Mexico. But, with the generous cooperation of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate Public Works Committee, I was successful in having the bill amended to lower the population figure to 1,000. This important amendment will bring these five reservations, and many other smaller communities elsewhere in the country, within the benefits of the law.

We were also successful in increasing the first year's funding from \$250 million to \$400 million for grants to help local governments construct essential public works.

In addition to the \$400 million which will be available for public works grants, the bill provides for \$170 million in loans to poverty stricken areas to assist in development of plants and facilities which will create employment.

Earlier this session, Senator Moss and I introduced an Appalachia-type bill to develop the Four Corners area of New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, and Colorado. S. 1648 replaces our bill by providing for larger scale regional development of all areas where economics and geography indicate that an interstate approach is a sound one.

The Four Corners region is ideally adaptable to the regional approach. This high plateau country, which is rich in natural beauty and natural resources, is seriously hampered by an inadequate road system.

The area is sparsely populated and lacks the assets to develop the road system so vitally needed. By opening this area through an adequate highway system, many new job opportunities would be created and the overall economy of the area would be vastly improved.

Economic growth and development of the Four Corners in northern New Mexico will do much to relieve the other economic ills of New Mexico, as well as Arizona, Colorado, and Utah. New Mexico borders on other areas in these three States which together comprise one of the largest land masses of chronic unemployment and underemployment in the United States.

Many towns and cities in New Mexico have indicated the extreme need which exists for grants for public works and development facilities.

A great need exists throughout the country and in much of New Mexico for community-type facilities ranging from water projects to youth and aged recreation centers, libraries, gas systems, and the entire range of community facilities necessary to make life more decent and dignified in the smaller communities of the areas of unemployment and underemployment.

Indian tribes in New Mexico on the Acoma, Isleta, Laguna, Jemez, Jicarilla, Mescalero, Ramah, Santo Domingo, Zuni, Santa Clara, and Navajo Reservations, no less than other disadvantaged New Mexicans, suffer from substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment.

Federal financial assistance, including grants for the development of reservation and community facilities, establishing of industries and enterprises, particularly where there are self-help features, should do much to alleviate poverty and to help the people become self-sufficient. It will, indeed, as the bill states, "enable such areas to help themselves achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local conditions."

We wholeheartedly support the view that such assistance should be preceded

by and be consistent with sound, long-range economic planning and that under the provisions of this act new employment opportunities would be created by developing and expanding new and existing public works and other facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

ALASKA INDIANS AND ESKIMOS WILL BE HELPED  
BY S. 1648, THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we are about to vote on S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This bill will help us wage a more aggressive war against domestic poverty. I hope this proposed legislation will be enthusiastically endorsed by the Congress and sent to the President promptly. We need the tools provided by S. 1648.

The Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., through its executive director, William Byler, communicated with the Alaska congressional delegation for clarification of the population requirement in title IV of S. 1648. The association wanted to make certain that the benefits of S. 1648 would apply to the scattered Indian and Eskimo villages in Alaska. The Senate report on the bill specified:

Areas of less than 1,500 population shall not be eligible for designation under this program except in the case of Indian areas, which may be considered for designation if they have a population of 1,000 or more persons.

It is expected, however, that the Secretary would not consider for designation several separated or widely scattered very small Indian areas that in total would meet the 1,000 persons population requirement.

The association pointed out in its May 21, 1965, letter:

If the 1,000 persons population requirement is applied to native villages, then clearly only a very few will qualify for designation under this program.

The bill clearly specifies that the Secretary of Labor shall designate as redevelopment areas those with substantial and persistent unemployment or those where the loss of industry for reasons of removal, curtailment, or closing shall cause unusual and abrupt rises in unemployment.

The State of Alaska, with the exception of Juneau and its immediate vicinity is designated by the Area Redevelopment Administration as a depressed area. Conditions have not arisen to change the economic picture of the State. Most Alaskan Indian and Eskimo villages are in election districts which qualify for area and district eligibility as redevelopment areas.

To clarify the situation I asked the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to comment on the population requirement in title IV of S. 1648, area of district eligibility for redevelopment areas. Chairman McNAMARA concluded that the population limitation of 1,500 applies to the smallest area of eligibility which in



the case of Alaska is the election district. Thus, Indian and Eskimo villages located within an election district would be qualified.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter sent to me on May 21, 1965, by the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., my letter of May 24, 1965, to the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and the chairman's response of May 26, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this time, to dispel any doubts as to the eligibility of the Alaskan Indian and Eskimo villages.

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

ASSOCIATION ON AMERICAN  
INDIAN AFFAIRS, INC.,  
New York, N.Y., May 21, 1965.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Knowing of your vigorous support for S. 1648 and your strong interest in the welfare of Alaska's native communities, I am writing you to seek clarification of the population requirement in title IV of the bill.

Senate Report No. 193 (p. 16) states:

"Areas of less than 1,500 population shall not be eligible for designation under this program, except in the case of Indian areas which may be considered for designation if they have a population of 1,000 or more persons. It is expected, however, that the Secretary would not consider for designation several separated or widely scattered very small Indian areas that in total would meet the 1,000 persons population requirement."

We are concerned that the benefits of this legislation be extended to the many scattered native villages. If the 1,000 persons population requirement is applied to native villages, then clearly only a very few will qualify for designation under this program.

Is it your understanding that, the above quoted language notwithstanding, scattered native villages with populations less than 1,000 persons will qualify for assistance under the terms of the legislation?

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BYLER,  
Executive Director.

MAY 24, 1965.

HON. PAT McNAMARA,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public  
Works, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. seeks clarification of the population requirement in Title IV: Area of District Eligibility for Redevelopment Areas, of S. 1648, as interpreted in Report 193, page 16, which states:

"Areas of less than 1,500 population shall not be eligible for designation under this program except in the case of Indian areas, which may be considered for designation if they have a population of 1,000 or more persons.

"It is expected, however, that the Secretary would not consider for designation several separated or widely scattered very small Indian areas that in total would meet the 1,000 persons population requirement."

The bill clearly specifies that the Secretary of Labor shall designate as redevelopment areas those with substantial and persistent unemployment or those where the loss of industry for reasons of removal, curtailment or closing shall cause unusual and abrupt rises in unemployment.

The State of Alaska, with the exception of Juneau and its immediate vicinity is des-

ignated by the Area Redevelopment Administration as a depressed area and conditions have not arisen to change the economy of the State.

Most Alaskan Indian and Eskimo villages are in election districts which qualify for area and district eligibility as redevelopment areas. I will appreciate your clarifying this matter for the members of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. A copy of the letter I received from Executive Director William Byler is enclosed.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,  
May 26, 1965.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of May 24 requesting clarification of the population requirement in title IV of S. 1648 with specific reference to the limitation on Indian areas.

The population limitation of 1,500 applies to the smallest area of eligibility which, in the case of Alaska, would be the election districts, or a labor market area defined by the Secretary of Labor.

The exception to this is where there is an Indian area of at least 1,000 population which is not within an area designated and eligible for aid but which otherwise meets the eligibility requirements.

It should be understood that Indian areas of less than 1,000 population located within otherwise designated areas are eligible for specific aid, and may themselves be applicants for such aid.

The report language to which you refer was so stated so as to preclude from designation, Indian areas of less than 1,000 population scattered over a wide geographic area. It would be considered illogical to group such small areas, in order to come within the 1,000 limitation.

Unless the election districts to which you refer are themselves less than 1,500 in total population, those Indian and Eskimo villages located within them would be qualified.

Sincerely,

PAT McNAMARA,  
Chairman.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state out of whose time the quorum call is to come?

Mr. McNAMARA. I ask unanimous consent that it be charged to neither side.

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

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 quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS UNTIL 2 O'CLOCK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m.

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

(Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p.m. today.)

At 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BASS in the chair).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From which side will the time necessary for the quorum call be taken?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call not be charged against any Senator.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on Wednesday last I proposed five amendments to S. 1648, all amendments having the objective of insuring the maximum involvement and participation of local government in the program provided by this legislation. It seemed to me that these amendments were in keeping with the basic principles of the program, as outlined by President Johnson in his message on area and regional economic development. In that message he stated that no economic development district would be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated, no plan would be approved unless it has the approval of State and local authorities.

I realized that even without my amendments many of the economic development programs would be developed by "economic planning and development groups" composed of, or responsible to, the elected officials of units of general local government. I also realized that in some areas constitutional and statutory limitations would preclude local officials from undertaking these proposed activities. Furthermore, in other areas the officials may demonstrate a complete refusal or a reluctance to provide the necessary leadership. These limitations of our local governments have been adequately recognized in the committee reported bill. But I felt that we have failed to provide sufficient congressional emphasis on the positive role of local government, specifically in the development and implementation of the economic development programs themselves.

This should be done by—

First. Encouraging and giving preference to economic planning and development groups, composed of elected officials of units of general local government within whose jurisdiction such groups are authorized to plan an economic development program.

Second. Where the appropriate units of general local government are not represented on the economic planning and development group the proposed economic development program should be submitted to them for their review and comment and consideration of such comment by the economic development and planning group prior to the formal submission of the program.

This is not a requirement for the formal approval or rejection of the local governments, rather a procedure to assure their awareness and participation in a program which is designed to utilize

the combined resources of an area or district. To prevent unwarranted delays, such comments must be made within 60 days, otherwise the requirement would be waived.

This additional effort appears to me not excessive. It would provide a one-time requirement for a program with long-range objectives and commitments. Any initial delays created by these amendments would be more than compensated for in the program's actual implementation.

In addition, these requirements would assist in the coordination and correlation of the economic development program with the existing programs and plans of the constituent local governments. It would be these local governments who will continue to have the responsibility of zoning, transportation planning and a host of other governmental functions which are the ingredients of a successful economic development program. Included within the resources of local government are the matching funds called for in title I of the bill.

There is another potential of this legislation which should not be overlooked and my amendments were designed greatly to aid in its realization. That is with respect to the economic development district. It is not only in the area of economic development that we can gain by having our local governments working together to solve common problems, but it is also true in such areas as health, water and air pollution, roads and highways, education, planning, and so forth. By encouraging our local governments to plan and work together in the field of economic development we can assist in providing the framework for other forms of increased cooperation. This cooperation will be slow to come, if at all, if the elected officials of the local governments are not an integral part of the leadership of any such effort.

It could be argued that the important role of local government is inherent in the program and need not be spelled out in legislative language. To me, their role is too vital for it to be assumed.

Mr. President, my concern of this situation is shared by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, all of whom support these amendments.

In the intervening time since Wednesday of last week I have spent some time consulting with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and with others. The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is one of the principal sponsors of S. 1648 and has been a leader in its development and consideration. Based on our discussions, I have modified my amendments. Therefore, I shall not call up the printed amendments at the desk but in their stead I offer four revised amendments. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc, that a full reading of each be dispensed with, and that I be permitted to explain each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair).

Without objection, the amendments will be received and considered en bloc; and, without objection, reading of the amendments will be waived.

The amendments offered by Mr. Moss are as follows:

On page 31, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"(3) to encourage participation by appropriate local governmental authorities in such economic development districts."

On page 7, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"(f) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section."

On page 10, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(e) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section."

On page 32, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(f) For the purpose of this Act the term 'local government' means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State."

On page 32, line 11, strike "(f)" and insert "(g)" before the word "There".

On page 32, line 15, strike "(g)" and insert "(h)" before the word "In".

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the amendments I offer I shall try to relate to the bill. The amendment would come under title I of the bill, which refers to grants for public works and development facilities. At the end of section 101 of title I the amendment would add an additional paragraph to be styled as paragraph (f), and would read as follows:

The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local government authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section.

I would welcome at any point any comment the Senator from Maine or any other member of the committee might care to make on any of the amendments.

The second amendment would be inserted on page 10 of the bill. This is under title II, which is entitled "Other Financial Assistance. Public Works and Development Facility Loans."

On page 10, between lines 18 and 19, which is at the close of section 201, would be added a new paragraph styled paragraph (e), which would read:

The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which will assure that appropriate local governmental authorities have been given a reasonable opportunity to review and comment upon proposed projects under this section.

It will be recognized at once that the language is similar in both amendments, one applying to title II and the other applying to title I, both having the same purpose.

Since the term "local governmental authorities" has been used in both amendments, and this term appears else-

where in the bill, it is proposed, in the third amendment which I now offer, that on page 32, between lines 10 and 11, subsection (f) be inserted, which would read:

For the purpose of this Act the term "local government" means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

By reason of inserting paragraph (f), the remaining subparagraphs in this particular section would have to be redesignated—(f) to (g), and (g) to (h).

The fourth amendment would be inserted on page 31, between lines 17 and 18. It would be a paragraph (3) subdivision of paragraph (b), coming under the Economic Development District provision. This subparagraph (3) would read as follows:

To encourage participation by appropriate local governmental authorities in such economic development districts.

This whole section is designed to define and designate the economic development districts which would approve the overall economic development programs.

The Secretary would be required to invite the States to draw up proposed district boundaries, to cooperate with the States in several ways, and to encourage participation by appropriate local governments in such economic development districts.

It is felt that these amendments would, by writing into the legislation these requirements for contact with and comment by local governmental units, bring the local governmental entities into the program. It is highly important that the local people be consulted and be concerned. As I have already said, many of the requirements of Government that surround the development of a program of this sort already lie with the local districts, such as zoning, roads, highways, water supply, and other items that are of great importance in planning a development district.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The purpose of the Senator from Utah is one in which I think most, if not all, members of the committee would concur. I should like to point out that these amendments to S. 1648 constitute a further implementation of a purpose which was stated in the committee report, page 16, as follows:

*Local approval of development districts*

Before the Secretary approves the establishment of any economic development district as provided under section 403, which in most cases will consist of several counties, municipalities, or other political jurisdictions, steps should be taken to obtain concurrence of the appropriate local governmental authorities in the counties, municipalities, or other political jurisdictions when such jurisdictions are wholly within the proposed economic development district.

The first two amendments of the Senator from Utah are to the public works section of the bill. As I understand them, they would require that an application made by a private or a public nonprofit organization or association

representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, and covering a public works project under the bill, should pass through the appropriate governmental authority for review and comment.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. This is highly proper, desirable, and indeed necessary, if we are to get a development program underway which truly reflects local desires, local hopes, and local sentiment. So far as I am concerned, these two amendments, dealing with the public works section of the bill, are wholly acceptable.

The third amendment, which deals with the economic development district provision of the bill, is also one that I find acceptable. The Senator's purpose is that when an economic development district is defined, it is likely to include several units of local government, ranging from counties on down. It is the Senator's desire that representatives of the governments involved be brought into the process by which designation would be achieved, and also into the process which would develop an overall economic development program for the area.

The difficulty in dealing with this amendment is that situations vary in different parts of the country. For example, Aroostook County, Maine, which is an eligible area under the existing Redevelopment Act, is 1 county involving 93 towns, each of which is a unit of local government. This is a peculiarity, perhaps, of New England, where the town has been the foundation of local government from the beginning.

An area similar in size, involving a similar number of people, in the part of the country from which the Senator from Utah comes, may involve only two or three governmental units. So there would be the problem of fewer governmental units than exist in New England. Therefore, what the Senator from Utah and I have tried to devise is compromise language which would make it possible to work in both situations, and still insure that local units of government would be encouraged to participate in the implementation of this provision of the act.

Do I correctly understand the Senator's purpose?

Mr. MOSS. Yes. I thank the Senator from Maine for his comments. He has analyzed the amendments and has stated the purpose of offering them at this time. It was found, when we began to discuss the amendments I submitted last week, that there was such a wide variation of local governmental organization in different parts of the United States that perhaps my previous amendments were too broad. I should say that diversity is one of our strengths in this country, and we must recognize it and deal with it. We must make certain at the Federal level, when we begin to deal with local areas, that we take into account the variances that exist in our local governmental organization. But the Senator from Maine is entirely correct in saying that the objective of the amendments is to involve, in planning stages, the local authorities—the towns, the counties, and the cities—where the various activities are to be conducted,

not only to be in close communication, but also to bring forth the strength of local government.

In some instances, where there are to be matching funds, it is of paramount importance that we begin, at the start, with the local authorities, who have the control of local taxing power and local funds.

As I indicated, many governmental activities are controlled by local authorities—zoning, the providing of facilities, roads, water, and so on. These governmental activities ought to be involved and recognized so that we do not create a development district or finance any kind of project that would be at cross purposes or in competition with the appropriate local governmental authority, or not recognized by it.

In my discussions with various county officials—and I was a county official before I became a U.S. Senator—I found that there was a great desire to cooperate with these types of programs. At least, those with whom I have talked welcomed the program. The predecessor of this bill has been used very widely and

effectively in my State. Our towns and counties desire that the program continue. They want to contribute to the program and be a part of it.

That was another reason for writing the requirement into the legislation that the appropriate local authorities not only be advised of proposed projects, but also be consulted and asked for their comments so that they may participate in the projects from the beginning.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Utah has stated what we each have in mind.

With reference to the arguments offered, I believe that it would be useful to have printed at this point in the RECORD—and I ask unanimous consent that this may be done—two tabulations which indicate the number of local governments that could be involved in some potential groupings of counties under the bill. This indicates the problem that would be created by a multiplicity of governmental units.

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

#### Local governments

##### VERMONT

County	Total (including county)	Municipalities	Townships	School districts	Special districts
Caledonia	37	6	17	2	11
Essex	17	1	13		2
Orleans	34	9	18	4	2
Total	88	16	48	6	15

##### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Coos	48	1	20	20	6
Carroll	52		18	17	16
Grafton	89	1	37	39	11
Total	189	2	75	76	33

##### OREGON

Clatsop	40	6		11	22
Tillamook	51			7	36
Lincoln	38	7		1	29
Cane	70	9		18	42
Benton	23	3		12	7
Linn	78	11		47	19
Polk	25	4		10	10
Marion	93	18		42	32
Yamhill	41	10		13	17
Total	459	75		161	214

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, notwithstanding that problem, we feel that the Administrator and the Secretary should use their discretion to do everything possible under the regulations to encourage the participation of appropriate local governments.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am sure that we are in agreement on that. The amendments are offered so that there would be a large involvement of appropriate local authorities from the beginning of any planning or action. In this way, there would not be misunderstandings at a later point.

At this time, I send the amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

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

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what effect would the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah have on bringing the establishment of these regions in line with the Appalachian region? As I understand, under the Appalachian program, we must have full cooperation with the local governmental authorities.

Is it the purpose of the amendments to place the regions that would be created under this bill in the same category as Appalachia?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I do not believe that the concept of the economic development district, which is a part of this bill, was the basic concept of the Appalachian bill.

The Appalachian program is a multi-State regional project, for which Congress approved an overall program. The economic development district proposed in S. 1648, in most instances, would involve probably a few counties, or a large number of smaller local units of government, such as towns and cities. However, it is not the regional concept, as in the Appalachia bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. However, under the Appalachian program, an entire State, or two States, may cooperate, particularly in roadbuilding or other development projects of common interest. Certain procedures are set out to accomplish these purposes under the Appalachian program.

Are those procedures of the Appalachian program the same as those provided to carry on programs in the regional areas of the country that would be covered by this bill? As I recall, when the debate was held on the Appalachian program, many Senators desired to provide assistance for their own area. The proponents of the Appalachian bill said: "Do not offer your amendments now. Later we will provide assistance for your States under another program."

I believe that this bill is an answer to Senators who desired to participate in the Appalachian program.

How does the procedure under the Appalachia program differ from what the Senator from Utah now proposes?

Mr. MUSKIE. First of all, the Appalachian program is a multi-State program. This development district program concept is not primarily a multi-State proposal. All that S. 1648 would do with respect to the formation of regional commissions similar to those established under the Appalachian program would be to authorize the establishment of regional commissions to study the possibility of establishing programs in the multi-State regions.

In my own State of Maine, we could, if we were to meet the established criteria, form economic development districts wholly within the State of Maine. That would be true in the State of Louisiana or in the State of Utah. Those districts would involve combinations of counties and towns, rather than combinations of States.

I believe that this same approach is possible under the Appalachian program in individual States—an economic development district.

This would be wholly within one State, or a few adjacent counties in two States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could it be on a larger basis?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, this bill would permit the establishment of a number of development districts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the procedure in handling the money, if we were to create the development districts that we are now discussing, be the same as under the Appalachian program?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I hesitate to offer an answer that would constitute an interpretation of the Appalachian program. However, I should say that it is the intent of both programs to encourage the participation of appropriate local units of government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, would States in the Appalachian region be able to obtain funds under the program that would be established by the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct. The Appalachian areas would not be excluded from participation under the bill. They would be covered by the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, States which are participating in the Appalachian program would gain extra benefits to the extent of more than a billion dollars and be eligible for this program also?

Mr. MUSKIE. Those areas of Appalachia which could establish eligibility under the criteria of this bill would be eligible for the type of assistance authorized by S. 1648.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was trying to find out what the difference was between the Appalachia program and the program we are now considering, particularly in the establishments of regions that have been the subject of discussion on the Senate floor today.

Mr. MUSKIE. I notice the Senator from West Virginia is present. I would like to have him correct me if I am wrong with reference to the eligibility for inclusion in the Appalachian program, it was Congress which determined the geographic boundaries of the Appalachian region, so that no finding of eligibility for assistance can be made administratively. In contrast, under this bill, Congress would establish the criteria for eligibility. The actual designation of eligibility would be made by the Secretary under the guidelines in the bill. So not all areas included in the Appalachia program would necessarily be eligible under this program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the statement that the bill authorizes an Appalachia program for other regions of the country really is not correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. I refer the Senator to title V of the bill. Title V, beginning on page 32 of the bill, authorizes the Secretary to designate appropriate economic development regions within the United States with the concurrence of the States. This title undertakes to create authority for the establishment in other parts of the country of development regions similar to Appalachia.

This measure would authorize regional planning programs. So to that extent the bill does carry out the Appalachia concept if other regions are qualified.

Mr. ELLENDER. And notwithstanding the fact that we are creating this authority to establish regions similar to the Appalachia region, areas within Appalachia will still be able to obtain funds under this program?

Mr. MUSKIE. This will be true also of the other regions which might be established similar to Appalachia. Those regions can, under this bill, take advantage of these benefits and at the same time begin the process of creating special regional programs for those parts of the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. But those regions will not be able to obtain funds from the Appalachia program.

Mr. MUSKIE. No; and they will not get any funds unless and until they have

established an Appalachia type program for their region which has been specially authorized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose, for example, there had been established an Appalachia type regional commission in the States of Indiana and Illinois. Would those two States be able to obtain money authorized for the Appalachia region?

Mr. MUSKIE. No; they would have to come to Congress for the approval of a similar type of program for that region.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could it be done under this act, without having to come back to Congress?

Mr. MUSKIE. The process set up in title V of S. 1648 would authorize the designation of economic development regions which would have the power under the terms of the bill to research and study their programs and submit plans for their development. When such plans are developed, they must come to Congress, or the administration must submit to Congress Appalachia-type programs for the various regions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it be necessary for us to provide additional appropriations or authorizations?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. We would be premature in providing them now, because as yet there are no plans.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. We were talking about the kind of economic development which is usually within one State. Then we come to the title V, which includes regions in more than one State. Title V is a total planning process. It has nothing to do with putting the program into action, but planning. Therefore, a State or region under title V would have to go back to Congress for appropriations before anything could be done under title V of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. So if these regions are created, they will again come back to Congress and attempt to obtain an authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is not a question to which we can answer precisely "Yes" or "No." Direct loans for public works and supplementary grants for public works are contained in S. 1648. If a county or region should qualify for such money under this program, it would not be barred from this assistance simply because it was also included within a special regional program.

Northern New England, which conceivably could be made an Appalachian-type region, could obtain exactly the same kind of benefit as the Appalachian region would get.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there may not be any need to develop the region.

Mr. MUSKIE. The fundamental purpose of the Appalachia region bill is to develop a particular region. The public works projects covered by S. 1648 are more local in nature.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We cannot create a program of development highways, as envisioned under the Appalachia pro-

gram, on a county-by-county basis. The Appalachia bill is focused upon the problem of regional transportation, recognizing that some areas are, to a degree, isolated, and it was designed to break down those barriers. In Appalachia it was thought that businesses and economic progress could not be generated adequately without a sound transportation system. With reference to the Senator's argument, I think one program complements the other, because in this instance we shall be providing public works to a degree and providing business loans for those who need to develop their areas. In the case of Appalachia, the program was primarily a development of the transport system.

I believe that is a fair analysis.

Mr. MUSKIE. Nevertheless, it may be possible, under this bill, to build a limited developmental road within the confines of a State or economic development district. The Secretary of Commerce agreed that this was a part of the concept. But when we speak of a multi-State development highway program, that would be developed as a regional program under a special authorization for that region.

There may be other projects in other regions of the country that could be more important at this time than developmental highways. We do not foreclose the development of any kind of regional project in this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The region would have to document its case. They have to prove it; is that not true?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. What concerns me, and the reason I am asking these questions, is that under the Appalachia program we are bound to spend—as I remember—a figure of \$1 billion and \$60 million.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is the total authorization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over 5 years?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is the Senator from Louisiana directing his question to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Is it \$1.06 billion over a 5-year period?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The sum of \$840 million is provided for the regional developmental highway system. That has to be taken out of the \$1.06 billion total authorization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Notwithstanding the spending of \$840 million for roads, do I correctly understand that the States in the Appalachian region could come in and get more money for roads within their own boundaries under title I?

Mr. MUSKIE. My impression is that the States within the Appalachian region and the communities within those States are eligible, under the Appalachia program, for benefits which are similar to these. If they establish eligibility under the Appalachia program, they cannot at the same time, for the same project—let me repeat that—the same project—and for the same purposes, establish eligibility and obtain the benefits which would be provided under the pending bill. In other words, they can-

not have assistance from both for the same project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but—

Mr. MUSKIE. If the community is depressed, it cannot first go to the Appalachia Administrator and have its program underwritten by that Administrator, and then take the exact same project to the Secretary of Commerce and, under the pending bill, obtain additional grants.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to respond to the Senator from Louisiana, speaking with respect to the points he has raised. I believe that there is a distinct difference between the purposes of the Appalachia program and the pending bill, at least in regard to titles I and II. I believe that the distinction, which has been alluded to by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], is this: The Appalachia bill looks toward the basic development of regions including developmental highways, multicounty hospitals, timber management, and construction of facilities to encourage investment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Schools?

Mr. COOPER. No schools, other than vocational training, the basic kind of development of a whole region is the Appalachian approach.

The emphasis of titles I and II of the proposed legislation is to direct funds toward community development and industrial facilities which will provide long-term employment. In the Appalachia bill no funds are made available to a State or subdivision of a State or to any nonprofit organization for commercial or industrial plants.

To me, that is the distinction between the Appalachia bill and the pending bill. The money will be spent in an attempt to encourage either the location or expansion of plants—not relocation—along with the generation of local investment in commercial and industrial plants within a county or subdivision of a State or an area. That is the distinction.

I believe that the other question the Senator from Louisiana raised, concerning the building of roads under Appalachia, was whether a State could come to the Commerce Department and secure funds to build roads under the pending bill.

If a county, or three counties, in an Appalachian area should make application under the pending bill for funds to locate or build an industrial or commercial plant in that area, and if it were shown that it would be necessary to build a quarter-mile or half-mile length of road, or a road 100 yards long, as an access road to that plant, then it could secure funds under the legislation enacted, provided for in the Appalachia bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that.

Mr. COOPER. I hope I have made it clear.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator stated the items that could be eligible under Appalachia, and I said schools, I had in mind, at that point, vocational schools.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. We can spend quite a bit of money under Appalachia on vocational schools.

Mr. COOPER. For vocational schools; the Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. To go back to the question of creating regions—if, as, and when the regions are created throughout the country on a basis similar to Appalachia—they then come back to Congress for further authorization; is that not correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. They would have to obtain a special authorization from Congress for anything more than planning funds and technical assistance.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, they would have to make a case, as was done for Appalachia?

Mr. MUSKIE. Exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the amount of money which may be authorized in the future for the many regional areas which may be created is somewhat indefinite; it could amount to a large sum, could it not?

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot imagine that Congress would let it go into a large figure—at least not without full discussion and debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Appalachian region includes certain areas in West Virginia and seven or eight other States. The amount authorized is \$1,060 million. Under title I of the pending bill for public works facilities and grants, \$400 million a year would be authorized for 5 years, or \$2 billion over that period. Then, as I understand, under title II, title III, title IV, and title V, the moneys provided are for no specific time, but would remain available indefinitely.

Mr. MUSKIE. Titles II and III have been limited, under an amendment adopted last week, to 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not aware of that.

Mr. MUSKIE. The major sections of the bill are now under a 5-year limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. So under the pending bill, the major authorizations are limited to 5 years. I shall not ask any more questions on that point, because I am glad that that was done. The expenditure of as much as \$665 million, as I remember it, with an indefinite time limitation in the authorization, was, I thought, very unwise.

Mr. MUSKIE. I know. The Senator expressed that concern the other day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. His concern had something to do with adoption of the amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason I am asking these questions is that I believe the bill as a whole to be a good bill, if properly administered. The only point I wish to go into again concerns that portion of the bill which permits a community to obtain money from several sources, for example, to build hospitals.

I do not know what the committee had in mind in permitting a community to obtain money under this legislation, while under the Hill-Burton Act as much as 80 percent of the construction cost can already be made available.

I am not clear about the necessity for a community to be able to obtain funds for up to 50 percent of the cost of a project under one law, and then, under the pending bill, be entitled to obtain 30 percent more. Why make it possible for that community to obtain 80 percent from two sources, when it could obtain 80 percent from one source?

I should like to know the reason for the committee's action. I do not yet see the necessity for tying in any Hill-Burton Act funds. The Hill-Burton Act has been operating very well, so far as I know, and I am very proud of the part that I played as a coauthor of it. This bill is making it possible for funds to be derived from two sources for one project. That question is something that I believe needs a little study. I believe that the possibility of obtaining money from any other source than the Hill-Burton Act should be reconsidered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Let me explain what I apparently failed to explain previously, and the reasons behind our action. In the first place, a public works program under the pending bill must be related to the long-range economic development prospects of a community. This is not a general supplement to any existing grant-in-aid program. Furthermore, it is limited to areas of high unemployment or low income.

To the extent that existing grant-in-aid programs may be useful in aiding the community develop those long-run economic development prospects, it can be eligible under the bill.

I am trying to find the language in the bill which is applicable.

Mr. ELLENDER. While the Senator is looking for the section of the bill he is discussing, I should like to say that in the past, Congress has been very liberal in providing funds for use by certain localities in connection with the construction of hospitals. That program has worked very well. I fear that if we permit communities to obtain funds from sources other than the Hill-Burton Act, we shall make it possible to have them get 30 or 40 percent of the money from the Hill-Burton Act, and entice them to get the rest of it from funds to be obtained under the pending bill. I believe that whatever money is provided in the pending bill, particularly under title I, should be used to the fullest extent to provide sewage facilities, good water, and things of that kind, instead of mixing it all in with hospital construction.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not believe the testimony that was presented to us in committee indicated any great intent to supplement hospital programs. The bill does not prohibit doing what the Senator would visualize so far as hospital construction is concerned. However,

there is no indication that this would be a great part of the program. It may be that in an isolated area, where it is not possible to raise the necessary funds locally under the Hill-Burton Act, the area or community would be able to get money under the pending bill. It would be able to get some of that money, at least. However, I do not visualize any great program being developed in that connection under the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. They could get 80 percent under the Hill-Burton Act, could they not?

Mr. McNAMARA. They could get up to 80 percent only with a supplementary grant under this program. However, we do not visualize the building of a great many hospitals under the projected program. Very few would be assisted under this program.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if I may pick up the thought which I started to develop a while ago, this is the criterion which the public works project must meet under the act: It must "tend to improve the opportunity in the area where such project is or will be located

for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities."

Unless a hospital under the Hill-Burton program would tend to improve the opportunity for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial commercial plants or facilities, it would not be eligible under the pending bill.

This is true of any other public works facility with respect to which application is made. This is a more restricted criterion than that established under the Hill-Burton program, or under any other grant-in-aid program, intended to support projects useful to such an area.

In the second place, the concept of supplementary grants is already a part of the Appalachia program, which has been approved by Congress in principle.

With respect to the impact of the supplementary grant, last Thursday I inserted in the RECORD various other programs and the matching formulas. The insertion is found at page 11915 of Thursday's RECORD. Some typical public works and development facilities are as follows:

*I. Public works and development facilities "directly" related to economic development*

Type of project	Existing grant-in-aid program
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. Up to 30 percent from Public Health Service.
Waste treatment facilities relating to industrial and commercial development.	50 percent from Office of Education. 50 to 75 percent from Federal Aviation Agency. 30 to 100 percent from Soil Conservation Service.
Area vocational schools.	50 percent from Office of Education.
Airports.	50 to 75 percent from Federal Aviation Agency. 30 to 100 percent from Soil Conservation Service.
Watershed protection and flood prevention related to industrial or commercial development.	None.
Water works and water lines related to residential development.	Do.
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. Up to 30 percent from Public Health Service.
Waste treatment facilities not related to industrial or commercial development.	33 to 66 percent from Public Health Service.
Hospitals related to community or district economic development.	33 to 66 percent from Public Health Service.

These are some of the existing grant-in-aid programs under which local public works projects can be built with Federal assistance, and some of them without Federal assistance.

The Senator has asked what the theory is. If a community or region or economic development district is deteriorating badly, either because of the loss of its essential element of economic strength, or because of technological change, the community is less able to put up matching funds under existing Federal programs than a healthy, viable community is able to do. If there is a public facility available under an existing program which would help that area get back on its feet and increase its prospects for economic growth, the committee felt that in such a situation it would be useful and justifiable for the Federal Government to supplement the existing program and bring the Federal contribution up to 80 percent. That is the theory.

I raised this question about assistance for hospitals during the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce before the Public Works Committee.

I asked whether or not hospitals would be eligible.

Secretary Connor answered:

Secretary CONNOR. We were thinking of those only if there is a total lack of adequate hospital facilities which seriously hampers the economic needs of the community. In that case a hospital project might be eligible.

A case we have financed under the ARA program, as you know, were the hospitals, the miners' hospitals in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. They were terribly important to economic development.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator says to bring it up to 80 percent, he means cases in which a community could not raise the necessary funds to match the Government in programs other than this. Is that correct?

Mr. MUSKIE. I assume that would be one of the considerations of the Secretary in reviewing and evaluating the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can understand that in many areas the Government would be putting up everything except the 20 percent of the money that could be obtained locally. That is one thing we must be careful about.

Mr. MUSKIE. Under the accelerated public works program there was a gradation in the Federal contribution which depended upon the ability of the community to participate. Similar tests would be applied by the Secretary. The 80 percent is not mandatory.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. That is why I thought that if the bill were directed to programs to improve a sewage disposal system or improve water, we would be going far toward assisting communities to get back on their feet. Because of a low tax base, I can see that it is impossible for many small communities to provide sufficient funds to construct adequate water and sewage facilities. It was my hope that most of this money could be used in that connection, and that we could let the roadbuilding and hospital construction be done under existing laws.

At first that is what I thought the bill would do. I express the hope that the administrators of the program will see to it that as much money as possible is used to assist cities, towns, and villages to obtain good water supplies and sewerage systems.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator should be assured by the record of the public works program under which a majority of the projects were for either water or sewers. I would expect that comparable experience would develop under the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had hoped that the Senator could so provide by limiting the program.

Mr. MUSKIE. We did not do so because we could not imagine all of the diversities of program that might be involved in communities. If a community needs a vocational school, for example, and it could not obtain assistance under any other program, or if it could get aid under an existing program, but could not provide the necessary matching funds, and if that were the critical additional public facility that that community needed, we did not wish to make it impossible for the Secretary of Commerce to be of assistance.

On page 46 of the hearings of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Louisiana will find typical examples of public facility projects which the Secretary believes would be covered and supported under the proposed program. The Senator might be interested in examining that material.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a few questions in relation to title II. To what extent would the Small Business Administration have under its control the distribution of funds for loans and for the purpose of making industrial and commercial guarantees for working capital?

Mr. MUSKIE. As the Senator knows, there is now a division of responsibility between the ARA and SBA in respect to that function. ARA makes the evaluation on the basis of the economic feasibility of the project and its need in the area. SBA makes the credit evaluation. That procedure could continue.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under SBA the loans must be repayable. That is, there

must be reason to believe that if money is put into a certain business, the borrower will be able to repay it.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose an application is made to the Small Business Administration for a quarter-million dollars, and SBA does not believe that the industry which would be created would return enough profits to repay the loan. If a case like that were presented, would it be possible for moneys to be loaned under the proposed legislation in order to bolster a project which the SBA might think to be too risky?

Mr. MUSKIE. It is possible, because the Economic Development Administration, proposed successor agency to ARA, would be the administrative unit, EDA would be the ultimate administrator of the program. There has been some debate outside of Congress and within the committees as to whether EDA should not have total jurisdiction over all the authority in the bill. The committee felt that with the new arrangements which have been established between SBA and ARA, the present relationship could continue. In some instances, the agencies have disagreed; but I do not think that they have disagreed to a degree that should raise any alarm.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the present act, there must be a reasonable belief that the loans would be repaid.

Mr. MUSKIE. The language is "a reasonable assurance of repayment."

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The Small Business Administration could lend a certain amount of the loan applied for and be almost entirely secured for its part; but there might be serious doubt as to whether or not, under the present proposal, any further loans could be repaid. What does the Senator have to say about that point?

Mr. MUSKIE. All I can say is that the language of the bill is clear. The language of the bill contains a mandate not only to the SBA, but also to ARA. Their credit standards are different, but I cannot conceive of either agency deliberately disregarding that mandate. I suppose that there could be an honest disagreement between two individuals of equal competence as to whether or not a particular loan is a viable loan. But the policy is clear. ARA delegated the credit evaluating functions which it has under the law to SBA primarily because SBA has the manpower and the organization to do the work. But both the ARA and the proposed EDA programs are intended to be developmental programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the SBA would loan a business up to 50 percent of the money necessary to construct a new facility. And suppose that the business could only raise from its own sources an additional 30 percent of the total amount needed, under the pending bill, would it be possible for moneys to be used to supplement the SBA loan to that business?

In other words, it is now possible for SBA to loan a certain amount of money which might not be satisfactory to the borrower. Could the borrower then come in under the proposed legislation

and borrow 20 percent more or 30 percent more, or whatever would be necessary in order that he might proceed to construct the facility for which he had applied, but for which the SBA had refused to loan all that he asked?

Mr. MUSKIE. We are talking about industrial loans?

Mr. ELLENDER. We are talking about industrial loans.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is asking whether or not SBA could supplement the ARA loans—

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. MUSKIE. Whether ARA could supplement the SBA to support a given project.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. I cannot give the Senator from Louisiana an interpretation of the law on that point; but, administratively, I cannot conceive that happening, because the EDA and the SBA together would administer this provision of the law as the agencies have administered the ARA law. In the ARA experience, I do not know of any instances of splitting individual loans.

Mr. ELLENDER. The SBA would then administer the project with its own funds?

Mr. MUSKIE. The ARA—or the EDA, as it may be called—would have direct authority over the industrial loan provisions of the bill, could continue to delegate to SBA the evaluation of the credit risk of each of the loans. The two evaluations would finally determine whether or not the loans should be made, so that when the decision was finally made by EDA under the proposed program, the decision would encompass the total financing for the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. The financing would be obtained from two sources or only one? That is the point I am trying to develop. In other words, the borrower under the SBA program may not be satisfied with the amount of money that he can obtain from SBA.

Would one agency play against the other?

Mr. MUSKIE. They could not do that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to be certain about that, because if an application were made, under the bill, for a small business loan, the Small Business Administration would handle it for the Commerce Department.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator means that there are some purposes for which the SBA can make loans and the ARA cannot?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And I wish to be certain that the SBA is not placed in the position of making unsecured loans, or loans secured by another Government agency.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator understands that both SBA and ARA may be in the financial picture of the particular business, but they cannot play each other off on any particular loan authorized under the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, if the Small Business Administration were to say to a concern that was about to start a new business, "All we can lend is 60 percent of your needs, because that is all we believe you can pay back; you

will have to put up the balance of 40 percent," it would not be possible, under the bill, for the SBA loan to be supplemented from funds derived from this source.

Mr. MUSKIE. I would say "No" to the Senator, based on my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want it to appear to be the intent of Congress for the SBA to begin approving dangerous loans and thereby losing money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendments, en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendments, en bloc, were agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SMALL TOWNS IN AMERICA ARE ENTITLED TO THEIR FAIR SHARE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield time to me?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it has been the historic function of the American Government to rise to meet the challenges of each age. When we

were in the period of our great national westward expansion, the Government gave away free land to settlers to see to it that all sections of our vast domain were settled, and gave away vast areas of land to railroads to see that transportation was available to all sections of our country. Today the American Government is taking action to insure that these areas remain settled and productive and not be abandoned to wastage, but that they retain the prosperity which has been created there down through the years by the hard work of pioneer families and their descendants.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will provide assistance to communities that are distressed by low income and high unemployment. This is a do-it-yourself project. Local communities will work up overall economic development plans which will detail the steps they will take to restore their economies to their former healthy conditions. Then they can receive assistance in the form of loans to attract industry and grants for badly needed public works.

The bill makes it possible for small towns to obtain the funds for water works and sewage treatment facilities. With our vast population, pure water and adequate sewage are necessary if our small towns are to be saved. Without these health safeguards hepatitis and other outbreaks or threatened outbreaks of disease doom towns and small cities to a gradual withering away. With

the health and comfort safeguards of pure water and adequate sewage disposal, such towns are more nearly able to hold their own.

Towns may also receive aid for fire and police stations, tourism facilities, airports, watersheds and flood protection, and area vocational schools. In other words, this bill spells survival for hundreds of smaller cities and towns of America, which lack the capital to build these facilities alone.

Mr. President, as a coauthor of the Senate bill I strongly support the proposed legislation. It should be passed without further delay so that we can get on with the task of revitalizing our small towns and rural areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, tables 1 to 8, on pages 176, 178, 179, 182, 184, 185, 190, and 192, chapter V, of "Essays in Southern Economic Development," edited by Melvin L. Greenhut and W. Tate Whitman, and printed by the University of North Carolina Press. Chapter V is by George Macesisch.

Table 4 is especially relevant. Projecting population migration in the South for the period 1970-2020, it shows that migration from rural areas will continue, although at a decreasing rate, unless action is taken to save our rural areas.

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

TABLE 1.—Total, urban, and rural migration: 1950-60

	Migration (thousands of persons)			Migration rates (percent per year)		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
United States.....	2, 621	11, 733	-9, 112	0.16	1.07	-1.69
South.....	-3, 247	2, 607	-5, 854	-.75	1.20	-2.73
Alabama.....	-368	166	-534	-1.16	1.07	-3.35
Arkansas.....	-422	17	450	-2.34	.25	-3.93
Georgia.....	-214	260	-474	-.88	1.40	-2.60
Kentucky.....	-390	67	-457	-1.30	.56	-2.58
Louisiana.....	-50	223	-272	-.17	1.27	-2.26
Mississippi.....	-434	77	-511	-1.99	1.09	-3.49
North Carolina.....	-328	133	-461	-.76	.84	-1.69
Oklahoma.....	-219	147	-366	-.95	1.13	-3.75
South Carolina.....	-222	21	-242	-.99	.23	-1.77
Tennessee.....	-273	138	-410	-.99	.83	-2.32
Texas.....	114	1, 135	-1, 019	.13	1.01	-3.88
Virginia.....	15	320	-306	.04	1.72	-1.74
West Virginia.....	-447	-94	-353	-2.31	-1.34	-2.87
Florida.....	1, 617	1, 451	166	4.30	5.52	1.49
Arizona.....	330	412	-83	3.30	6.30	-2.48
California.....	3, 145	3, 364	-219	2.42	3.10	-1.05
Colorado.....	164	279	-115	1.07	2.67	-2.41
Connecticut.....	234	197	37	1.04	1.12	.75
Delaware.....	64	53	11	1.69	2.17	.84
District of Columbia.....	-158	-158	(1)	-2.02	-2.02	(?)
Idaho.....	-40	11	-51	-.64	.39	-1.40
Illinois.....	124	383	-259	1.13	.52	-1.33
Indiana.....	63	139	-75	.15	.53	-.45
Iowa.....	-228	30	-258	-.85	.22	-1.93
Kansas.....	-44	153	-197	-.22	1.33	-2.24
Maine.....	-66	-37	-29	-.70	-.77	-.63
Maryland.....	320	326	-6	1.18	1.70	-.08
Massachusetts.....	-93	-120	27	-.19	-.29	-.34
Michigan.....	156	288	-132	.22	.67	-.67
Minnesota.....	-97	189	-285	-.30	1.01	-2.15
Missouri.....	-130	120	-250	-.32	.45	-1.69
Montana.....	-25	30	-55	-.40	1.01	-1.65
Nebraska.....	-117	40	-158	-.86	.59	-2.34
Nevada.....	86	84	2	3.97	6.04	.28
New Hampshire.....	13	12	1	.22	.35	.05
New Jersey.....	577	614	-37	1.06	1.29	-.55
New Mexico.....	52	160	-108	.65	3.41	-3.25
New York.....	210	152	58	.13	.11	.25
North Dakota.....	-105	22	-127	-1.68	1.14	-2.94

TABLE 1.—Total, urban, and rural migration: 1950-60—Continued

	Migration (thousands of persons)			Migration rates (percent per year)		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
Ohio.....	409	560	-152	0.46	0.89	-0.61
Oregon.....	16	146	-130	.10	1.53	-1.90
Pennsylvania.....	-475	-235	-240	-.44	-.30	-.76
Rhode Island.....	-26	-5	-22	-.32	-.06	-1.80
South Dakota.....	-94	7	-101	-1.41	.28	-2.38
Utah.....	10	83	-72	.13	1.50	-3.14
Vermont.....	-38	-6	-32	-.99	-.45	-1.31
Washington.....	88	186	-98	.34	1.08	-1.09
Wisconsin.....	-53	185	-239	-.14	.83	-1.65
Wyoming.....	-20	11	-31	-.64	.69	-2.16

1 The District of Columbia has no rural population.

TABLE 2.—Southern rural migration by race, 1950-60

	Migration (thousands of persons)		Migration rates (percent per year)	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
South.....	-3, 955	-1, 899	-2.40	-4.00
Alabama.....	-315	-219	-2.82	-4.60
Arkansas.....	-326	-124	-3.63	-5.01
Georgia.....	-241	-233	-1.86	-4.44
Kentucky.....	-428	-29	-2.52	-4.12
Louisiana.....	-115	-157	-1.47	-3.76
Mississippi.....	-203	-307	-2.63	-4.46
North Carolina.....	-254	-206	-1.26	-2.92
Oklahoma.....	-326	-39	-3.70	-4.23
South Carolina.....	-42	-201	-.62	-3.53
Tennessee.....	-344	-67	-2.16	-3.75
Texas.....	-848	-171	-3.70	-5.15
Virginia.....	-194	-112	-1.42	-2.84
West Virginia.....	-318	-34	-2.72	-6.02
Florida.....	210	-44	2.32	-2.09





TABLE 7.—National image deviations: 1950 and 1962<sup>1</sup> (percent of total nonagricultural employment)

	1950	1962		1950	1962
South.....	6.5	4.9	Iowa.....	10.3	6.3
Alabama.....	5.2	5.1	Kansas.....	14.3	11.7
Arkansas.....	9.8	4.6	Maine.....	10.2	8.7
Georgia.....	3.5	3.9	Maryland.....	3.7	4.3
Kentucky.....	11.8	6.6	Massachusetts.....	7.9	7.4
Louisiana.....	11.9	13.8	Michigan.....	15.4	10.0
Mississippi.....	10.0	6.4	Minnesota.....	8.9	6.2
North Carolina.....	11.2	12.1	Missouri.....	6.7	4.1
Oklahoma.....	20.4	16.7	Montana.....	23.2	18.6
South Carolina.....	12.2	13.0	Nebraska.....	19.3	13.6
Tennessee.....	3.4	3.7	Nevada.....	30.0	29.8
Texas.....	15.7	11.8	New Hampshire.....	13.6	13.3
Virginia.....	7.0	5.6	New Jersey.....	11.7	8.7
West Virginia.....	22.7	11.9	New Mexico.....	28.2	24.3
Florida.....	20.5	15.0	New York.....	5.2	5.6
Arizona.....	24.0	15.7	North Dakota.....	29.7	25.8
California.....	11.3	4.6	Ohio.....	10.2	8.7
Colorado.....	16.7	13.5	Oregon.....	5.2	5.8
Connecticut.....	16.4	14.4	Pennsylvania.....	9.6	7.9
Delaware.....	12.3	7.3	Rhode Island.....	15.6	9.8
District of Columbia.....	38.6	36.6	South Dakota.....	25.0	22.3
Idaho.....	18.3	13.8	Utah.....	19.1	13.9
Illinois.....	5.2	4.9	Vermont.....	7.0	4.9
Indiana.....	11.7	10.6	Washington.....	9.5	5.4
			Wisconsin.....	8.6	7.2
			Wyoming.....	29.1	25.4

<sup>1</sup> Source: See table 5.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COOPER OF KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$325,000,000."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the time to be taken from the time of the Senator?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, my amendment is not difficult to understand. It would reduce the amount authorized under section 1 from \$400 million to \$325 million—a reduction of \$75 million.

The President of the United States, in submitting his message and request to the Congress that this bill be enacted, asked only an annual authorization of \$250 million. The Secretary of Commerce testified at length before our committee. His testimony was comprehensive and indicated a fine knowledge of the background and purposes of the bill. The Secretary stated that \$250 million would be an adequate sum for this section, and he supported his testimony with careful data.

It may be asked then, if \$250 million was the sum requested by the President and by the Secretary of Commerce, why I do not move to reduce the \$400 million by \$150 million? I shall be frank to say that I believe that there is a greater possibility that the Senate will consider favorably a reduction of \$75 million than a reduction of \$150 million. I say that from my experience in the Senate and my judgment of the programs under consideration. There are other substantive reasons, which I shall now discuss.

In past years I have supported and now support the various bills which are now comprehended in this bill. As I said in presenting the provisions of the bill on

the floor of the Senate, it is an extension of three programs—the ARA, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and the accelerated public works program of 1962 and 1963, all of which I strongly supported. I was one of the five cosponsors of the original ARA bill, first recommended by President Eisenhower and later enacted under the leadership of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the Senate. I also cosponsored with other Senators the Appalachian Act, particularly with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and I comanaged with him the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I speak as one who has supported the legislation upon which the pending bill is based. Nevertheless, I believe the record will indicate that the sum proposed by my amendment, \$325 million annually, a reduction of \$75 million in the bill, will be fully adequate. Neither the President of the United States nor the Secretary of Commerce asked for \$400 million. Having worked on these bills in past years on the Committee on Public Works, I know that there are differences between the pending bill and the earlier emergency bills, which I believe, support my argument.

This section of the bill differs from the old accelerated public works program in that it is not directed toward providing emergency employment for a 2-year period, as was the old bill. The bill will be effective for 5 years, and its criteria emphasizes the development of commercial or industrial enterprises which will provide long-term permanent employment in our communities.

The Secretary of Commerce said, in his testimony before our committee, that these criteria would be stricter than the criteria used under the old Accelerated Public Works Act. The new criteria must be developed for both the area, and the specific project within the area. It would be wise for the Senate to watch the operation of this new bill for a year to see if the new regulations meet the needs, before voting for the full amount over and above the requests estimated by the administration.

TABLE 8.—Per capita personal income levels, 1950 and 1962

	Personal income (dollars per capita)		Increase	
	1950	1962	Dollars	Percent per year
United States.....	1,491	2,366	875	3.85
Alabama.....	867	1,567	700	4.93
Arkansas.....	805	1,504	699	5.21
Georgia.....	1,016	1,759	743	4.57
Kentucky.....	958	1,712	754	4.84
Louisiana.....	1,089	1,705	616	3.74
Mississippi.....	729	1,285	556	4.72
North Carolina.....	1,009	1,732	723	4.50
Oklahoma.....	1,133	1,905	772	4.33
South Carolina.....	881	1,545	664	4.68
Tennessee.....	995	1,702	707	4.47
Texas.....	1,340	2,013	673	3.39
Virginia.....	1,222	2,018	796	4.18
West Virginia.....	1,095	1,810	715	4.19

Source: Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business.

The increase of \$150 million over the request of the President is not included in the budget. It would be added to the deficit which is now expected to exceed \$4 billion. That has some significance. The President has also now requested that the national debt limit be raised to \$329 billion, and the House has approved only \$328 billion. We must take these facts into account and make some reductions as we go along, so that worthwhile programs can be maintained and paid for, and so the criteria that are applied will enable people all over the Nation to benefit.

The reduction encompassed by my amendment is from \$400 to \$325 million annually. I ask that the Senate agree to this reduction. I ask this as one who has been a cosponsor and a supporter—both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate—of the worthy bills to assist depressed areas and unemployed people. I am the only Republican who originally joined in sponsoring and introducing this bill in this Congress. Since the committee work on the bill, Senator FONG has given his sponsorship, and I believe that more than half of the Republican Senators will vote for the bill; but it is necessary that we do not authorize more than is actually needed.

I believe that this is a sensible amendment. I notice my friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], looking at me. I know that he will say, "We are giving the same kind of assistance to foreign countries." In answer I say I want to give this assistance to our own people and communities. I shall vote to reduce the foreign aid bill by the amount needed to do so.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would tell us, and accurately so, of the value of these projects. I agree with him.

I support the bill, but I believe that it is sensible for us to adhere as closely as possible to the request of the President, so that the money will be spent wisely.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I gather that the Senator's amendment has no relation whatever to any other title of the bill than public works.

Mr. COOPER. In no way at all.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator a question about title II, while he is on his feet? I am deeply concerned about the section's continuing to provide loans for machinery and equipment.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I know that was brought out in the hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. We in the great industrial States are concerned about the pirating of business; that is, the attraction to business which comes from liberal offers which can be an inducement to establish new plants in other States.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is directing attention to title II.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. We discussed this question quite thoroughly. As I remember, the old ARA did not permit loans for machinery except in cases of demonstrated need. It was argued by the Secretary that, unless the loan section included provision for machinery, certain projects might never come into operation. A second point discussed was that loans should not exceed the life of the machinery.

The committee unanimously accepted the policy previously adopted by ARA in this regard.

Has the Senator any particular thought as to the value or lack of it?

Mr. JAVITS. We had a colloquy the other day and have the implementation in the Record enjoining the Secretary to condemn and beware of pirating practices, and the section of the bill referred to was implemented; but I was interested in the substantive part relating to machinery and equipment. When I was on the Banking and Currency Committee I protested it. I sought to excise it from the bill. I think it is a rather dangerous point and requires great scrupulousness in its administration. I wanted the Senate to have some concept of the way in which the committee looked at it. I gather that the committee assumed that it would be used sparingly.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. I believe we had assurances from the Secretary that applications for funds for this purpose would be considered carefully, particularly in regard to the terms of these loans.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be required, which will not be long.

The Senator's amendment goes to title I. Now we are getting into a discussion of title II.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to comment now on the amendment of the Senator to reduce the amount from \$400 million to \$325 million.

We believe that any reduction in the amount of money proposed to be authorized for public works grants in this bill would be a serious mistake. The Public Works Committee has looked long and hard at this subject, and believes that the \$400 million authorization is the very

minimum needed to accomplish the desired result.

Our examination indicated that there is a backlog of at least \$250 million in projects that could not, because of exhaustion of funds, be financed under the APW program, but would meet the criteria of this bill. We expect that a similar total of new applications will be made in the next fiscal year. About \$100 million in projects that are received next year should be processed to the point of approval during the coming year. That gives us a total of at least \$350 million in viable projects.

In addition, the committee felt that there should be available an additional \$50 million in reserve to help finance projects that may come in from areas hit suddenly by economic disaster because of plant closings, the removal of military establishments, or other causes.

The Senator from Kentucky discussed the testimony given by the Secretary of Commerce and the grants requested by the administration. His remarks were perfectly in order. However, there was a great deal of other testimony given before the committee that justifies the amount of \$400 million, which the committee recommended in the bill.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who, I believe, has some thoughts on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the Public Works Committee in giving me an opportunity to join in the refutation of the remarks on the amendment offered by our beloved colleague from Kentucky, who would cut the amount of the annual grant under the bill from \$400 to \$325 million, the so-called public works feature of the legislation coming before us now.

It is important for me to say this at the outset, because the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has indicated, at least by indirection, that the White House would be displeased if the Senate should vote \$400 million, rather than \$325 million that the Senator would like to have in the bill.

The White House will not veto this legislation if \$400 million is included in title I over the period of 5 years for such a worthy purpose.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has indicated the amount of accelerated public works projects which are now, in a sense, on the shelf, ready to be proceeded with, approval for which has been given and local financing having been arranged. I think the Senator has given a very conservative figure.

I like the presentation the Senator has made, but frankly, I desire to have incorporated in the Record the table which is found on page 44 of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the table, entitled, "Pending APW grant-in-aid applications in presently eligible redevelopment areas by States," be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Pending APW grant-in-aid applications in presently eligible redevelopment areas by State

State	Number of projects	Amount requested
Total	2,518	\$467,858
Alabama	43	11,531
Alaska	27	8,467
Arizona	22	3,948
Arkansas	64	10,373
California	28	7,356
Colorado	14	1,408
Connecticut	6	1,777
Delaware	1	134
Florida	5	624
Georgia	73	13,894
Hawaii	2	69
Idaho	3	180
Illinois	93	17,324
Indiana	19	4,091
Iowa	7	499
Kansas	11	1,917
Kentucky	98	27,079
Louisiana	56	14,921
Maine	14	709
Maryland	12	2,844
Massachusetts	27	5,417
Michigan	102	16,565
Minnesota	76	14,833
Mississippi	64	8,690
Missouri	32	3,420
Montana	21	6,452
Nebraska	28	1,806
Nevada		
New Hampshire	8	2,359
New Jersey	108	29,618
New Mexico	53	6,691
New York	62	16,805
North Carolina	21	5,667
North Dakota	4	553
Ohio	68	12,341
Oklahoma	54	7,329
Oregon	34	4,413
Pennsylvania	416	88,009
Rhode Island	13	7,298
South Carolina	35	4,795
South Dakota	40	3,680
Tennessee	68	15,103
Texas	62	15,314
Utah	27	2,927
Vermont	1	30
Virginia	18	3,081
Washington	22	3,337
West Virginia	116	22,153
Wisconsin	83	6,807
Wyoming	6	293
Guam		
Puerto Rico	251	22,950
Virgin Islands		

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to comment on the amount. It is not \$250 million. It is \$467,858,000. We realize that there is an attrition, and the chairman of the committee has set forth his views on this matter. But when we find that in the State of Kentucky there are applications pending for more than \$27 million, we realize that those applications are valid applications. These are projects in Kentucky now that are ready to go, not a year from now, not 2 years from now, and not 3 years from now. They are ready to go now. They are necessary projects. They would strengthen the economy of the area. They would provide employment. They would build an economic base on which the community could develop business, industry, and its entire economy in the years ahead, as well as provide necessary employment.

With respect to the State of Michigan, so ably represented by the Senator who manages the bill, Michigan now has 102 projects ready to move, in the amount of \$16,565,000.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate to realize that the \$400 million in Federal grants under title I of the pending bill is not a figure arrived at out of thin air.

My beloved friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] himself set \$325 million as a figure. We believe that in

the figure of \$400 million we are being conservative.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] who is now in the Chamber believes that it should be \$1 billion a year.

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Alaska has introduced legislation looking toward that objective.

There are many Senators who, I believe, are of the conviction that \$400 million is a conservative figure, that it is not a high figure—and I am one of those Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD under title 1, the report which was filed with S. 1648 which covers this provision of the pending legislation.

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

#### MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

##### TITLE I—PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

The purpose of this title is to increase the amount of Federal funds being expended both for general improvement of the physical structure of an area and for specific improvements related to projected economic development. The committee believes that one of the greatest handicaps of a community, area, or region can suffer when economically disadvantaged is the inability of its physical plant and public services to support existing industry, let alone new development.

"Indirect" as used in the language of this title in section 101, as well as in section 201 of title II, is meant to include those facilities which commercial and industrial development depend upon, but which are not necessarily related to a specific business enterprise.

For example, if a community has an inadequate sewage treatment plant it can hardly hope to induce industrial development which would further overload its disposal plant, thus creating a health and welfare problem.

This type of investment cannot adequately be measured in terms of jobs created. The purpose in this case is not the immediate employment gain, although that will be an additional benefit. The purpose is first to create public facilities that make a community attractive for economic growth, capable of supporting additional population, and of making the most of its natural and human resources.

The grants are not limited to traditional public works but are meant to include physical properties which will have a bearing on industrial and commercial development.

##### Examples of projects

Examples of projects which should be eligible for grants under section 101 (as well as loans under sec. 201) on the basis of being directly related to economic development are waterworks and waterlines, sanitary and storm sewers, industrial parks, police and fire stations, research centers, tourism facilities, industrial streets and roads, waste treatment facilities, area vocational schools, airports, and watershed protection and flood prevention. This list is not meant to be exhaustive nor to imply that grants applied for under these examples need be related to a specific industrial or commercial project. They are not limited to serving one new customer although that could be a possibility. Prospects for industrial and commercial development will more likely follow after these projects are undertaken.

Examples of facilities which if indirectly related to economic development could be eligible for grants under section 101 (and loans under sec. 201) are streets primarily related to residential development, water

and sewage facilities related to residential development, hospitals, vocational education facilities, community centers, and in some circumstances libraries and similar buildings.

##### Use of funds

The committee wishes to emphasize that the funds provided under this title for grants-in-aid are not to be merely substituted for funds available under existing programs. It would be contrary to the intent of this act if other Federal agencies cut back the amount of funds which would have gone to designated areas if these additional funds were not available. The General Accounting Office ought to be concerned that the intent of Congress in this respect is carefully followed. The funds here are to be considered additional to those which a designated area might obtain under other programs.

This is a major reason for providing supplementary grants in this bill in addition to the direct grants available. It is an important feature in this program over and above previous programs, that supplementary grants may be made for projects receiving basic grants under this bill, as well as under other programs. Thus the Secretary can make grants up to 80 percent of the cost of a direct grant project in areas of greatest need. These supplementary grants are expected to be used for projects in designated areas without regard to any limitation of other laws, except that in no case will the Federal share be greater than 80 percent. Where supplementary grants are made to direct Federal projects, such projects must have been previously authorized. Direct Federal projects which can be useful include, but are not limited to, watershed and flood prevention, water storage, and land improvement.

The committee particularly notes the grants can cover the cost of related equipment and machinery in development facility projects as well as in industrial and commercial projects.

The funds authorized under this title should be used for projects in eligible areas even if those areas are in established development regions, but they should not be used only for projects with regionwide impact. The same is true for development districts within regions. Projects of value to one county, community, or a group of counties should not be denied because of regional assistance being given under another program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is every reason for the Senate to endorse the provisions of title I of the pending bill. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be decisively defeated by the Senate, that the pending bill will be agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives, that it will go to the President of the United States, and he will sign it into law.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am in full accord with the statement the Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Public Works Committee has just made, which has been so well amplified by the Senator from West Virginia who has never ceased to work for this kind of legislation which will put the unemployed to work, and give the economy a substantial boost.

Whenever the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] rises on the floor, his words

are entitled to the most respectful and sympathetic consideration. We all love and admire him. This happens to be one of the rare occasions when I find myself in disagreement with him. I must oppose his amendment to cut the annual public works appropriation in this bill from \$400 to \$325 million. As it is, the amount provided is far from sufficient. I find it particularly distressing that he, who has been the only Republican, according to his own statement, to endorse this measure, should spoil that beautiful and unique record by now moving a reduction in the amount to be authorized, which reduction is not quite so slight, because the reduction of the \$75 million he proposes will be an annual reduction and will therefore go on through the years.

This is one of the most important pieces of legislation from the standpoint of the national economy that we could have. I have been fighting for the reenactment of public works legislation ever since I came to the Senate. It has demonstrated its value. It means that people will be put to work on useful projects, that the economy will be stimulated, not merely at the site of the project where it goes into operation but at the factory where the materials are produced and on the arteries of transportation in between. In Alaska particularly, this will be important, because it will affect so many of the depressed areas which need help, and all but one of Alaska's areas are depressed areas. This legislation will diminish the depression and the unemployment.

I hope that the amendment will fail.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the biggest mistakes Congress made in recent years, in my opinion, is that it did not refresh and refinance the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962.

Under that act, speaking only for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a great many projects were built costing many millions of dollars. This money was spent—and spent wisely—for essential public works. The increase in employment which was generated by that money is really startling. As soon as the accelerated public works bill ran out of money, we had a recurrence of unemployment in many of the areas of chronic and persistent unemployment in my State.

I believe that Republicans and Democrats alike in Pennsylvania will testify today to the great economic benefit which was brought to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by the passage and administration of the Accelerated Public Works Act.

I was very much disappointed when, in this year's budget, there was not, to my way of thinking, adequate refinancing

and refurbishing of the accelerated public works principle.

The Senator from Michigan, the Senator from West Virginia, a number of other Senators and I were of the view that we should at least reduce the program to the same amount as before; namely, \$1 billion plus.

I was vastly disappointed when that was not done. I testified before the subcommittee of which the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was chairman, and with my enthusiastic support it increased the amount of the authorization for public works from \$250 million to \$400 million. I believe that that increase was modest. I had hoped that the amount authorized would be substantially more, but he and I realize the practical, pragmatic situation under which we are operating, and it seemed unwise to go further than we had. We were also acutely aware of the fact that all of the State of West Virginia is in Appalachia, as well as much of the State of Kentucky. It seems to me incredible that Senators coming from States where the benefits of the war against poverty are so badly needed, where the Appalachia program is making some dent in the war against poverty, where the major part of the public works program in Appalachia is for highways, would not join unambiguously in supporting the increase in the appropriation for public works in this particular bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but the Senator must do so on his own time.

Mr. COOPER. That is satisfactory.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I joined the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in supporting and sponsoring these related programs, the area redevelopment program, the accelerated public works program, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Appalachia development bill; but I have submitted this amendment for two reasons. One is that it would cut back the authorization to one-half of the increase which was made over the President's recommendation of \$250 million. Second, I am aware of what Congress, and the Senate in particular, has done in passing the great bills which have helped my State; namely, the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the Appalachia Development Act.

I believe that we cannot overdo it. We just cannot expect that the country will continue to provide ever larger amounts before full needs and uses are shown and proved. I believe that we must keep these programs within some kind of reasonable limit—and the most reasonable limit wherever possible. I have proposed a very reasonable limit; namely, one-half the increase made by the committee beyond the request submitted by the President.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Kentucky is one of the ablest members of this body. I respect him in every way. I honor his integrity and ability. In this particular case, however, I believe that he is dead wrong.

This is not an extravagant and unnecessary increase in a vitally needed program. The provision as it now appears in the bill falls far short of the requirements for assistance in a number of States, which come under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 seconds to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the State of Pennsylvania, there are 416 projects at a cost of \$88 million which are now eligible and ready to move. The able Senator from Pennsylvania knows that this is the situation in all States in the Union. I congratulate him on his vigorous espousal of this moderate increase in the pending bill.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful interest.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO VOTE ON COOPER AMENDMENT AT 4:45 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield me one-half minute?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Cooper amendment take place at 4:45 o'clock p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How is the time to be allotted for further debate on the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whichever way Senators wish to use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Kentucky has stated that he has supported all these programs. He has been so preeminent in that support that I did not wish to add my own voice at the point when he was speaking, although it is a fact that I have, on this side of the aisle, also supported these programs, both in committee, when I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and on the floor of the Senate.

I am known, and proud to be known, as a liberal, anxious to have my State, which pays the most taxes of all the States, support the well-being of the country, notwithstanding the fact that it is often said, in answer to my votes that New York pays \$3 for every dollar that it gets back. As long as I am a Member of the Senate that will never be a factor in determining my vote.

However, I appreciate and am ready to support conservation where conservation is appropriate in terms of these

projects. When the President of the United States requests \$250 million, and the amount is raised by the committee to \$400 million, I expect eventually to hear facts stated that will support the increase.

The Senator from Kentucky, a strong supporter of the bill, proposes to cut the increase by 50 percent, on the theory that it is necessary to have a good reason to raise the figure by \$150 million, and that in the absence of such a good reason the least that can be done is to cut the increase by one-half. If one is to be a liberal, he must be a hardheaded liberal. Therefore, I am glad to support the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, when the Senator from New York speaks of facts as an essential element in deciding the issue which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I would say that both the Senator from Kentucky and the other members of the committee felt that they had a sound factual basis for their conclusions.

Secretary Connor, when he testified before the committee, advised us that more than \$700 million worth of APW applications were pending when that program ran out. The Secretary has screened the applications, and has reduced the amount to a possible \$450 million, or a little more than that which might be eligible for assistance under the pending bill, if it is enacted.

The \$250 million figure obviously falls short of that figure. We recognize that the \$250 million called for in S. 1648 would be an annual figure, running for the life of the authorization, and that the \$450 million figure is also an annual figure running for the life of the authorization.

I believe that in addition to the points which have been made, it should be pointed out that the \$450 million in APW applications will have a running start on whatever figure Congress approves for this bill. If it is the \$250 million figure, the projects which can be justified on the basis of needs developed since the APW program terminated will have to fall behind and run behind the projects that are pending in the APW file. It has seemed to us that this would militate against the many areas of the country which have developed needs since that program terminated, and would militate against smaller communities and smaller towns which are not in a position to develop projects as rapidly as more sophisticated planning departments are able to do in the larger communities.

For that reason, in addition to the others that have been advanced by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from West Virginia, we felt we were justified in increasing the figure to \$400 million.

Mr. COOPER. To respond to that argument, I should like to ask that the analysis of the APW backlog, submitted to the Committee on Public Works by Secretary Connor, shown at page 45 of the hearings, be included in the Record at this point.

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

#### ANALYSIS OF THE APW BACKLOG

From areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act on April 15, 1965—excluding the "labor surplus areas" eligible only under the Public Works Acceleration Act—the Community Facilities Administration of HEPA and the Public Health Service of DHEW had on hand 2,518 applications requesting \$468 million in APW grants.

However, these figures have only very limited significance as a measure of the potential demand for grants under section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act for the following reasons:

(1) The principal purpose of the APW program was to create jobs, and projects had only to fulfill an essential public need, not necessarily related to economic development. Under the new act, each project must tend to improve either directly or indirectly the opportunity for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities, or assist otherwise in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities, or primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965.

(2) While apparently eligible under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, many of the pending APW applications clearly do not meet the requirements of the new act. For instance, the total includes 363 grant requests for courthouses, townhalls, and the like, amounting to \$61 million, and 51 grant requests for hospitals and other health facilities amounting to \$29 million, most of which do not meet the new requirements.

(3) Many of the pending APW applications date back to 1962 and 1963, and we do not know how many of these projects have been built in the meantime.

(4) Among the 624 grant requests for water and sewer facilities and other utilities amounting to \$129 million, there appears to be a preponderance of projects which may not meet the test of contributing to economic development, and the same appears to be true of the 573 grant requests for streets and roads, amounting to \$92 million.

Conservatively estimated, no more than one-third of the APW "backlog," or about \$150 million in grant requests, will be eligible under the new act.

On the other hand, the flow of new applications under the Public Works Acceleration Act was drastically reduced in the spring of 1963, when both CFA and DHEW announced that APW funds were already oversubscribed. A large influx of new applications which would be eligible under the new act may, therefore, be anticipated as soon as the new law is passed.

Mr. COOPER. This analysis was prepared by the Secretary of Commerce. It states:

Conservatively estimated, no more than one-third of the APW "backlog," or about \$150 million in grant requests, will be eligible under the new act.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the words are "conservatively estimated." Whatever figure is used to settle down that \$450 million figure will be an estimate. His guess may be better than mine, and his guess may be more conservative than mine. Whatever the size of the backlog, it gives a running start for communities which have applications on file, and militates against communities which do not have applications

on file, even though their need might be greater.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

#### MINNESOTA AND THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to speak in support of S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I welcome the opportunity because this legislation represents a sound approach to the problems of labor surplus and economic decline in many areas of the Nation. It extends and improves the important features of the area redevelopment program, the accelerated public works program, and the Appalachian redevelopment experience. It proposes to deal with underdevelopment by a concerted regional and areawide attack, grouping distressed areas together to form economically viable development districts.

Those of us who have worked closely with the ARA and the accelerated public works in the past will recognize in the new bill many substantive and technical improvements which will make these programs more effective and more suited to the task of mobilizing our economic resources.

The greatest promise of America has always been the unqualified assurance of equal opportunity for all people regardless of their background or circumstances. We have made it a fundamental principle that every American be afforded the chance to build a full life for himself and his family. Today in America there are a wide range of programs and projects to guarantee that no one is denied this chance because of race, because of a lack of education, or because of the poverty of his birth.

But today opportunity is closed to many of our fellow Americans because of the economic decline of the area in which they live. In such distressed areas, which spread throughout the country, young people leave school early to help their families and thus rob themselves of the skills and knowledge needed for a full and rich life. The same young people leave the area entirely, stripping it of the youth and vigor necessary to fight its economic problems. These circumstances lead to blocked progress and further decline.

We simply cannot afford to waste our human and natural resources. Loss of economic power stunts national growth and inhibits our position as the leading nation in the world community.

Most of all, we cannot sit contentedly by and allow millions of Americans to be foreclosed from the fulfillment of hope that the rest of us share. This would deny the American promise I spoke of earlier—the unqualified assurance of equal opportunity for all.

I am most happy that the bill specifically provides for relief and assistance to those living in substandard and poverty conditions on Indian reservations in the United States. This bill recognizes that the great majority of these areas are among the most critical in the United States in terms of labor surplus, economic distress, and poverty.

As former attorney general of Minnesota and one who has long been interested in Indian affairs as well as the problem of economic development in economically distressed areas, I myself was shocked by a recent review of the economic conditions of our own Indians.

In the State of Minnesota there are entire communities, not just isolated families, living on Indian reservations in poverty and in destitution. The median family income of the Indians on Leech Lake, White Earth, and Nett Lake Reservations is under \$1,000 a year, which, as I understand it, Mr. President, is less than one-third of the minimum which our Government has ascribed as the poverty line and poverty level.

The unemployment rate on Leech Lake ranges from 40 to 80 percent depending upon the time of the year. At Nett Lake the average rate is 69 percent, at White Earth 60 percent, at Red Lake 47 percent.

Ninety percent of the Indians at Leech Lake live in substandard housing, and 70 to 100 percent of the children drop out of the public schools in the area before graduating from the 12th grade.

I do not believe there is any other area in the country or any other people in the country that could mark a higher rate of dropout than that.

This is, I think, a pathetic circumstance of incalculable proportions in the midst of the richest nation in the world. I would like to see an attempt in Minnesota to harness experienced, retired managerial talent, making them available for an extended period of time to work with those on Indian reservations and train them in management and development skills.

I think our businessmen would find such a project exciting, if we could say to them, "You are now retired at the age of 65. You are in good health. Why do you not help us put together an industry that will provide employment, diversification, and give these people a chance to get started?"

The bill does make it abundantly clear that technical and management assistance will be made available to local development areas. Many of these areas lack the technical skills and know-how to attack their problems in an efficient and practical fashion. The technical assistance the Secretary is authorized to provide to redevelopment areas includes project planning and feasibility studies, management and operational assistance, and studies evaluating the needs of and developing potentialities for economic growth of such areas. This section will provide local areas with assistance in developing their staff, their action programs, and liaison with Federal and other agencies that will be needed to further their progress under this act. It will assist them in understanding what the economic potential of their area is. It will help them pinpoint methods by which they might harness the economic resources they possess.

In this connection, the bill will allow the Secretary to provide such technical and managerial assistance through experienced retired managerial talent. It seems to me a terrible waste to have hundreds of top executive personnel, who

have spent their whole lives in the unique and rewarding experience of entrepreneurial ventures, who have behind them skills and talents to assemble capital, to development of management systems, to train and assemble what is necessary to make an enterprise work not being fully used by our society. \*

I might add at that point that many leading executives in Minnesota who have reached retirement age have come to me and said, "Now, what do I do? I am in good health. I should like to help in some fashion. Is there some area in which I can contribute my talents and time?"

I believe that one of the most exciting features of the Economic Development Act of 1965 is the provision to use those talents where they are most needed.

In addition, I was most happy to see included in the bill language to insure that eligible areas will not lose designation or have their eligibility removed in cases where economic growth may be short term or where the growth is primarily the result of increased temporary employment. In many areas, an influx of construction labor, with a corresponding rise of employment, will cause a rise in unemployment statistics which is purely temporary and passing. Once the construction workers leave, affected areas would have to wait 3 years for renewed eligibility, and many of the good effects of the Federal programs would be lost in the intervening period. This amendment would allow a sufficient period of time during which it could be demonstrated with some assurance that the expansive effects in certain areas were not merely temporary.

I see this amendment as one of the keys to the success of the program in the State of Minnesota and in many other regions across the Nation.

I had specifically in mind the problem with which we are confronted in north-eastern Minnesota, in the heart of Minnesota's traditional Iron Range. There we are experiencing the beginning of a taconite development which stretches across that range. Approximately five persons will be engaged in construction labor for every one person who is finally employed in the taconite mines once the industry is in full operation. There will be several thousand construction laborers and workers in related construction work on the range during the next few years, and that fact would probably make St. Louis County and Itasca County technically ineligible under the ARA. But once the plants were in full operation, I believe the statistics would reflect that those counties would once again be eligible.

What the amendment, incorporated in the bill, would provide is that those counties might continue to be eligible during that period, recognizing the temporary nature of the employment.

Many Senators must share in the praise for the drafting and work on this good bill. As a member of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee which considered titles II and IV of this legislation, I think that my chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the other members of the subcommittee, the

Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROX-MIRE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are to be commended and congratulated on the fine result of their work. I also thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his excellent work in preparing this bill in the Public Works Committee. I was most happy to have had the opportunity to play a role in drafting this legislation.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has 2 minutes remaining on the amendment. Does he yield 3 minutes on the bill also?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. I yield the necessary time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I wish to urge my colleagues to support the bill before the Senate, S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The citizens of Portsmouth, N.H., and the Maine-New Hampshire seacoast area, as well as the citizens of other communities which are about to be hit by the loss of major sources of employment, will all share my appreciation for the action of the Senate Committee on Public Works in retaining, and indeed, strengthening, the language of my bill, S. 400, which would have amended the Area Redevelopment Act.

I would like to express my own sincere thanks to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and my neighbor from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], for their assistance and contributions toward the best possible legislation for the problems facing Portsmouth.

What section 401(a)(4) does is to provide the full assistance of the Federal Government earmarked for redevelopment areas for communities such as Portsmouth which are threatened with severe unemployment because of the planned, future loss of a major source of employment. In the case of Portsmouth and the seacoast area, such a threat has been posed by the statements of the Department of Defense that the workload at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard will undergo a severe drop by 1968.

The testimony before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency clearly brought out the seacoast region's need for this type of assistance.

Mr. President, again I urge my colleagues to support the pending bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Maine

[Mr. MUSKIE] to my statement, which will be brief. At the end of it I expect to ask a question.

First, I shall support the bill. I believe that we should have good, strong, permanent legislation in the field of public works. We might call it made-work, or whatever we will. The program is necessary particularly in view of the fact that a great many areas are so depleted financially and their resources are so thin that they cannot modernize, if we might use that term, fast enough to get into the running and thereby support a viable economy at the present time. With a little lift they could get over that barrier.

As the Senator from Michigan knows, title IV establishes the basic standards for designation of redevelopment areas under the pending bill. The two primary criteria are that an area first, must have an unemployment rate in excess of the national average; or second, have a family median income not in excess of 40 percent of the national family median income. I am aware that these criteria were drawn purposefully to be more restrictive than the standards which were established by the Area Redevelopment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act. In addition they are concerned with economic factors rather than labor surplus standards.

Although I agree that the standards under this bill should be more restrictive than those of previous acts, I question the particular standards set up in title IV.

Under the operation of the bill, 20 counties in my State would not be able to qualify. Some of those counties have a relatively thin economic status and standing.

As will be recalled, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 adopted the standard that a family whose annual income was less than \$3,000 should be classified as a poverty stricken family. Nationwide, 21.4 percent of all families had an income of less than \$3,000. The average for the State of Mississippi, however, was 51.1 percent of all families, and every county in the State exceeded the national average of 21.4 percent. Therefore, all of the 20 counties excluded under this bill exceed the national average for families with less than \$3,000. For example, in Prentiss County 62.1 percent of all families have less than \$3,000 income; in all of the 20 counties except one, the percent of families having less than \$3,000 exceeds 30 percent. So it is clear that 19 of these 20 counties far exceed the national average for poverty standards as adopted last year when Congress passed the antipoverty bill. In view of these facts I believe it would be well to consider modifying the standards.

I shall not offer an amendment, because this is a complicated subject to deal with, and needs the benefit of the consideration of Senators who are members of the committee and of their experts. I hope that as the bill progresses through Congress, those handling it on the part of the Senate will consider the additional facts that the debate has brought out, to see if some standard could be adopted which would protect the

bill and its sound provisions, and at the same time make it possible for some of the counties which are situated as I have described to be included.

If we amend title IV, for example, to make counties eligible if their family income did not exceed 50 percent of the national family median or 53 percent, which equals the \$3,000 standard of the poverty bill, 7 of these 20 counties in Mississippi which are now excluded would be eligible. These counties are Union, Prentiss, Tishomingo, Scott, Itawamba, Wayne, and Alcorn. I believe these are counties of great need and should not be excluded from participation in the benefits of this program. With only a small variation in the formula, I believe those counties could qualify for participation in the program.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maine what his interest would be in a certain situation. I do not ask him to give a binding promise at this stage of the debate.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is conceivable that a policy could develop in the direction which the Senator from Mississippi has suggested. The 40-percent-of-national-median-income test was written into the bill because the criteria in the Area Redevelopment Act were unsatisfactory with respect to rural areas—that is, areas as to which no labor statistics and unemployment figures were available. The Area Redevelopment Administration developed some ad hoc standards, which were regularized by its regulations. They were useful and helpful in spreading the benefits of programs into areas such as

the Senator from Mississippi describes. Out of this experience was developed the criterion of 40 percent of national median income.

As experience develops under the proposed act, I would not be at all surprised if the agency and the committees of Congress found that, in all justice, this standard should be broadened so as to cover the areas with which the Senator from Mississippi is concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Maine for his fine sentiment along that line. The situation I have described could exist because of the lack of more accurate statistics as to the percentage of persons who are actually employed.

I hope that as the bill progresses through Congress, the Senator from Maine will be friendly to the idea that the criterion should be changed and the formula modified to the extent of perhaps being more accurate, so as to include countries that are near the borderline of the formula.

Mr. MUSKIE. We shall certainly take a good look at the situation to see if the formula should be modified. I thank the Senator for his support and for his eloquent expression of the philosophy of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Maine. I appreciate the excellent work that he and other Senators are doing in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table of the counties of Mississippi that are excluded, their population,

and the percentage of families having less than \$3,000 annual income.

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

Counties excluded	Population	Percentage of families with less than \$3,000 annual income
Alcorn.....	25,282	54.0
Tishomingo.....	13,889	61.0
Prentiss.....	17,993	62.1
Union.....	18,904	60.3
Lee.....	40,589	43.8
Itawamba.....	15,080	55.9
Monroe.....	33,953	50.0
Lowndes.....	46,639	42.8
Lauderdale.....	67,119	39.7
Scott.....	21,187	61.4
Rankin.....	34,322	40.4
Hinds.....	187,045	30.9
Adams.....	38,730	39.8
Wayne.....	16,288	54.4
Lamar.....	13,675	42.6
Forest.....	52,722	37.0
Pearl River.....	22,411	44.3
Stone.....	7,013	46.1
Harrison.....	119,489	42.1
Jackson.....	55,522	28.6
Total.....	846,778	.....

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a number of questions have been asked concerning the operations of the three programs. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table entitled "Comparison of Industrial Commercial Loan Programs," which consists of a comparison of provisions of the bill in nine categories.

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

Comparison of industrial and commercial loan programs

Item	ARA	EDA	SBA, 7(a) loans
1. Limits on individual loan amount.....	None.....	None.....	\$350,000.
2. Limits on Federal participation.....	65 percent.....	65 percent.....	100 percent direct loans; 90 percent guarantees or participation.
3. Limits on term.....	25 years.....	25 years.....	10 years.
4. Rate of interest.....	Established with Treasury at 4 percent.	Cost to Treasury plus at Secretary's option, amounts to cover other costs. Estimate 1966, 4½ percent.	Same as ARA in ARA areas; otherwise maximum 5½ percent.
5. Security required.....	Reasonable assurance of repayment. Can go to 2d position.	Reasonable assurance of repayment. Can go to 2d position.	"Of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment." Stricter collateral requirements than ARA.
6. Working capital loans.....	None.....	Guarantee up to 90 percent of outstanding balance.	No restriction.
7. Funds available.....	Not to exceed \$200,000,000 in loans outstanding.	Annual appropriation for all loans and guarantees \$170,000,000 annually.	Not to exceed \$1,325,000,000 outstanding, including Poverty Act and disaster loans. Approximately \$250,000,000 unused authority will remain as of June 30, 1965.
8. Restrictions.....	1. Applicants approved by instrumentality of State, or subdivision thereof concerned with problems of economic development. 2. Provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment. 3. Not available for relocation. 4. Financing must not be otherwise available.		Also required to make guaranteed loans first if possible. (a) Disaster loans, 3 percent, 20 years, no limit. (b) Poverty program. \$25,000, interest provision same as Economic Development Act, 15 years, "reasonable assurance of repayment." (c) Investment company 50 percent or \$4,000,000, whichever less. (d) State and local development company for relaunching to small business. 25-year term (secs. 501 and 502). (e) Small business investment company purchase of debentures on matching basis up to \$200,000.
9. Additional loan authority.....	Public facility loans.....	Public facility loans.....	

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I support S. 1648, which is a very far-reaching bill and perhaps one of the most significant pieces of proposed legislation to come before Congress thus far. It involves economic development; but more, it puts the approving stamp of Congress on planning. This is impor-

tant. Planning at the regional level; planning at the multicounty level; and planning at the local level. As in the case of the Appalachia legislation, it looks to sound programs of public improvements geared to stimulating permanent industrial growth and permanent employment.

S. 1648 recognizes that there are areas other than Appalachia which have not shared in the general level of our pros-

perity and seriously need resource development through Federal assistance. This is the philosophy that was shared by many of us at the time of the debate on the Appalachia bill. As Senators will remember, it was because such a piece of legislation was promised by the administration to cover national needs that we held off in expanding the Appalachia program to include our other needy areas. S. 1648 seeks to fulfill the



promise and to expand the policy of regional rehabilitation.

I wish to compliment the Senators and other Members of Congress who have worked diligently and persistently to develop the concept of regional development for other areas of our Nation, and who have worked hard on the particular bill before us. My particular gratitude goes to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] who have done an outstanding job in guiding this legislation in committee and on the floor.

S. 1648 is an excellent bill. It provides for the establishment of regional commissions to study the needs of our less developed areas, and come up with broad economic recommendations and programs which can be applied above and beyond existing Federal assistance.

It combines the better features of the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs, placing primary emphasis on public improvements that will foster and expand industry.

It recognizes the importance of the role that the healthier communities must play in assisting the less fortunate areas. The opportunity is provided for multicounty economic development districts which could bring together eligible and noneligible areas under special regional and subregional plans for growth. This type of economic, multicounty planning is already underway in my State. The planning and technical assistance money provided in the bill will give these larger areas a good opportunity to work out coordinated programs.

The key to this new legislation is coordination; among the communities; among the States; and between the States and the Federal Government. The goal of the legislation is to apply the assistance to those areas and projects where it will do the most good for the long haul. This is a public works bill with a plan; it signifies an excellent approach for the future. I sincerely urge its passage.

Last March, I made a special address to the Massachusetts Legislature citing the crucial need for a coordinated regional development program for New England, and for a regional commission to implement this program. The response which I received to this suggestion at that time was particularly encouraging. Today I am extremely gratified to announce that the Massachusetts House and Senate have adopted a joint resolution fully supporting S. 1648 and the concept of a New England regional commission.

The joint resolution emphasizes that the economic status of New England more than qualifies the region for assistance provided under S. 1648, and it supports the principal that regional planning will be effective and beneficial in coping with our economic problems.

Mr. President, I think this expression of approval from the Massachusetts Legislature is a splendid example of the way many sections of the country feel about this economic development bill, and I would hope that other States in New England, and in other areas, would follow the lead of Massachusetts in offering State legislative support for this impor-

tant legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Massachusetts joint resolution be placed at this point in the RECORD.

The formal presentation of this resolution was made in the RECORD earlier today.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing Federal grants and assistance to economically distressed areas and regions

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently launched an attack on certain areas of poverty, undevelopment, and underdevelopment by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; and

Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States two bills, cosponsored by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, one providing grants for public works and development facilities and other financial assistance to alleviate unemployment in other economically distressed areas and regions (S. 1648) and one providing for the use of public works and other economic programs in a coordinated effort to aid other economically disadvantaged areas of the Nation (S. 812); and

Whereas said bills provide for the creation of regional commissions to plan and implement economic programs, designed to foster regional productivity, and growth; and

Whereas such a regional commission for New England would be extremely effective and beneficial in coping with serious economic problems which transcend State boundaries, and which require Federal assistance founded on sound planning and directed to projects that will enhance long-term growth; and

Whereas at a joint session of the General Court of Massachusetts on March 9, 1965, Senator KENNEDY expressed his hope that the general court authorize participation in a New England Regional Commission which would work for regional development and cooperation, and his intention to sponsor major legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide Federal assistance for development of the New England region; and

Whereas said legislation is vital to the New England region whose economic status more than qualifies it for the assistance provided by said legislation, because of many critical problems, the more pressing of which are caused by the closing of military installations, slack growth, deficient transportation becoming more critical each day, inadequate water pollution control, high electric power costs, a declining fishing industry, undeveloped natural resources, and unemployment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 1648 and Senate bill 812, thereby providing for strong, effective regional development commissions to coordinate an attack on the varied regional problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts recognizes the importance of regional planning in connection with such legislation, and looks with favor upon the participation by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in a New England regional development commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.  
Mr. President, at the hearings before the

Public Works Committee, members of the New England senatorial delegation and representatives from industry, labor, and the Governors of our various States made a comprehensive presentation in support of S. 1648 and S. 812. There was bipartisan support, and it was strong support.

Mr. President, this regional approach to solving economic problems was very much a part of President Kennedy's thinking. As a Senator, he devoted his first speeches on this floor to outlining New England problems, and calling for a multistate approach to solving them. He sought the united efforts of the entire New England congressional delegation. He supported the idea of New England Governors' conferences, he backed the New England Council, representing businessmen, all with the conviction that the way to get New England moving forward again was to plan, and coordinate, and organize, and work hard. Above all, he believed that New England's development would be best obtained by regional planning and sound Federal-State programs.

S. 1648, then, in large part, reflects the President's hope for the future.

Mr. President, I think it would be very helpful if excerpts of certain statements and materials were placed in the RECORD which would provide a picture of our New England situation, and the strong support this bill has received in our New England area. I ask unanimous consent that these be printed following my remarks.

Thank you very much.

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

STATEMENT DELIVERED BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BILL (S. 1648) AND THE NEED FOR SUCH LEGISLATION IN THE NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL AREA, TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to appear before the committee this morning and express my support for the administration's economic development bill. As the chairman well knows, many of us were seriously concerned during the Appalachia debate that other areas of the country, also lagging in economic growth, should have the opportunity to develop regional programs similar to Appalachia. In fact, we were prepared to introduce our own region amendments to the Appalachian legislation, but held off on this after assurances from the administration that we would be covered in a forthcoming national development bill.

This we now have before us in S. 1648. One of its most important provisions concerns the creation of regional commissions to plan and implement long-range economic programs. For some time, I have urged that the establishment of such a commission for New England would be extremely effective and beneficial. The administration has wisely chosen to extend the Appalachia approach of regional programming to other problem areas. In my opinion, this is one of the most significant new steps in economic development legislation to come forward in many years.

I would suggest that the committee seriously consider integrating the language of S. 812 into the administration bill. S. 812, of which I am a cosponsor, was introduced by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], whose knowledge and experience in

this field is of the highest caliber. I feel that this language would provide more effective guidelines and greater flexibility in the selection of regional commissions; a stronger incentive for such commissions to come to the administration and to Congress with a development program as soon as possible; and a more specific description of the membership of the regional commissions and of the power of the Federal member in approving commission plans.

In addition to providing for regional development commissions, S. 1648 provides for continuation of the better features of area redevelopment and accelerated public works assistance, on a more flexible basis with greater emphasis on planning for permanent industrial development rather than the mere creation of temporary employment. This assistance would be available as soon as money is appropriated, and for the most part, would not have to wait for long-range programs to be developed by the commission. Continuing ARA and APW type of funding to assist existing redevelopment areas is of crucial importance. My only major concern here is that the annual money authorized for public works and development facility grants is too modest and thus should be increased substantially in order to develop a truly meaningful growth program.

S. 1648 has two other features which I like very much and which I feel will be helpful in implementing long-range growth programs. One involves the recognition of economic development centers which although not distressed, would still be eligible for development assistance if the projects would contribute to the alleviation of high unemployment and low income in surrounding areas. The other concerns the creation of multi-county economic development districts which would bring together eligible and noneligible areas under a kind of subregional development plan and program.

This type of coordinated area attack on unemployment could be extremely effective in the Lowell-Lawrence-Haverhill area of Massachusetts, and in the Fall River-New Bedford-Providence area.

Of particular importance to my State, and to New England, is the new provision for Federal assistance to those areas or military installation closings, or other economic emergencies.

Throughout the bill, there is the basic philosophy that Federal assistance shall be concentrated in accord with sound planning, and directed to projects which will enhance long-term growth. With this kind of assistance, and with the additional funding which I hope will come from a New England regional program developed by its commission, we have substantial reason to be encouraged and hopeful.

New England's present economic status more than qualifies it for the assistance provided in the pending legislation.

It is a six-State area, with economic and cultural ties, separated from surrounding regions by its geographical location and its topography. There is probably no more precise version of an economic region existing in the United States today than New England. We have traditionally shared markets, employment, transportation, financial investment, education and other resources. In size, the region covers only 2.2 percent of the country's area, yet it has almost 6 percent of U.S. population, and much of this is concentrated in its three smallest States. Because it is a small but distinct area, its problems transcend local and State boundaries, and it is constantly in search of regional solutions.

Recognizing this, our New England Governors recently proposed a six-State regional planning compact to deal with major New England problems. This cooperative effort on the part of our Governors, will be en-

hanced and strengthened by the creation of a New England Regional Commission adding the Federal Government as a partner to our regional efforts to solve problems and stimulate economic growth.

Details on New England's present economic condition will be set forth in exhibits and analyses which have been prepared by the Library of Congress, the Department of Commerce, State agencies, the New England Council and others. These materials will be submitted for the record during our presentation. From this economic information, I should like to make some important general observations.

New England is a region which is increasingly lagging behind the Nation's level of growth. Unlike Appalachia, we were once prosperous and productive, with a high level of employment in manufacturing and agriculture. As the Nation expanded, our mills moved elsewhere, our farming declined, and there was not sufficient diversification of industry to take up the slack.

As a result, New England's increase in personal income is below the national average. Except for Massachusetts and Connecticut, its per capita personal income is considerably less than the national figure. Serious pockets of poverty are prevalent in its northern rural areas and in older industrial centers of southern New England. Unfortunately, aggregate statistics cannot tell the true story, because the metropolitan Boston area and southern areas of Connecticut with heavy populations are doing rather well, while many other parts of New England are falling far behind.

The most important single source of personal income in New England has been manufacturing. It has provided a base for the trade and the service industries. It has developed a splendid force of skilled and semi-skilled industrial workers. However, during the past 15 years, industrial employment in New England has fallen off by over 250,000. Most of this decline has come from losses of textile, shoe, furniture, jewelry, and other traditional industries which were concentrated in relatively few urban centers. For many, the impact has been catastrophic with substantial unemployment continuing for many years despite efforts to bring in new industry. Almost half of New England's labor markets are in this category.

Other factors contribute to New England's economic distress. The region ranks close to the last in new buildings for trade and industry. Many of the old edifices which housed the production of a great industrial era now stand dilapidated and in some instances, unusable. New industry is not attracted to old environments. Existing industry lacks the incentive for expansion when cities and towns cannot provide modern public improvements. Much private housing, schools, and municipal buildings are of ancient vintage. All of these factors discourage new industry from moving into our labor depressed centers.

We need a major redevelopment effort through Federal assistance to provide the opportunity for more and diversified industrial activity, and the development of our human and material resources.

However, apart from its economic distress, New England has a number of immediate problems which need to be solved through regional cooperation and planning.

We have a crisis in transportation. Our major railroads are in or near bankruptcy and need complete rehabilitation. We are at this moment faced with the discontinuance of all intercity passenger service, and the possibility of substantial abandonment of freight service which could ruin forever industrial development in hundreds of potential growth centers in New England. Our only major airline is fighting for its life in the courts. It needs permanent status as a trunkline carrier, major financing for new

equipment; and better airports with electronic guidance equipment. Air service from New England to eastern cities is suffering under this situation. Efficient air service is a necessary part of economic improvement.

High-speed expressways are needed to open up the resources of northern New England. The Port of Boston is not being adequately utilized. Many urban centers need new and larger warehousing and handling facilities for integration of truck, rail, and air freight services.

All these things call for a regional program of coordination and assistance to develop a fast, efficient transportation network between New England centers, and to markets outside the New England region. Industry cannot grow without efficient transportation.

New England has an abundance of water—for human consumption, for industry, for power. Yet water is one of its major problems. Sewage and industrial wastes make much of this resource unusable and a peril to recreation, fishing, and industrial development.

Water collection and distribution systems are inadequate. Many urban areas increasing their demands for clean water will be faced with serious shortages. Again, we need a regional program, substantially financed, for both pollution control, and water distribution and conservation.

New England is the highest cost electric power area in the Nation. Its consumers and industries pay almost 30 percent more than the national average. While other regions of the Nation have benefited from billions of dollars of Federal funds, for hydropower complexes, no major facility of this nature has been constructed in New England. Nor do we have any substantial program for buying power from other regions. Instead we rely on small and scattered power systems which must import various fuels from long distances at increased expense. This is another example of the need for a regional plan to coordinate our existing capacity, and to prepare major projects to meet the demand that lies ahead. Cheap and abundant electric power is fundamental to any regional economic development program.

New England has natural resources which have not been adequately utilized. Perhaps it has been our preoccupation with manufacturing that has diverted our attention away from this. We have more of our land area covered by forests than does any other region in the United States. This area is a natural for extensive recreational and housing development for middle and lower income families. At the same time, through modern methods of forestry and transportation, commercial use of this resource can be expanded. Since the early settling of New England, commercial enterprise has looked to the coastal areas and to the sea for profit.

For many reasons, our fishing industry has been allowed to decline, when in fact it should have moved to keep pace with other regions of the United States and foreign countries. This decline has contributed substantially to unemployment in Massachusetts, and other States. The Continental Shelf and coastal regions abound in fish, shellfish, minerals, and other resources. Science has provided us with the technology and know-how to modernize our fishing fleet and its marketing methods, and to begin industrial development of our offshore resources. We need now the program and the initiative to move ahead. This, too, is a regional responsibility.

Other problems concern our human resources. New England's severe unemployment situation in areas which had long been dependent on a single industry points up the need for an accelerated program of vocational education and manpower retrain-

ing. This is particularly necessary where the industry we are attracting have job opportunities primarily in the skilled categories. Our special need here is for regionally located vocational schools, training institutes, and community colleges, closely integrated with local industrial development programs. New England can benefit greatly from a computerized assessment of its job opportunities leading to regional and sub-regional placement programs.

Boston is one of the world's most prominent medical centers, yet the rest of New England suffers substantially from the lack of modern hospitals, medical schools, and nursing care facilities. This creates a special problem because our region has one of the highest percentages of citizens over 65, which will need increasing care in advancing years. Many of these older people are in the low-income category. We will have to develop a network of regional medical complexes, combining the latest in psychiatric, medical and surgical care, and providing special inexpensive diagnostic services. Our State universities must be encouraged to develop medical schools and training centers at these complexes. Extensive centers for aging, nursing care facilities, should be constructed in each of our population centers.

A substantial financial investment is needed with respect to our human resources. A community which cooperates with industry, trains and places its workers, provides top medical care, and looks out for the aging, is a community which is bound to grow. It is attractive to industry, and to the professions which will give it leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time to explain some of New England's problems in order to place in perspective the importance of regional planning contemplated by S. 1648, and the great need for substantial Federal assistance to stimulate economic activity in our area.

In many ways we are different from Appalachia. We once had economic success, but now we are slipping behind the Nation, unable to offset fast enough the severe employment losses and industrial shifts dealt us over the past 20 years. Appalachia never got started, but now it is on its way. We still have the economic potentials—in human skills, in resources, in consumer strength, in industrial sites, but we need a new effort to put these potentials to work in a different kind of economy.

Both Appalachia and New England, like the areas of the upper Great Lakes, the Ozarks, and others can benefit from the special assistance and guidance that will come from a Federal-State regional planning program. S. 1648 will begin the task. It is for New England to take the lead from there. We will take that lead, and we will succeed.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., April 26, 1965.

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
U.S. Senate, Old Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Attached, as requested, are materials relating to the New England economy.

Salient points about the region's economy are:

1. Personal income in the New England States has been rising, but more slowly than the United States.

2. Only Connecticut and Massachusetts, among the several States, show significant associations between personal income and gross national product. The pull of overall national growth through stimulation of aggregate demand is likely still to leave behind and to aggravate the economic problems of New England.

3. The trend of employment, as revealed by industrial patterns in the period 1950-60,

shows movement away from land use (agriculture), labor intensive production (textiles), and outmoded forms of manufacture and transportation. As demand shifts, as the service sector grows, and as automation and technological change takes place—these being concentrated in the metropolitan areas—the intraregional disparity in growth widens.

4. Economic activity is primarily concentrated in the Boston metropolitan area and in the Connecticut SMSA's. Aggregate indicators, therefore, understate the slow growth and development in the region as a whole.

To lessen intraregional disparities and to promote the growth of New England as a whole, the slowly growing areas need to be more closely integrated with and draw economic sustenance from growing areas.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. MIKI.

CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND EMPLOYMENT, 1950-60—INDICATORS OF TRENDS IN THE REGION'S ECONOMY

The material in the following four pages show that:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Textiles.....	55.0	54.9	30.7	53.1	35.1	76.5	18.7
Agriculture.....	18.1	17.0	33.4	8.7	34.6	2.8	48.2
Railroad and railroad express.....	8.9	6.8	6.2	10.3	11.0	2.9	8.6
Total.....	82.0	78.7	70.3	72.1	80.7	82.2	75.5

2. One other industry was represented in the decrease in every State, but the industry share was usually less.

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Forestry and fisheries.....	2.3	1.1	5.9	1.7	0.3	3.8	1.3

3. Five industries were represented in the decrease in all but one State each:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Lumber and wood products.....	3.9	-----	10.6	1.6	2.8	0.3	9.8
Other transportation.....	2.5	1.1	.9	3.6	.2	3.6	-----
Food and dairy products.....	1.0	-----	1.5	3.6	.9	2.9	.5
Hotel and other personal service.....	2.6	1.9	.9	4.9	3.3	2.6	-----
Entertainment and recreation.....	.7	-----	1.3	1.3	.8	.2	.7
Total.....	10.7	3.0	15.2	15.0	8.0	9.6	11.0

4. Total percentage share accounted for by the nine industries listed above:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
9 industries' share.....	95.0	82.8	91.4	88.8	80.0	95.6	87.8

CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND EMPLOYMENT, 1950-60; INDICATORS OF TRENDS IN THE REGION'S ECONOMY

INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT

1. The increase in total employment was distributed more evenly over several industries and not all of them represented a major share of the increase in each State.

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Medical, educational, and other professions.....	23.7	20.2	17.8	27.1	18.8	10.4	27.8
Industry not reported.....	18.7	14.2	8.8	28.6	15.0	21.6	8.3
Electrical and other machinery.....	12.0	9.0	-----	15.4	21.5	5.1	12.0
Transportation equipment manufacturing.....	8.9	20.6	6.6	2.9	4.0	4.0	-----
Armed Forces.....	7.4	2.6	21.1	5.9	10.6	14.0	3.1
Total.....	70.7	66.6	54.3	74.9	69.9	64.1	51.2

2. Five industries were represented in the increase in every State, but did not account for as large a share of the employment increase:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Food and kindred products manufacturing.....	2.9	2.3	3.7	3.0	2.2	3.6	2.7
Printing and publishing.....	2.7	3.0	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.3	3.3
Chemicals and allied products.....	.5	1.1	.4	.1	.1	.8	.4
Other retail trade.....	2.8	6.0	6.4	.4	4.8	-----	10.5
Publications administration.....	3.2	2.8	5.7	2.3	3.0	5.4	2.0
Total.....	12.1	15.2	18.3	8.4	12.3	12.1	18.9

3. Six industries were represented in the increase in all but one State each:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
Apparel, other fabric.....	0.9	-----	1.6	1.8	0.6	3.8	0.8
Trucking service and warehousing.....	.7	0.6	-----	.7	1.0	.6	1.4
Communications.....	.8	1.1	.7	.8	.4	-----	.2
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	4.6	-----	11.5	5.1	5.0	6.9	10.9
Total.....	7.0	1.7	12.8	8.4	7.0	11.3	13.3

4. Total percentage share accounted for by the industries listed above:

Industry	New England	Connecticut	Maine	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Rhode Island	Vermont
14 industries' share.....	89.8	73.5	85.4	91.7	79.2	87.5	82.4

#### THE NEW ENGLAND ECONOMY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The objective of New England, as a region, and of its component States includes the economic development of underdeveloped resources and the promotion of more vigorous development in growing areas, and the incorporation of lagging areas into growing sectors.

New England is growing, but less rapidly than the Nation as a whole. Over the long run, as a consequence, its share in total personal income has shrunk from 6.72 percent in 1948 to 6.44 percent in 1963. Concomitantly, nonagricultural employment has fallen from 6.94 percent of the total in 1957 to 6.70 percent in 1964; manufacturing employment from 8.66 percent (1957) to 8.25 percent (1964). As a region, New England has been losing economic resources to other, more rapidly growing regions.

1. Rhode Island, Maine, and Massachusetts shares in total personal income have fallen, while New Hampshire, Vermont, and Connecticut shares remain virtually constant.

2. The individual States have shared proportionately in the decline in manufacturing employment. In 1964, the percentages of New England manufacturing were:

Connecticut.....	30
Maine.....	7
Massachusetts.....	46
New Hampshire.....	6
Rhode Island.....	8
Vermont.....	2

There have been wide sectional variations within the region, for individual States experience different patterns and rates of growth depending on their industrial composition and the growth rate of a region within a particular industry—its regional share. In general, New England's employment gain (1950-60) in general industry, finance, insurance, real estate, transportation equipment manufacturing, and government has been offset by losses in agriculture, textiles, railroads, railroad express service, and retail food and dairy products stores.

1. Connecticut, employment losses in agriculture, textiles, and miscellaneous manufacturing have been offset by long run gains in machinery manufacturing, general retail, and finance, insurance, real estate.

2. New Hampshire's employment losses in agriculture, textiles, lumber, furniture, wood products, and railroads and railroad express services were matched by gains in machinery manufacturing and government, leaving a positive total employment effect.

3. In the other New England States, however, losses in the several sectors (agriculture, textiles, railroads and railroad express services, and retail food and dairy products) have outweighed employment gains in manufacturing and other sectors.

The pattern, then, is one of slow employment gains, punctuated by employment rates greater than the national average in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island and pockets of high unemployment in the several States, as shown. If the unemployment rate in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island were brought down at least to the U.S. average, the gap between potential and actual output would be narrowed and personal income should rise. Similarly, an increase in employment in Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire, would raise the growth rate in output and income.

The pockets of continuous high unemployment are especially significant for these areas are not being pulled up by growing areas via spillover benefits. A program of public works and development facilities is particularly well suited to assist in facilitating and accelerating the growth process by providing a capital structure for the creation of external economies in localities where such economies are presently poorly developed, and the fostering of the location of several enterprises in the same area.

PRESENTATION OF NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, APRIL 27, 1965

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. PHILLIP W. HOFF, GOVERNOR, STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct pleasure and honor to act as liaison of my fellow New

England Governors before you during your deliberations on Senate bill 1648.

New England, by the dint of the magnificent efforts of our forebears and the Yankee ingenuity of our inhabitants, has managed to share in the prosperity of our American free enterprise system. New England as a region badly needs the assistance of the current bill in order to maintain its proper share of the Nation's bounty.

To this point, I invite the attention of the body to that work with which you and your companion New England Senators are familiar, the 1961 Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Report: "New England at work in the Space Age." As so well stated by the author, "Obviously the New England economic machine simply cannot work—and equally obviously, it does."

#### Disadvantages

Among the disadvantages New England labors under are its general lack of industrial raw materials, and its disadvantageous location. I have presumed, Mr. Chairman, to attach some core statistics (exhibit A) which to me contain some important facts which help highlight the need and desirability of Senate bill 1648. Review of these facts show:

(1) Our declining share of population and density of population; our slow rate of change from agriculture to other income sources; our failure to automate.

(2) Our eggs-in-basket dependence on manufacturing; our decline in size of manufacturing work force; our low wage status.

(3) The substantial handicaps imposed on New England's manufacturers, e.g., lack of raw materials; high costs of fuel and power (to which I shall turn in a later section of my statement); our longer haul to market and our crucial transportation problems.

(4) Our curiously structured work force, with proportionately higher older workers and female workers than is found elsewhere in the Nation.

Added to our disadvantages, Mr. Chairman, are those economic scars, infrequent we are pleased to say, which are identified in the pending bill as distressed areas. And, further, those areas of pitifully low incomes. It is indeed encouraging to note that in legislation now being implemented, in the 3½-year history of the Area Redevelopment Administration, significant strides have been taken. I am sure that this committee is well aware of the well-documented report on this matter issued in February 1965 by the U.S. Department of Commerce Secretary, John T. Connor, and Area Redevelopment Administrator, William L. Batt, Jr.

I have attached hereto interim and informal statistics as to New England's participation in this worthy program (exhibit B). May I note, Mr. Chairman, that it was the wise and judicious action of the Senate which caused the so-called Proxmire amendment to be added so that our rural areas incapable of showing technical compliance with the distressed area concept might also share in the "operation bootstrap" improvements made available to our low-income areas by the original ARA bills.

I strongly urge that the pending bill might well be subjected to minor amendment to permit continuation of eligible areas designated under the Proxmire amendment. We realize the annual review section of the pending bill might be interpreted to divest States, such as Vermont and New Hampshire, of designations under the original ARA bill. We in Vermont have had the benefit of the Proxmire amendment by gubernatorial designation of a three-county area. This has brought needed municipal improvements and new industrial hope.

#### New flexibility

The pending bill enjoys much needed new flexibility. We note, with appreciation, that

grants and loans for municipal projects may now be given to improve job opportunities on a long-range basis, as well as the proven validity of the providing of jobs concurrent with the construction of the projects. The previous job justification criteria, proven somewhat unsatisfactory, has been eliminated. Also the area designations are more flexible in that in addition to the pocket-poverty distressed areas, now areas contiguous may share in the designation—provided the multiarea unit is a recognized economic region.

The new bill also provides guarantees for working capital to industries being aided. We feel this will enhance participation by private banking sources—in Vermont our recent amendments to our Industrial Building Authority Act were passed on this premise.

In 1963 I had the pleasure of appearing before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in respect to the ARA bill. At that time, I requested that technical planning money be made available without matching funds from the State or community. I note with appreciation that the \$15 million technical assistance program in the present bill does not require matching funds.

**Action remedies**

In addition to the badly needed changes which this new bill includes, this bill provides what we in New England believe to be the key to the future. I refer to the regional action planning commissions we find in title V.

The six New England States comprise one region in the opinion of its inhabitants and in the opinion of the Nation.

As was well said in an editorial in the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, on Tuesday, March 30, 1965: "the eastern megalopolis now stretching from Concord, N.H., south beyond Washington, D.C. \* \* \* In 1975, New England \* \* \* in effect if not in fact \* \* \* will be one large State. Programs of regional cooperation which are just in the discussion stage now, will wipe away the stifling boundaries of traditional competition."

Over the years, valiant efforts have been made to meet the regional needs of New England. We are all well aware of the significant contributions to our economy and unity made by such groups as the New England Council, our labor groups, and various regional committees and commissions.

With partnership between the Federal Government and our State governments made feasible by the Regional Action Planning Commission, we could begin to find action remedies for many of our problems.

**Transportation**

The transportation situation is but one of a number of major interstate-Federal problems that are in evidence. Our air system needs both planning and action. And, this Senate is well aware of the staggering multi-State impact of the proposed closing of rail services on the New Haven Railway. You are also well aware of the fact that with temporary economics in sight, some of our Federal agencies are curtailing use of rail services, such as now occurring to railway mail operations in New England. This, despite the fact that New England is so distant from the population center of the Nation—which continues moving westward—and New England urgently needs a major improvement in surface bulk and passenger transportation.

**Power**

New England urgently needs massive improvements in electric systems. Our regional consumers pay as much as 20 percent more for electricity than the national average. Our industrial consumers pay 66 per-

cent more than the national average. Our commercial enterprises pay 17 percent more than the national average (exhibit C).

Again, the partnership among the New England States needs the addition of the Federal partner.

**Planning**

As indicated above, the New England States have realized the urgent needs for regional action. I am proud to have led the introduction of a New England planning compact before the New England Governors. This compact has been approved by each of the New England Governors and is currently pending passage in the several States (exhibit D).

I hasten to assure this body that the New England planning compact is by no means an instrument competitive with the Regional Action Planning Commission, as viewed in title V of this bill.

Viewed in one light, the planning compact could serve a long-range purpose plan project for New England. Viewed in another, the planning compact could serve as one of the arms of the New England Regional Action Planning Commission.

The Appalachia solution, to us, seems long overdue and most reasonable. The problems of New England are not the problems of the Pacific coast. The enactment of legislation designed to meet New England needs is a real necessity. The joint Federal-State effort is long overdue.

While we in New England appreciate the significant contribution of ARA and APW, we foresee the Regional Action Planning Commission as the most significant device for improving the well-being of our citizens. A plan without a purpose is piffle. A plan without consideration of regional impact is equally worthless, and overall action without proper planning and proper recognition of the needs of our respective regions is reckless.

I have attempted, Mr. Chairman, to accurately reflect the combined views of the New England Governors. Factors of time did not permit submission of the text of these remarks to my fellow Governors. However, although we New England Governors may have differences of opinion as to the priority of needs, I am confident that I reflect our combined views when I urgently recommend passage of this significant legislation.

**EXHIBIT A**

**NEW ENGLAND HANDICAPS**

Basically—disadvantageous location; general lack of natural resources.

Specifically—1. Declining share in most of the Nation's economic activities and vital statistics.

(a) Population, 1950-60.<sup>1</sup>

	Percent	Density
New England.....	+12.8	166.5
Middle Atlantic.....	+19.3	300.1
Great Lakes.....	+19.2	148.0
Pacific.....	+40.2	23.6
United States.....	+18.5	50.5
Vermont.....	+3.2	42.0

(b) Employment changes—nonagricultural employment—1950-1960.<sup>2</sup>

	Percent
New England.....	+11.1
Middle Atlantic.....	+ 9.2
Far West.....	+43.9
United States.....	+18.2

<sup>1</sup> Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census.

(c) Overall relatively lower output per employee (failure to automate).<sup>3</sup>

Gross product originating per employee—1960 dollars

	1947	1967
New England.....	\$5,400	\$6,600
Middle Atlantic.....	5,640	7,414
Great Lakes.....	5,582	7,535
Far West.....	6,523	8,274
United States.....	5,350	7,164
Vermont.....	4,357	5,681

2. Eggs-in-one-basket dependence on manufacturing for its livelihood.<sup>3</sup>  
In terms of concentration on manufacturing—New England ranks No. 1:

	Percent
New England current income from manufacturing.....	38
Middle Atlantic current income from manufacturing.....	34
Far West current income from manufacturing.....	27
U.S. current income from manufacturing.....	28
Nonagricultural employment in manufacturing:	
New England.....	39
Middle Atlantic.....	35
Far West.....	27

3. Decline both relative and absolute in manufacturing work force.<sup>3</sup>

**Percent change**

	1950-60	1947-62
New England.....	-2.2	-6.0
United States.....	+9.1	+7.8
Middle Atlantic.....	-7	-6.4
Far West.....	+56.8	+70.1

4. Wage rates—differentials, hourly wages, manufacturing:<sup>3</sup>

New England, \$2.09 (a low-wage area).  
Middle Atlantic, \$2.32, +11 percent over New England.  
Far West, \$2.62, +25.4 percent over New England.

5. Handicaps imposed on New England manufacturers:<sup>3</sup>

- a. Basic lack of industrial raw materials.
- b. Higher than average costs of fuel and electric power.
- c. Transportation costs higher because of greater haul to market.
- d. Distance from Nation's population center and from rapidly expanding consumer markets.

6. The general antiquity of its overall manufacturing equipment and to its lower than average investment rate in new capital equipment.<sup>3</sup>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

1. Low agricultural employment and income—1960:<sup>3</sup>

New England, 3.4 percent of labor force—1.1 percent of total personal income.  
United States, 10.0 percent of labor force—3.7 percent of total personal income.

Percent change—agricultural employment, 1950-62:<sup>4</sup>

New England.....	-42.5
United States.....	-32.5

2. Transfer payments (social security and old-age benefits) large part of New England personal income:<sup>3</sup>

New England, 10.8 percent of population—65+.

<sup>2</sup> National Planning Association.

<sup>3</sup> Federal Reserve Bank of Boston—Annual Report, 1961.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Labor—Manpower Administration.

United States, 9.2 percent of population—65+.  
Vermont, 11.2 percent of population—65+.

About 8 percent of New England personal income from transfer payments.  
3. New England has older work force.

Labor force participation rates—female, 1960

Structure of labor force—percent distribution, 1960

Age groups	14-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65 and over
New England.....	16.52	19.48	23.40	35.47	5.13
United States.....	17.16	21.04	23.59	33.69	4.52
Vermont.....	17.51	18.74	21.60	30.11	6.04

	All ages	45-64	65+
New England.....	29.4	51.1	11.5
Middle Atlantic.....	28.0	45.8	10.8
Great Lakes.....	25.5	44.0	10.4
Far West.....	26.9	47.0	10.2
United States.....	26.0	44.4	10.2
Vermont.....	25.3	48.8	12.5

LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMANTS FOR COMPENSATION<sup>5</sup>

New England, 40 percent of claimants were over 55 years of age.  
United States, 25 percent of claimants were over 55 years of age.  
New England, 25 percent of claimants were 65+.

United States, 11 percent of claimants were 65+.

4. New England has a larger female work force.<sup>3</sup>  
New England, 40 out of 100 women are in the labor force (34.59 percent).

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 3 on page 12175.

United States, 36 out of 100 women are in the labor force (32.09 percent).

New England: Women accounted for more than half of the long-term unemployment claimants for compensation.<sup>5</sup>

United States: Women accounted for only two-fifths of the long-term unemployment claimants for compensation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Federal Reserve Bank of Boston—New England Business Review, March 1963.

EXHIBIT B

ARA activity in 6 New England States as of Mar. 31, 1965

	Financial assistance			Technical assistance		Training			APW assistance (Jan. 1, 1965)		
	Number of projects	ARA investment	Employment potential	Number of projects	ARA investment	Number of projects	ARA investment	Trainees	Number of projects	Investment	Man-month employment
Connecticut.....	6	\$5,693,000	1,510	5	\$73,480	15	\$519,357	1,212	54	\$6,367,000	6,511
Maine.....	20	13,156,428	4,185	12	213,967	28	208,925	754	55	4,593,000	7,212
Massachusetts.....	15	3,257,683	1,095	10	463,631	29	777,046	738	102	20,857,000	21,306
New Hampshire.....	4	991,730	220	2	102,535	2	190,590	17	23	2,110,000	2,497
Rhode Island.....	4	1,485,784	565	5	190,590	17	955,687	1,225	43	12,398,000	16,554
Vermont.....	2	119,075	110	1	400	3	44,718	70	11	1,317,000	1,609
Total.....	51	24,703,700	7,685	35	1,044,603	92	2,566,333	3,908	288	47,648,000	55,689

New England—ARA totals:  
Number of projects approved..... 178  
ARA investment..... \$28,143,636  
Employment potential (direct)..... 7,685  
Employment potential (direct and indirect)..... 12,680  
Number of trainees..... 3,908  
New England—APW totals:  
Number of projects approved..... 288  
APW investment..... \$47,648,000  
Man-months of employment..... 55,689

INDUSTRIAL  
[Percent paid above the national average]  
Industrial consumers:  
Maine<sup>1</sup>..... 12.4  
Connecticut..... 45.7  
Massachusetts..... 57.1  
New Hampshire..... 41.9  
Rhode Island..... 61.9  
Vermont..... 44.8

<sup>1</sup> Source: Federal Power Commission publication, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1962."

A combination of long winter nights, high heating requirements, and high rates \* \* \* results in the commercial consumers paying from 11.3 to 45.4 percent more in their electric bill than the national average.

[Percent paid above the national average]  
Commercial consumers:  
Maine<sup>1</sup>..... 42  
Connecticut..... 17.2  
Massachusetts..... 31.5  
New Hampshire..... 45.4  
Rhode Island..... 43.7  
Vermont..... 11.3

<sup>1</sup> Source: Federal Power Commission publication, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Privately Owned, 1962."

EXHIBIT C  
POWER

New England's electric consumers pay the highest electric rates in the continental United States.

Residential consumers pay as much as 20.2 percent more for electricity than the average for the Nation.

Highest bills in the continental United States for 250 kilowatt-hours are paid by residential consumers of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, in that order.

As of January 1, 1963, Connecticut residential consumers' bills were 10.8 percent above the national average for 250 kilowatt-hours.

RESIDENTIAL  
[Percent paid above the national average]  
Residential consumers:  
Maine<sup>1</sup>..... 20.2  
Massachusetts..... 18.9  
New Hampshire..... 19.8  
Rhode Island..... 16.6  
Vermont..... 2.4

(Vermont's low figure is due to St. Lawrence and Niagara power.)

<sup>1</sup> Source: "Typical Electric Bills, 1963," a Federal Power Commission publication (cities 2,500 and more).

COMMERCIAL  
In 1962 New England commercial enterprises paid 17.2 percent more than the national average for power.

Power purchased by manufacturing industries—1962

	Kilowatt-hours purchased	Total cost	Average cost per kilowatt-hour	Percent above or below U.S. average
Total, United States.....	Billion 313.7	Million \$2,827.1	Cents 0.9013	
New England.....	12.0	180.0	1.4961	+56
West North Central.....	12.2	151.8	1.2468	+38
Middle Atlantic.....	47.7	545.3	1.1431	+27
East North Central.....	81.0	808.8	.9990	+11
South Atlantic.....	35.4	327.3	.9250	+3
West South Central.....	20.8	175.9	.8442	-6
Pacific.....	38.9	277.0	.7121	-21
Mountain.....	8.5	60.4	.7080	-21
East South Central.....	57.2	298.5	.5222	-42

Source: 1963 Census of Manufactures, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Commerce Department.

EXHIBIT D

STATUS REPORT—LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON THE NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE PLANNING COMPACT BY STATE, APRIL 23, 1965

Connecticut

Compact legislation has been submitted in both the senate and the house. The house

committee on State development has approved the compact and no opposition was voiced at the hearing held by the senate committee on Federal and intergovernmental relations.

Maine

After a hearing at which there was no opposition the joint committee on State gov-

ernment reportedly has a very favorable reaction to the compact.

#### Massachusetts

Governor Volpe strongly supported the compact when he introduced the legislation at a meeting of the joint assembly on April 5, 1965. The compact was unopposed at a recent hearing held by the joint committee on State administration.

#### New Hampshire

The compact, which has the strong support of Governor King, is presently in the house rules committee.

#### Rhode Island

The necessary legislation has been submitted by Governor Chafee's office, in addition to the introduction of a supplemental appropriation request to cover the State's share for the operation of the interstate planning commission.

#### Vermont

The compact, considered to be one of Vermont's most important pieces of legislation by Governor Hoff, has recently passed the senate with extremely strong support. The legislation is now in the hands of the house conservation and development committee which held its first discussion on the measure on April 22. The house committee's initial reaction appeared quite favorable.

### NEW ENGLAND INTERSTATE PLANNING COMPACT

#### ARTICLE I

##### Findings

New England is by virtue of geographic location and other characteristics a great population, cultural, economic, and resource area which, with more intense use of physical, social, and economic resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective and orderly growth of the region. To this end, it is the intent of this compact to establish and provide for the operation of an interstate planning agency for New England.

#### ARTICLE II

##### Purpose

It is the purpose of this compact to provide, in the New England region, improved facilities and procedures for the coordination of the policies, programs, and activities of interstate significance in the New England region in the field of physical, social, and economic resources, and to study, investigate, and plan appropriate governmental activities with respect to the conservation, development, and use of the same; to provide means by which interstate conflicts may be resolved; and to provide procedures for interstate coordination of the interests of all public and private agencies, persons and entities in the fields covered by this compact, and to provide an organization for cooperation in such coordination.

#### ARTICLE III

##### Creation of commission

There is hereby created the New England Interstate Planning Commission hereinafter called the commission.

#### ARTICLE IV

##### Membership

The commission shall consist of one member from each party State to be appointed and to serve, in accordance with and subject to the laws of the State which he represents.

#### ARTICLE V

##### Functions

To carry out the purpose of the contract it shall be the responsibility of the commission to prepare studies and plans, and to recommend procedures for implementing coordination of the policies and programs and

activities of interstate significance in the field of physical, social, and economic conservation and development in the New England region which may include the following:

(1) Collection and interpretation of basic data.

(2) Investigation, planning, and programming (including scheduling) of projects of interstate or regional significance.

(3) Planning and scheduling of governmental services and programs which would be of assistance to the orderly growth and prosperity of the region, and to the well-being of its population.

(4) Encouraging of the referral of plans or proposals for projects and programs of interstate or regional significance to the commission.

(5) Studying and recommending means for the most effective utilization of such Federal assistance as may be available on a regional basis or as may have an interstate or regional impact.

(6) Assisting the party States, or any of them, in cooperative planning undertakings with the Federal Government or any agencies thereof.

To avoid duplication of effort and in the interests of economy, the commission shall make use of existing studies, surveys, plans, data, and other materials in the possession of the governmental agencies of the party States and their respective subdivisions or in the possession of other interstate agencies. Each such agency, within available appropriation and if not expressly prevented or limited by law, is hereby authorized to make such materials available to the commission and to otherwise assist it in the performance of its functions. At the request of the commission each such agency is further authorized to provide the commission with information regarding plans and programs affecting the New England region so that the commission may have available to it current information with respect thereto.

The commission shall use qualified public and private agencies to make investigations and conduct research, but if it is unable to secure the undertaking of such investigations or original research by a qualified public or private agency, it shall have the power to make its own investigations and conduct its own research. The commission may make contracts with any public or private agencies or private persons or entities for the undertaking of such investigations or original research within its purview.

The officers and personnel of agencies of the party States, and of any other government or agency whatever, or private citizens, or representatives of private organizations, may serve at the request of the commission upon such advisory committees as the commission may determine to create; and such officers and personnel of any such government or agency, may serve upon such committee without forfeiture of office or employment and with no loss or diminution in the status, rights and privileges which they otherwise enjoy.

#### ARTICLE VI

##### Cooperation with the Federal Government and other governmental entities

Each party State is hereby authorized to participate in cooperative or joint planning undertakings with the Federal Government, any appropriate agency or agencies thereof, or with any interstate agency or agencies. Such participation shall be at the instance of the Governor or in such other manner as State law may provide or authorize. The commission shall facilitate the work of State representatives in any joint interstate or cooperative Federal-State undertaking authorized by this article, and each such State shall keep the commission advised of its activities in respect of such undertakings, to

the extent that they have interstate or regional significance.

#### ARTICLE VII

##### Voting

No action of the commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the commission members are present and a majority of the total number of votes on the commission are cast in favor thereof; provided that any action not binding by reason of failure to meet this requirement may be ratified within 30 days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the commission members.

#### ARTICLE VIII

##### Finances

A. The commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer of each party State a budget including a statement of all funds expected to be available to the commission and their sources and, a request for an appropriation to cover that State's share of expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof.

B. With due regard for such moneys and other assistance as may be made available to it, the commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the several States participating therein to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the commission.

With due allowance for moneys otherwise available, each budget of the commission shall be the responsibility of the party States, to be apportioned among them as follows: 50 percent on an equal basis; 30 percent on the basis of population; 20 percent on the basis of area, either within incorporated places or places having units of local government, such population to be determined in accordance with the last official U.S. census of population.

C. The commission shall not pledge the credit of any jurisdiction. The commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under article IX(E) of this compact, provided that the commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in such manner.

D. The members of the commission shall be paid by the commission their actual expenses incurred and incidental to the performance of their duties, subject to the approval of the commission.

E. The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the commission shall be audited by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

F. The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission.

#### ARTICLE IX

##### Administration and management

A. The commission may sue and be sued and shall have a seal.

B. The commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, vice chairman, and treasurer. The commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and together with the

treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the commission may require.

C. The commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions irrespective of any civil service laws which might otherwise apply. The commission shall establish and maintain, independently by contract or agreement, or in conjunction with any one or more of the party States, suitable retirement programs for its employees. Employees of the commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old-age and survivors insurance provided that the commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to Federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party States generally.

D. The commission may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any intergovernmental agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

E. The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact, any and all appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services, conditional or otherwise, from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, or any institution, person, firm, or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

F. The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

G. The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

H. The Commission shall make and transmit annually, to the legislature and Governor of each party State, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

#### ARTICLE X

##### *Other compacts and activities*

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to impair, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of any interstate agency in which any party State participates nor to abridge, impair, or otherwise affect the provisions of any compact to which any one or more of the party States may be a party, nor to supersede, diminish, or otherwise affect any obligation assumed under any such compact; nor shall anything in this compact be construed to discourage additional interstate compacts among some or all of the party States or the establishment of intergovernmental agencies in subareas of the region. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction or activities of any participating government, agency, or officer thereof, or any private person or agency.

#### ARTICLE XI

##### *Enactment*

This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by any three of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Thereafter it shall become effective with respect to any other

mentioned State upon its enacting this compact into law.

#### ARTICLE XII

##### *Withdrawal*

This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party State until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending 3 years' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the Governor each of the other States party hereto.

#### ARTICLE XIII

##### *Construction and severability*

The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof, to any State, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof, to any other State, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed.

#### PRESENTATION OF NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, APRIL 27, 1965

##### STATEMENT OF EDWIN W. WEBBER, DIRECTOR OF INTERSTATE RELATIONS AND NATURAL RESOURCES, NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear before this committee on behalf of the New England Council, a private nonprofit organization with offices in Boston, Mass. The council is composed of 2,200 members drawn from business, labor, education, and government within New England, and is devoted to the development of a sound and dynamic region through full utilization of all its human, natural, and material resources.

It is an organization that seeks to represent all of the economic interests of the region. The council is vitally interested in S. 1648, the proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the emphasis the act gives to regionalism as a device by which joint Federal-State efforts may be undertaken toward effective treatment and solution of economic problems.

Regionalism has always been a meaningful concept to New England. It has been made much more so in recent years, due to the region's realization that total development of the region's potential is achievable only through creation of a balanced and viable economic system.

More specifically, this achievement is possible only through regional cooperation.

New England is a small region, composed of six small States. These States share a close-knit identity, and a similarity of outlook and economic interest. There are, of course, differences among the various States, some of which are economic, such as levels of income and economic resources. But in general it may be said that their size and compactness qualify them eminently for regional planning and for regionally based programs of economic development.

These six States recognize this feature as an integral part of their collective future, and have been actively seeking regional solutions to a number of common problems, including regional economic development and planning.

While our States have enjoyed some success in moving toward achievement of these regional goals, much remains to be done. We have many needs, and I would like to enumerate a few of our more basic requirements of today.

First, we need an economic system by which the benefits of economic growth created within those areas now enjoying high

levels of economic activity can be spread to include those areas in New England that have lagged behind, often as a result of structural changes in the economy.

The gradual reorganization of the region's economy from manufacturing to nonmanufacturing activities has resulted in shifts in the location of our economic growth centers. This process of change, in turn, has reinforced a trend of population movement from outlying towns and villages to our expanding metropolitan areas.

The result has been that the areas most distant from these metropolitan centers have experienced chronically high rates of unemployment, as well as deterioration of their public facilities.

The stresses and strains of making up for lost tax bases have created severe burdens on the remaining economic elements of the community, now required to support facilities such as schools, water and street systems, recreation facilities, and downtown rehabilitation programs.

The problems of the expanding metropolitan area and the decline of the small community suggests the need for new solutions. The idea of organizing for development in terms of growth centers, multicounty development districts, as well as the traditional distressed redevelopment areas, seems to hold creative answers to hard problems.

It must become possible to develop, through more adequate transportation systems and better technical services, a more meaningful and complementary economic relationship between economically weaker communities and the growth centers. Such a development would go far in applying effective treatment to one of our region's basic needs.

Second, we need mechanisms by which all levels of government can work closely together in devising the coordinated system necessary for the effective, deliberate, and orderly development of the region.

Governmental efforts must be coordinated as well with private development efforts. To this end, S. 1648 would provide authority to create a series of joint Federal-State regional development commissions. This undertaking is unique in that decisionmaking would be shared by the participating States.

In New England much exists upon which to build an even stronger regional economic program. Numerous Federal, State, local, and private development efforts are underway or are being proposed.

The need for more effective coordination is clear. Before the present Congress there are other legislative proposals which have regional implications.

For example, there is the proposed Water Resource Planning Act, S. 21, H.R. 1111, which could lead to establishment of a New England Regional River Basin Commission. This agency would be charged with the responsibility for preparing comprehensive plans for the development of the region's river basins, and for related land resources.

By comparing this program with the aims of the regional commission envisioned by S. 1648, it is possible to see two activities, seeking the same basic ends, but quite possibly utilizing conflicting and competing techniques. You cannot talk about regional economic development on the one hand, and regional water resource planning and development on the other, without running the risk of repeating yourself.

There has been a growing recognition within New England of the need to avoid this type of confusion, and our New England States on their own initiative have moved on this problem by seeking creation of a New England Regional Planning Commission.

The purposes of this interstate body are to provide a mechanism by which the various statewide planning and development ef-



forts may be coordinated, and by which a comprehensive regional plan may be developed.

This proposed interstate group is but the most recent and dramatic example of regional cooperation in New England in a number of important areas. It is our belief that already existing and proposed interstate cooperative efforts can be an extremely valuable asset in mounting the type of effective regional development program proposed by S. 1648.

Against this background of general need, namely, creation of a balanced viable economic system and coordination of governmental efforts, it is possible to single out some of New England's specific requirements. For the sake of simplicity, they may be categorized as functional and geographical.

#### A. Functional

1. Passenger transportation, both intercity and commuter service.
2. Urban development, particularly along the circumference of our metropolitan areas, and redevelopment of the downtown sections in our older industrial towns.
3. Comprehensive multipurpose river basin development.
4. Water and air pollution control planning.
5. A regional program to alleviate poverty.
6. A regional program for retraining and placement of workers.
7. A regional program for technological development with particular emphasis on rendering technical assistance to industries and local governments in the outlying areas.
8. A regional program for health services.
9. A coordinated regional program for outdoor recreation planning and development.
10. Optimum regional development of all power resources.
11. Development of adequate port and air facilities.

#### B. Geographic

We have urgent need for action programs in certain subregional areas in New England which are geographic in their context, including the following:

1. Redevelopment of the Fall River-New Bedford-Providence area which comprises major portions of Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts.
2. Development of northern Maine.
3. Development of northern Vermont.
4. Development of the Berkshire area, including Pittsfield and North Adams, Mass.
5. Development of the fringe areas of Boston's metropolitan area which reaches northward toward Maine and New Hampshire.

It should be stressed that this list is selective rather than exhaustive and is primarily intended to show the dimension and form of developmental needs for our region. A more complete picture is needed, and can only be obtained by systematic study of the problem.

However, if even this small list of problems is examined in terms of regional growth trends, as projected to 1976, a picture of even greater urgency for action emerges.

According to recent studies completed by the National Planning Association, the population of New England will be approximately 14 million by 1976, an increase of approximately 3 million over the present.

As a consequence, New England will have an increase in its labor force of approximately 1½ million people by 1976. Approximately 700,000 to 800,000 new and better paying jobs are going to be required in New England if the increased population is to be accommodated.

Furthermore, urbanization will continue to spread, and 78 percent of the population increase will occur within these urban areas. Today's major centers of population will continue to radiate outward, forming an integral part of what is referred to as the

"megalopolis" of the Northeastern United States.

More urbanization means more need for recreational opportunities, but it is equally obvious that open space for such needs will be in less supply. This increased population will require newer and expanded methods of air and water pollution control, waste disposal, improved passenger transportation, and numerous other public services.

It is no less significant that there will be an increase of approximately a quarter of a million people 65 years of age and older that will have to be accommodated, and that additional health facilities will have to be constructed.

Even more dramatic in its impact is the projected increase in number of our young people. It is predicted that we will have approximately 1 million more children 14 years of age or younger coming along within the next 10 years. We will need teachers and schools in sufficient number and quality for them.

These problems are not limited to any single region. Much of our frustration in not finding quick and easy solutions to our economic difficulties has been our failure to recognize completely the regional dimensions of the task.

We believe that the willingness to experiment with new approaches to economic distress on a regional basis represents a promising step toward balanced economic growth.

We would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear before the committee to comment on certain aspects of this significant legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the capable Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the State of Massachusetts is incorporated certainly within an area that could well provide a proving ground for these programs, including the program of public works and development facilities.

At present, 116 projects in West Virginia amounting to \$22 million, are eligible for moving forward and employing people in the construction of needed facilities.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am most appreciative, as I am sure other Senators are, of the support given the pending proposal by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator is one without peer in understanding the concept of regional development. He has devoted his great energy and conviction to this bill and to the regional approach. The people of my State—and the people of New England—very much appreciate his understanding and support.

We recognize that New England must come up with a program and the kind of study that will demonstrate the need for this special and far-reaching assistance.

I am convinced that we have the facts to justify our program and receive the

support of Congress. All we ask is that there be thorough consideration of the needs of our less developed areas.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the contribution which he has made over the course of the past several months to the development of the regional concept upon which the important title V of the bill is based.

The Senator and I have worked closely. I know that he has worked closely with Senators from other areas of the country which could conceivably take advantage of that title, the development of the regional concept, the administration support for it, and the effort needed to bring the legislation to the floor.

It has been a privilege and a stimulating experience for me to work with the Senator. I congratulate him and take this opportunity to make his contribution clear on the record.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky has offered an amendment that would reduce the authorization of \$400 million, provided for in title I, to \$325 million.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that if the amount were cut to \$325 million, it would still be \$75 million more than the administration requested?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. The administration asked for an authorization of \$250 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill, instead of providing \$250 million, would make \$400 million available in the form of grants.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that there are other acts now on the books that have a relationship to the objective of this bill, which is, supposedly, to help areas in which unemployment exists. Those acts are the Appalachian Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Manpower Retraining Act. The pending bill, if enacted into law, would be the fourth program to cover the same field of activity.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. The acts which the Senator has enumerated are related. However, they have different specific purposes.

We discussed on the floor today the Appalachian program. That program goes more to the basic structure of the area—such as roads, multicounty hospitals, timber and land management, vocational training, and local public facilities.

The Economic Opportunity Act has as its chief purpose, educational and job opportunities. The Manpower Retraining Act would train individuals in the development of skills. I know these programs well, and I have worked in support of them.

The pending bill would appropriate money for grants or loans to encourage the establishment of commercial or industrial enterprises which would have long-term opportunities. The bill has a specific objective and differs from the other acts. However, it is true that they are all related in that they try to improve educational and employment opportunities for the people.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there is very little duplication between the programs. They are all carefully separated. For example, the ARA program, which is current and has been in existence for 4 years, included a manpower retraining program which we eliminated from this program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I did not offer my amendment because a number of bills contain similar proposals. I merely ask that the amount be reduced because the administration asked for only \$250 million and \$325 million is all that has been shown to be adequately usable; after this program has been in operation, there may be further use shown to be required. This would be a new program in the sense that its purpose is long time employment opportunities, rather than emergency employment opportunities, and the money is to be more carefully spent.

The pending bill, if enacted into law, would develop new and specific criteria which, I assume, will take some time for the Secretary to apply and use to determine what additional use of money may be needed.

I believe that it is reasonable to say that the Government cannot successfully spend more than \$325 million on this program, based on the information and testimony given the committees. That is my judgment. I have worked on these bills and know something about them. I know something of their practical application.

With respect to the emergency public works program, we had to work quickly and approve applications to put people to work. That was the objective of the bill. However, this is a different kind of bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, were there any new developments in the economy that occurred between the time the administration requested that \$250 million be appropriated and the time the

committee recommended that \$400 million be appropriated?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I believe that there was a small change in the unemployment rate after the bill was introduced. Second, there is a proposed cut in excise taxes, which is designed to stimulate the economy and to provide additional work as demand increases.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there were developments, they were developments that would militate against the raising of the request, and support a reduction of \$250 million.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The real developments between the time the administration sent the bill to Congress and the time the committee acted on it were during the hearings on the bill. There were long hearings and, on the basis of the committee hearings, some members were convinced after hearing the evidence that there should be provided \$500 million a year for a 5-year period for public works; but we were able to prevail upon those members, after listening to the hearings, that we could make a better case, and a good case, for \$400 million. I have already made the case in the RECORD, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What the Senator has said refers to no new developments for the program. That which the committee had, the administration had when it asked for \$250 million a year. I do not think it can be refuted that the economy is stronger on this day than it was on the day the President recommended \$250 million.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

On the point just mentioned, I say to the Senator from Ohio that the bill was conceived in a period of unparalleled national prosperity. We needed no direct evidence that the country was prosperous. But we felt, and still feel after all the hearings on the bill that, in spite of general national prosperity, there are pockets of depressed areas, areas that are not enjoying prosperity, areas of high unemployment. The situation of such areas has not improved since the bill was reported from the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the administration knew about those areas.

I will ask another question. What will Congress really do when we get into a depression? What is it going to do when, in a period of great abundance, we are talking about spending that which revenues do not justify?

Mr. MUSKIE. We are trying to build into the economic structure machinery and safeguards that will avoid the heart-rending depressions that destroy a country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have heard that statement before. It touches the heart and makes one sympathetic, but it is not related to reality.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, as well as those of other Senators.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that there are now pending in the State of Ohio 68 projects, amounting to \$12,500,000. We do not look upon those projects in any way as boondoggling, but as investments. When sewage treatment plants are built in a local community, it is something that strengthens the economy in that community of Ohio. The Public Works Committee in the past reported a bill in an amount far in excess of what has been reported in this case for accelerated public works. It was not enacted, but the committee had done that prior to last year. There are bills containing larger amounts than that contained in this bill. It was my intention that the amount of \$250 million be increased to \$500 million. I offered an amendment to that effect, which is at the table, and which has been signed by 25 other Senators. We have lowered the amount to \$400 million, as reported in the bill before us, in an attempt to compromise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have half a minute to reply?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield half a minute to the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from West Virginia pointed out that there were 68 applicants.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Sixty-eight projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Sixty-eight projects. The more money that is made available, the greater the number of applicants. There were no applicants before this bill came into existence. If the amount were raised to \$650 million, there would be 130 applicants.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not know if the Senator was against the accelerated public works program, but I point out that his State and the people of Ohio were greatly benefited by it. I have referred to pending projects, requiring \$12½ million.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for the excellent job the Public Works Committee has done in bringing this bill to the floor so quickly. It will provide a great deal of assistance to communities throughout the country which are economically underdeveloped and distressed.

My own State of Maryland is now benefiting from the Appalachia bill. But Appalachia is not the only depressed and underdeveloped area in Maryland. We have in the Chesapeake Bay area, both on the Eastern Shore and in southern Maryland, serious economic hardship.

In fact, Mr. President, Maryland shares with its sister States of Delaware and Virginia a depressed economy in the entire Chesapeake Bay area. The bay is

our greatest natural resource in Maryland, but it has been misused and abused for many years. We now have serious problems of pollution, obnoxious aquatic plants, of drastically reduced shellfish and shellfish production. Many of our bay fishermen find their catches dwindling every year. Our oyster catch last year was one-tenth of what it was in 1890.

Title V of the bill provides for the creation of regional planning commissions to deal with the problems of depressed areas that occur in two or more States. I note that on page 17 of the committee report, the committee states that this title was developed to meet the needs of such depressed areas as the upper Great Plains, the Ozarks, and the upper Great Lakes, and perhaps New England.

I would like to propound this question to the distinguished Senator from Michigan: Whether this list is exclusive or whether it might be possible for other regions in the country to qualify for assistance under the title?

Mr. McNAMARA. I assure the Senator from Maryland that this is not an exclusive list, but is intended to be merely a list of examples of areas. It does not preclude such areas as the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. Am I correct, then, in assuming that if the Chesapeake Bay area, including parts of Maryland, Virginia, and possibly Delaware, could qualify under the standards set forth in section 501 of the bill, it would be possible to establish a Chesapeake Bay Regional Development Commission under title V?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am pleased to have that assurance from the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. As the record will show, there are a number of counties located in this area that have already been designated as depressed areas under the Area Redevelopment Act. In my own State of Maryland, Somerset and Dorchester Counties on the Eastern Shore, and Calvert County in southern Maryland, have already been so designated. In Delaware, Kent and Sussex Counties have been designated depressed areas under the Proxmire amendment to the Area Redevelopment Act. Finally, in Virginia the northern neck counties of Westmoreland, Lancaster, Richmond, and Northumberland have been designated as depressed areas.

It would be my hope and expectation that the States of the Chesapeake Bay would be able to utilize the provisions of this act to begin to solve some of the problems of economic depression in the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator mentioned title 5. I am sure the Senator recognizes that this title provides only for planning money. That is what the Senator has referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong

support of S. 1648, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, with amendments as proposed by the Senate Public Works Committee. This legislation is of historical significance in its dramatic approach to the problems of economically distressed areas, and I am pleased to have joined as a cosponsor of the measure.

This bill serves as a recognition on the part of the Federal Government that the vast majority of these areas cannot, within their own resources, initially provide the basic community needs which industry looks for and has a right to expect when seeking new plant locations for business expansion. The bill provides an inducement to industry, not only to accelerate its expansion programs, but also to locate in areas where new employment opportunities will have the greatest economic impact.

The experimental Area Redevelopment Act program has already demonstrated the value of Federal assistance to those areas of high unemployment and low family income. It has given new hope to the people in these areas and provided a stimulus for uniting in a cooperative effort toward a common goal—achieving economic stability.

The preparation of the overall economic development program under ARA was a large undertaking. For many areas of my State of West Virginia, it constituted the first organized effort at long-range planning and practical, coordinated determination on the direction to be taken in promoting economic growth.

But the development of a program was only the first step up the long trail toward economic recovery and only a few communities have been successful, thus far, in attracting a new industry. One of the greatest deterrents has been the inadequacy of basic community services, such as water and sewage facilities. Because of the intense competition for new industry throughout the United States, plant locators will not even look at a proposed site where basic community services do not already exist, or cannot be readily expanded to satisfy their requirements.

A further deterrent in many areas of greatest economic need was the ARA statutory requirement that 10 percent of the project cost be provided by local or State funds as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the Federal loan had been repaid in full. In some instances, intensive effort by the local development organization failed to raise the amount of money needed and the industrial prospect located in some other area. In other instances, the community was forced to turn away a second industrial prospect because its funds were tied up for such a long period as a result of participation in an earlier project.

The people of West Virginia recognized that ARA could provide them with an opportunity never before envisioned to help them on the road to economic recovery and they worked tirelessly and diligently to avail themselves of this opportunity. Not all their efforts were successful, but they have made a start.

They have been stimulated into activity and are ready to intensify this activity under the new legislation. ARA has approved 16 industrial and commercial loans; 17 public facility loans and grants; 30 technical assistance projects; and 49 training programs in West Virginia, as of the first quarter of this year. It has invested \$42,111,000 in these 112 projects which will create 4,835 direct jobs.

The accelerated public works program provided an additional source of assistance for obtaining needed public facilities. And 303 projects were approved in West Virginia with a total cost of \$79,674,000, of which \$42,543,000 was provided by APW. These projects will provide an estimated 52,125 man-months of labor.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 not only combines the best features of both ARA and APW but it also follows the concept of the Appalachia Regional Development Act by encouraging regional development planning. It has my full and wholehearted support.

I wish to compliment my colleague from West Virginia, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, for his effective and constructive work on this measure in the Public Works Committee. I pledge my full efforts toward securing the necessary funding to implement this authorization bill as such time as it may be before the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member.

It is my sincere belief that the planning and assistance envisioned under S. 1648 offer the sorely needed further opportunity for distressed areas to move toward long-range economic development and to consolidate past gains made under the previous Federal programs.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased that the Senate is moving surely toward final approval this afternoon of the vastly important Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

I have long supported legislation to provide the tools, the training, the advice, and the planning necessary to realize the full economic potential of every area of our Nation.

I have been a sponsor of bills to establish an effective framework for Federal State, and local planning to achieve the necessary environment and facilities for establishment of improved, stable, and diversified local economies and enhanced living conditions.

My sponsorship and vote for the Appalachia bill and my sponsorship of the predecessor bill to S. 1648 illustrate my continuing interest in this approach to local, State, and regional economic problems.

The signing into law of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will represent a milestone of effective Federal Government cooperation with State and local governments and private industry to bring all areas of the American economy up to their

potential, to eliminate poverty, and to provide full employment.

This bill addresses itself to the nationwide problem of underemployment of people, machinery, and resources. In short, it addresses itself to waste.

These problems of waste of human and industrial potential are common to many areas of our Nation.

They are of concern to all.

They prevent all our people from fulfilling and sharing in our national wealth and prosperity.

They rob us all by retarding our full national economic potential.

These problems are a particular and unique concern to New England, the cradle of industrial America, and to my own State of Connecticut.

The traditional technology and industry which New England nurtured for the new America a century and a half ago have been, in too many cases, outpaced by technological advance, displaced by lower costs elsewhere, or replaced by new forms of industry employing fewer persons.

The textile, shoe, and fishing industries and the decline of railroad transportation are cases in point.

As a result, New England's employment has declined, its new investment in plant has been retarded, and the personal income levels have lagged behind the national growth rates.

I am gratified to be able to report that industrial development and personal income in my own State of Connecticut have set a faster pace than most other areas of New England and by and large compare favorably with the national average.

But we in Connecticut have never rested on our oars in pursuing full utilization of our State's human and industrial potential.

We cannot afford to do so now.

This act will provide the people of my State, the people of New England, and the people of all the United States the planning and the financing to bring every area of the Nation up to its full economic promise.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 will help put an end to waste of national resources—human, industrial, and natural.

By doing so, the act will provide all our people a richer and fuller participation in our national life.

I hope that the New England States will work together and with the Federal Government, so that the people who live in these six States can benefit from this new program.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as a coauthor of S. 1648 and as one who is concerned with the development of an effective area assistance act, I want to congratulate the Public Works Committee on the pending bill.

I believe that the approach that has been fashioned in this act for aiding areas of lagging economic growth will prove much more effective than the old Area Redevelopment Act. I am espe-

cially pleased that the criteria for qualification of areas of below average development have been modified to include measures other than unemployment alone.

My own State of South Dakota is an agricultural State. Decline in farm numbers and farm employment in the State has been barely offset by an increase in tourism and development of minor industries. For the most part, industrial development has passed us by at this point in our history.

In spite of lagging economic growth, we do not have excessive unemployment. We train our young people, and they migrate to other States in search of employment. Our outmigration of persons seeking employment was slightly greater than the total number of new entrants into the labor force in the State in the 1950-60 decade. We have been transferring our employment problems—along with a sizable investment in training and education of young people—to other areas. To the extent that the South Dakota economy, and the whole Upper Great Plains economy, can be developed, we will lessen the problems of other States and cities.

I am strongly of the opinion that the measure now pending will be of real assistance to the Upper Great Plains, to my State, and to the sound economic growth of the Nation as a whole.

The Public Works Committee has reported a splendid bill, and I urge that it be enacted.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that it be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I ask for the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. 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.

The hour of 4:45 p.m. having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced, yeas 31, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Aiken	Fannin	Prouty
Allott	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bennett	Holland	Saltmstall
Boggs	Javits	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Carlson	Kuchel	Thurmond
Case	Lausche	Tower
Cooper	Morton	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Murphy	
Dominick	Pearson	

NAYS—53

Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bass	Hayden	Moss
Bayh	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Nelson
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Cannon	Long, La.	Randolph
Church	Mansfield	Russell, S.C.
Clark	McCarthy	Smith
Dodd	McClellan	Sparkman
Douglas	McGovern	Stennis
Ellender	McIntyre	Symington
Fong	McNamara	Tydings
Fulbright	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Mondale	Yarborough
Harris	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Inouye	Ribicoff
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Russell, Ga.
Eastland	Magnuson	Simpson
Ervin	McGee	Smathers
Gore	Miller	
Hruska	Neuberger	

So Mr. COOPER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that if the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1648) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 5 o'clock p.m., having arrived, the vote on the passage of the pending bill is in order. The bill having been read the third time, and the yeas and nays having been ordered on the passage of the bill, the question is, Shall it pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold by vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina

[Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The pairs of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Aiken	Burdick	Cotton
Anderson	Byrd, W. Va.	Dirksen
Bartlett	Cannon	Dodd
Bass	Carlson	Douglas
Bayh	Case	Ellender
Bible	Church	Fannin
Boggs	Clark	Fong
Brewster	Cooper	Fulbright

Gruening	McGovern	Prouty
Harris	McIntyre	Proxmire
Hart	McNamara	Randolph
Hartke	Metcalf	Russell, S.C.
Hayden	Mondale	Saltmstall
Hill	Monroney	Scott
Jackson	Montoya	Smith
Javits	Morse	Sparkman
Kennedy, Mass.	Morton	Stennis
Kennedy, N.Y.	Moss	Symington
Lausche	Murphy	Talmadge
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Tydings
Long, La.	Nelson	Williams, N.J.
Mansfield	Pastore	Yarborough
McCarthy	Pearson	Young, Ohio
McClellan	Pell	

NAYS—12

Allott	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bennett	Holland	Thurmond
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dominick	Mundt	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—17

Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Eastland	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Ervin	Magnuson	Simpson
Gore	McGee	Smathers
Hruska	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Inouye	Neuberger	

So the bill (S. 1648) was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that if the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

PASSAGE OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, passage by the Senate today of the Public Works and Economic Development Act is most gratifying. I voted for this bill because it offers the communities of New York as well as of the whole country an opportunity to participate in the economic well-being of the Nation. Under this bill, communities and counties can band together in economic development districts to improve employment and encourage the expansion of industry. Cities and towns will be able to build needed public facilities such as waterlines, police and fire stations, research centers and industrial facilities.

I am particularly pleased that the Senate accepted the committee amendment providing that counties eligible for assistance under ARA on or after April 1, 1965, will also qualify for funds under the new act. Hamilton County, which was just designated as a redevelopment area, would be eligible under the new program. Cayuga and Cattaraugus Counties, which are losing their designation, would also still be eligible for assistance under the new program.

Another committee amendment which the Senate accepted authorized \$400 million rather than the original \$250 million for the community development phase of the program. This larger sum will provide the needed funds for this important work.

It is now up to the communities of New York and the Nation, to use this assistance for the benefit of all our less fortunate citizens.

### NEED FOR NEW DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill which the Senate has just passed provides for new and streamlined redevelopment for distressed areas. In addition to providing more effective help to areas with high unemployment, it will also help communities hard hit by defense installations shutdowns and plant closures.

The bill embraces most of the recommendations made last year by the subcommittee of which I am chairman, the Subcommittee on Unemployment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It includes provisions for making Federal economic aid available to nondistressed communities faced by imminent closure of a defense installation. Many such communities, such as the Greater Harrisburg area in my own State, are not presently eligible for such assistance. With this assistance now available, a full kit of planning, technical, and financial aid will be available to help Greater Harrisburg adjust to the impact of the closure of the Olmsted Air Force Base when and if it comes.

The bill includes another of our subcommittee recommendations by permitting groups of counties or even groups of States to band together, pool their resources and launch a broad-scale attack on their economic problems. Experience has demonstrated how difficult it is for each separate county—hobbled by little money and little manpower—to rebuild its economy.

Congress has already passed another of our recommendations by consolidating the old area redevelopment retraining programs with the Manpower Development and Training Act, thus cutting red tape to a minimum.

Finally, the bill is in closer accord with our subcommittee findings on the need for public works assistance in distressed areas than the original administration request. It has increased the authorization for public works grants from \$250 to \$400 million. This is much closer to the \$470 million backlog of already approved but unfunded projects filed by distressed communities under the old Accelerated Public Works program.

In Pennsylvania alone, we have an \$88 million backlog of approved community public works in distressed communities awaiting funds. This includes \$12 million for hospitals, \$10 million for water lines, \$30 million for sewers and sewage treatment facilities, and \$17 million for streets and roads.

### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 175, H.R. 7717.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$5,183,844,850" and insert "\$5,196,826,350"; in line 3, after the word "astronomy", to strike out "\$4,537,121,000" and insert "\$4,533,350,000"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "Apollo", to strike out "\$2,967,385,000" and insert "\$2,973,385,000"; in line 3, after the word "astronomy", to strike out "\$160,500,000" and insert "\$165,900,000"; in line 12, after the word "development", to strike out "\$60,600,000" and insert "\$63,600,000"; in line 14, after the word "procurement", to strike out "\$179,500,000" and insert "\$178,700,000"; in line 20 after the word "systems", to strike out "\$33,000,000" and insert "\$27,000,000"; in line 24, after the word "propulsion", to strike out "\$51,200,000" and insert "\$36,200,000"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "\$242,321,000" and insert "\$246,200,000"; in line 5, after the word "utilization", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,750,000"; in line 8, after the word "acquisitions", to strike out "\$60,675,000" and insert "\$67,376,350"; after line 10, to insert:

(2) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, \$10,000,000;

At the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)"; in line 16, after the word "Florida", to strike out "\$7,854,400" and insert "\$8,195,000"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)"; in line 22, after the word "Texas", to strike out "\$3,953,300" and insert "\$4,180,000"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "(7)" and insert "(8)"; in line 24, after the word "Alabama", to strike out "\$4,291,100" and insert "\$2,309,450"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)"; in line 2, after the word "Louisiana", to strike out "\$269,500" and insert "\$284,750"; at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)"; in line 4, to strike out "\$1,905,600" and insert "\$1,910,450"; at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(10)" and insert "(11)"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)"; in the same line, after the word "locations", to strike out "\$19,871,400" and insert "\$20,182,700"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(12)" and insert "(13)"; in line 10, after the word "for", to strike out "\$7,215,700" and insert "\$5,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "operations", to strike

out "\$586,048,850" and insert "\$596,100,000"; on page 5, line 15, after the numeral "(2)", to strike out "contracts may be entered into under the 'Administrative operations' appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the fiscal year following that for which the appropriation is made" and insert "maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the 'Administrative operations' appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year"; on page 6, line 22, after the numeral "(10)", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the numeral "(11)", to insert a comma and "and (12)"; on page 7, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "\$53,459,300" and insert "\$62,376,350"; and on page 9, line 12, after "Sec. 5.", to strike out "It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end" and insert "It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible".

### SEVENTEENTH INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on September 20, 1963, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], together with the then Senator HUMPHREY and Senators CLARK, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, HICKENLOOPER, JORDAN of North Carolina, Keating, KUCHEL, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, and myself, introduced a resolution (S.J. Res. 120) extending an official welcome to the book and music publishers from some 40 countries throughout the world who would attend the 17th Congress of the International Publishers Association in Washington, D.C., from May 30 to June 5, 1965. This resolution was passed by the Senate on February 7, 1964, passed by the House of Representatives on April 6, 1964, and enacted into law on April 17, 1964.

This week, the 17th International Publishers Congress is meeting in Washington, D.C., under the sponsorship of the American Book Publishers' Council, Inc., and Music Publishers Association, Inc., in what will hopefully be a fruitful exchange of ideas and the basis for warm and lasting relationships. The meeting marks the first time in its 70-year history that the International Publishers Association will have conducted its meet-

ing in the United States. It is attended by approximately 800 publishers from the United States and abroad. I believe I speak for the sponsors of that measure and many other of my colleagues in extending a warm welcome to the publishers from abroad. I take particular pride in expressing these words of welcome in view of the fact that the State of New York, which I have the honor of representing, is considered by many to be the publishing center of the world and has contributed greatly to the development of publishing.

#### MAY 1—LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the lawyers of America have undertaken a public service in sponsoring May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A. In a recent issue of the Los Angeles, Calif., Bar Bulletin, the distinguished president of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, Mr. Edward S. Shattuck, wrote an excellent article describing what May Day, U.S.A., means to every American, under the Constitution, and contrasted it with what May Day means to communism, on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

I commend the article to the reading of all Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### MAY 1—LAW DAY, U.S.A.

(By Edward S. Shattuck)

May 1 is Law Day, U.S.A. What will it mean to the American people in this year 1965? What will be its impact upon citizens of other nations around the world? Can and should the lawyers of the United States lead a determined effort to make this year's Law Day purposeful and effective both at home and abroad? These are questions I have asked myself over and over again and, with your indulgence, I would now like you to share my thoughts and conclusions.

May 1 has long been a day set aside by Communist nations for bringing forth their armed might and parading it before the world. It has been a day when Communist dictators have wantonly indulged themselves and their people in excessive abuses to our country, falsely proclaiming us to be imperialists and aggressors.

In this posture of May 1, the American Bar Association suggested that we offset this bawdy demonstration of the Communist world by declaring through the President of the United States that May 1 each year should be set aside as Law Day, U.S.A. Throughout the land we should utilize it to give recognition and thanks for our government of the people, by the people, and for the people—a government of law and not of men—a government by our duly elected representatives, not a government imposed upon us by self-appointed dictators. In this manner—so we reasoned—we would call attention of peoples all over the world to the contrast between citizens living in our Nation under the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the individual rights of every person, and the citizens living under Communist regimes where individual rights depend upon the whims of the dictators of the moment.

Will May 1, 1965, utilized for this purpose in the United States, ring true in the minds and hearts of our own people? Will it create

the worldwide image of contrast between our people and people in Communist nations—the objective of Law Day, U.S.A.? I have concluded that the answer depends upon what action is taken by the lawyers of America—the very ones who conceived of Law Day, U.S.A. in the first place.

On March 16, 1965, the President of the United States, addressing a joint session of Congress, stated the issue we must face on Law Day in these eloquent and simple words:

"This was the first Nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose are still found in every American heart, North and South: 'All men are created equal'—'Government by consent of the governed'—'Give me liberty or give me death.' Those are not just clever words or empty theories. In their name American have fought and died for two centuries and today are risking their lives.

"Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man. This dignity cannot be found in a man's possessions or his power or his position. It rests on his right to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others. It says that he shall share in freedom, choose his leaders, educate his children, provide for his family according to his ability and merits as a human being.

"To apply any other test—to deny a man his hopes because of his color or race, his religion or the place of his birth—is not only to do injustice, it is to deny America and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for freedom."

The President was addressing himself primarily to the fact that we have not carried out the clear mandate of the 15th amendment to our own Constitution because we, in some instances, have denied American citizens the right to vote in the selection of their leaders. The challenge of his speech went much deeper. It said what should be and, in most cases, is in the mind and heart of every American citizen. The time for universal justice for every person in our Nation is now. The time to end forever bigotry, intolerance, and discrimination in America is now.

Universal justice, the end to bigotry, intolerance, and discrimination, which must come unless we are to sound like hypocrites before world opinion, cannot be accomplished by laws alone. Laws will help, as they always do when a few people resist the unalienable rights of others. The real challenge, however, is to arouse our conscience and to implant a determination in the heart and mind of every American that in his day-to-day life and in every way within his power he shall seek justice for every American and do no act which may be rooted in bigotry or intolerance or that could result in discrimination.

If Law Day, U.S.A. in 1965 is to ring true to our own people at home and to the people abroad, we as lawyers must use our inherent ability to speak and write by reiterating publicly in speeches and privately in correspondence our belief in the great purpose of our country. We must let the people know that our learned profession believes deeply that all men are created equal, are entitled to equal opportunity and must always stand equal before the bar of justice. We must be willing and anxious, at every opportunity, to defend the rights of Americans, all Americans, to vote, to the equal protection of law, to petition the Government, to peaceably assemble, to pray in private or in public, and to exercise fully every other right preserved by the U.S. Constitution. We must have the courage to insist on these rights being recognized and at the same time, to insist that we and those we

seek to help, who are demonstrating, do so in a lawful manner.

Cannot the members of the bar be effective in this fight for freedom for all? In these turbulent days in which we live, cannot lawyers put their full strength back of the wheel which is now in motion? I am sure we can and we must if Law Day, U.S.A. in 1965 is going to be impressive either at home or abroad.

So, what can we do? As individual lawyers we can write letters all over the country. At the time of the American Revolution, and again when the great moral issue of slavery confronted our Nation, and during this century, when we were called upon to defend liberty throughout the world, lawyers exchanged letters with each other and wrote profusely to their laymen friends espousing the cause of freedom. If everyone of our 6,000 members wrote 10 such letters before May 1, 1965, and asked every person to whom he wrote to do the same, the Los Angeles County Bar Association alone would reach 600,000 people. Will you do it?

Will you also seize on every opportunity to speak out? Lawyers are eloquent. Speak out among your neighbors, at social gatherings and in public addresses. Give the leadership to public opinion. Our knowledge of history and law is respected by our neighbors, friends and the public. We have a unique influence because of our education and our professional standing.

Finally, I have proposed to the board of trustees—I hope that by the time this reaches print the Board will have approved—that the Los Angeles County Bar Association ask every major bar association in America to join us in this "lawyers' crusade for freedom."

A fire has been kindled by the President. Can we make Law Day, U.S.A. in 1965 purposeful and effective so the flame will heighten and the fire will spread? I know we can and I believe we will.

#### EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF THE KANIKSU NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 435.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire by exchange, purchase, or otherwise, the real property described in section 3 of this Act. Upon such acquisition the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest are extended to include such real property.

Sec. 2. In the acquisition of the real property described in section 3, the Secretary of Agriculture shall be guided by the following policies:

(1) He should make every reasonable effort to acquire the property by negotiated purchase.

(2) The property should be appraised at its fair market value by the Secretary of Agriculture before the initiation of negotiations, and the owner or his designated representative should be given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during an inspection of the property.

Sec. 3. The real property authorized to be acquired under authority of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

Township 63 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian:

Section 18, southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 19, northeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 3 (southeast quarter northeast quarter); section 20, southwest quarter northwest quarter; section 33, lot 1 (northeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 2 (southeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter), lot 6 (southeast quarter southwest quarter), west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Township 63 north, range 5 west, Boise meridian:

Section 24, northeast quarter northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 2 (northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter).

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleague from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### URGENT NEED FOR ECONOMIC POLICY: STATISTICS ON JOB VACANCIES

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, a question that has concerned many economists and businessmen is the failure of the Federal Government to provide statistics on job vacancies. Unemployment statistics are vital ingredients of many Federal policies. But unemployment figures should be balanced with accurate, reliable, authoritative figures from the Federal Government to show what jobs are available for the unemployed.

The National Industrial Conference Board has taken up this issue recently and has made an interesting interim report. The conference board points out that, until quite recently, practically no information on this subject was available for the United States, while in most developed countries of the world it is available.

The conference board reports on an intensive study of Monroe County, N.Y., which includes the Rochester area. The board chose this area because it desired to ascertain what the job vacancy rate was in a county with a tight labor market. They found that the job vacancy rate was about 3 percent of employment. Unemployment was about 2.7 percent. Therefore, by their definition of vacancy rate, vacancies exceeded unemployment in Monroe County during the period of investigation they chose.

However, they point out that vacancies included some jobs that would not be available for several months. So they made another comparison, which they felt would be valid for some purposes, for what may be called the immediate job vacancy rate. Here they found that unemployment was 2.7 percent, while the immediate job vacancy rate was 1.9 percent. This makes an interesting com-

parison. I think both statistics are useful for analysis.

Furthermore, they compared the unemployment rate and the vacancy rate with respect to unfilled job openings as shown in the files of the U.S. Employment Service, which many people believe might serve as a good measure of job vacancies.

Their comprehensive investigation disclosed that unfilled jobs listed in the U.S. Employment Service covered only one-eighth of the vacancies, following their comprehensive survey of the entire county.

I should like to read the concluding sentence of their report, because I believe it is highly appropriate:

Our experience with these surveys has led us to the tentative conclusion that the collection of job vacancy statistics is a feasible operation when the information is obtained by interview and the groundwork in the community has been carefully prepared. Employers were cooperative in almost all cases and readily understood the concepts and definitions. A preliminary analysis of the results indicates that they are reasonable and consistent with other information. Our final judgment, however, must wait upon the results of the two additional sample surveys in Monroe County, one in May, and the other in August 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this brief 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:

[From the Conference Board Record, May 1965]

#### CAN YOU MEASURE JOB VACANCIES?

(NOTE.—Unfilled job openings totaled nearly 8,000 in Monroe County, N.Y., in mid-February. A sample survey conducted by the conference board revealed large numbers of vacancies in professional occupations and in semiskilled jobs. Employers required at least a high school diploma for most jobs but were willing to accept persons with no related experience in more than half of the cases studied. Vacancies were found in all industries surveyed; they were most common in durable manufacturing and education. The survey, which covered 401 employers, will be repeated twice this year.)

Many questions have been posed in recent years about the number and characteristics of unfilled job vacancies in the United States. The great interest in this subject has been evidenced by articles in business and trade journals, statements of businessmen and public officials, and in congressional hearings. Until quite recently, however, practically no information was available on this subject for the United States. This is in contrast with most other developed nations, where data on unfilled vacancies are collected and published regularly.

About 1 year ago, the conference board undertook a study of the feasibility of collecting job vacancy statistics. The study is to continue for 18 months and is financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The area chosen for field work is Monroe County, N.Y., which was coextensive, until this year, with the Rochester standard metropolitan statistical area and the Rochester labor market area. Among the reasons for selecting the Rochester area is the low unemployment rate that has characterized the area for several years. That is, it has been considered either a "tight" labor market or one in balance. This in turn suggests the existence of a significant number of unfilled job open-

ings. Our plans call for three surveys during 1965. This is a progress report based on the first of these surveys.

A series of probing interviews conducted during the fall of 1964 provided the basis for our first sample survey, conducted last February. Information on job vacancies and employment was obtained from 401 employers in the area. Almost all employers were contacted by personal visit and the information transcribed on the spot. The survey covered all branches of industry except agriculture and private households. A job vacancy was defined in our survey as an unfilled job opening, present or anticipated, for which the employer was actively recruiting an employee, on February 12, from outside his organization. Openings which the employer expected to fill by transfer or promotion of persons already working in the organization were excluded. Job vacancies include full time, part time, permanent, and temporary openings. "Actively recruiting" includes requests to employment agencies, public and private, newspaper, advertising, interviewing walk-in applicants, etc. Workers on layoff were not included.

There were nearly 8,000 job vacancies in Monroe County on February 12. About 5,000 of these, or 62 percent, were for immediate starting; the balance were for jobs to start at later dates, ranging through January 1966. There was a large concentration of jobs (over 1,000), with starting dates in September; these were almost entirely connected with education and they reflect the beginning of the new school year.

Starting date	Number of job vacancies	Percent distribution of job vacancies
Immediately (Feb. 12).....	4,989	62.4
Later in February.....	328	4.1
March.....	306	3.8
April.....	1,479	6.0
May.....	1,569	7.1
June.....	125	1.6
July.....	126	1.6
August.....	11	0
September.....	1,066	13.3
January 1966.....	12	0
Total.....	7,991	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Statistically unreliable.

Corresponding to the finding of 8,000 job vacancies is a total employment figure of 260,000. As shown in table 1, 33 large employers, each with total employment of 1,000 or more, accounted for 39 percent of total vacancies. Very small employers, each with total employment below 10 persons, accounted for another 16 percent.

The "vacancy rate," defined as the number of job vacancies divided by vacancies plus total employment, is a measure analogous to the unemployment rate. The vacancy rate relates vacancies to total labor demand (persons currently employed plus additional persons sought), while the unemployment rate relates the unemployed to total labor supply (employed plus those seeking work). In Monroe County, we estimate the vacancy rate at 3 percent in February. This figure permits a rough comparison to an unemployment rate of 2.7 percent in the area (without seasonal adjustment for the midweek of February), as estimated by the Division of Employment of the New York State Department of Labor.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Rochester Labor Market Newsletter," March 1965. The unemployment rate estimate includes agricultural and household workers; the industrial coverage is, therefore, somewhat different from that of the NICEB survey. The comparable unemployment rate for the United States for February is 5.7 percent (without seasonal adjustment).



TABLE 1.—Employment size—Job vacancies, number of employers, and total employment by employment size

Employment size	Number of employers interviewed	Estimated			Standard error of number of vacancies	Vacancy rate (V as percent of E+V)	Percent distribution of total number of vacancies
		Number of employers	Employment (E)	Number of vacancies (V)			
0 to 9.....	108	9,526	29,874	1,270	315.00	4.08	15.9
10 to 19.....	41	1,092	14,536	380	103.00	2.54	4.8
20 to 49.....	51	710	19,892	722	107.00	3.50	9.0
50 to 99.....	38	237	16,338	672	71.70	3.95	8.4
100 to 249.....	47	156	22,416	579	44.20	2.52	7.2
250 to 999.....	83	87	43,706	1,254	6.48	2.79	15.7
1,000 to 2,499.....	20	20	30,237	569	0	1.94	7.5
2,500 and over.....	13	13	81,637	2,515	0	2.09	31.5
Total, Monroe County.....	401	11,841	258,635	7,991	358.00	3.00	100.0

TABLE 2.—Industry group—Job vacancies, number of employers, and total employment by industry group

Industry group	Number of employers interviewed	Estimated			Standard error of number of vacancies	Vacancy rate (V as percent of E+V)	Percent distribution of number of vacancies
		Number of employers	Employment (E)	Number of vacancies (V)			
Durable manufacturing.....	66	460	94,644	2,537	83.60	2.61	31.7
Machinery (except electrical).....	15	107	10,803	407	50.70	3.63	5.1
Photographic, optical, and instruments.....	17	173	52,874	1,885	20.60	2.91	19.8
Other durable goods.....	34	180	30,967	645	62.20	1.73	6.8
Nondurable manufacturing.....	48	623	25,458	408	10.40	1.38	5.1
Food products.....	19	253	3,048	63	3.46	.78	.8
Printing and publishing.....	10	220	5,225	28	0	.63	.4
Other nondurable goods.....	19	150	12,185	317	9.80	2.54	4.0
Construction.....	28	1,347	11,536	966	183.00	7.73	12.1
Building construction.....	11	507	5,044	408	95.40	7.48	5.1
Other.....	17	840	6,492	558	156.00	7.91	7.0
Public utilities and transportation.....	15	405	10,027	1,408	201.00	3.91	5.1
Trade, retail and wholesale.....	103	3,678	43,317	1,010	143.00	2.27	12.6
Retail:							
General merchandise.....	12	283	9,333	97	6.48	1.03	1.2
Food.....	10	269	4,910	47	6.00	.95	.6
Auto dealers and service stations.....	14	535	4,838	359	102.00	6.91	4.5
Retail, eating and drinking places.....	17	814	5,434	196	61.80	3.48	2.5
Other.....	50	1,777	18,802	311	77.50	1.63	3.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	21	720	9,202	266	50.10	2.81	3.3
Services.....	104	4,388	51,399	2,066	156.00	3.86	25.8
Personal.....	12	515	4,009	130	33.60	3.14	1.7
Medical and health.....	22	1,718	10,650	328	7.75	2.99	4.1
Education (public and private).....	27	161	20,412	1,319	42.80	6.07	16.5
Other.....	43	1,994	16,328	1,289	145.00	1.74	3.6
Government.....	16	220	13,052	330	15.70	2.47	4.1
Total, Monroe County.....	401	11,841	258,635	7,991	358.00	3.00	100.0

Industry group	Total employment		Total vacancies		"Immediate" vacancies	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Durable manufacturing.....	94,644	36.6	2,537	31.7	2,168	43.5
Construction.....	11,536	4.5	1,066	13.1	302	6.1
Trade.....	43,317	16.7	1,010	12.6	882	17.7
Education.....	20,412	7.9	1,319	16.5	135	2.7
All other.....	88,726	34.3	2,159	27.0	1,502	30.1
Total, Monroe County.....	258,635	100.0	7,991	100.0	4,969	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.  
<sup>2</sup> Statistically unreliable.

It should be noted, however, that an unemployed person is defined, in official statistics, as a person immediately available for work. Our definition of job vacancies, on the other hand, includes positions for later starting dates. Another comparison, more valid for some purposes, can be made between the unemployment rate and what might be called the immediate job vacancy rate. The latter would relate job vacancies for immediate starting to the sum of total employment plus "immediate vacancies." This computation yields an immediate vacancy rate of 1.9 percent.

The (total) vacancy rate was highest for the group of smallest employers, but fluctuated erratically between other size classes; employers of 2,500 or more persons had an

overall vacancy rate of 3 percent, the same as for all firms combined.

A measure of the reliability of the sample estimates is provided by the standard errors shown in each table. The standard error indicates, approximately, the range within which the (usually unknown) true value will be, with a given probability. For example, the total number of vacancies, estimated at 7,991, has a standard error of 358 (table 1). This means technically that about 68 percent of all estimates of total vacancies, which could be made from samples of 400 firms drawn like the NICB sample, would fall within 358 of the true value. Also, about 95 percent of all sample values would be within 716, or two standard errors, of the true value;

and about 99 percent would be within 1,074, or three standard errors. Thus we can judge the reliability, or accuracy, of a sample estimate by comparing it to its standard error. When the standard error is small relative to the sample estimate (as with the estimate for total vacancies), the estimate may be taken to be reasonably reliable. When the standard error is large relative to the same estimate (see "personal services" in table 2), not much confidence in the numerical value of the estimate is warranted.

On the survey date, more than one-third of total employment (excluding agriculture and private households) was in durable manufacturing (table 2). This reflects the importance of the photographic, optical, and

instrument industries, for which the Rochester area is well known. It is not surprising, therefore, to find 32 percent of total vacancies in durable manufacturing and 20 percent in the photographic, optical, and instruments industries. Another large concentration of vacancies was in services, edu-

cational services in particular. As noted above, however, many jobs in educational services were to begin in September and were thus of a rather different nature than those in manufacturing (table 3).

The vacancy rate varied considerably between industries (table 2). The rate was

very high in construction, auto dealers and service stations, and education. In construction and education, this reflects seasonal variation to a large extent. The vacancy rate was quite low in food-products manufacturing; this reflected the seasonal low of this industry in Monroe County.

Occupation group	Total vacancies		Percent of vacancies open to—		
	Number	Percent distribution	Males	Females	Either sex
Professional workers.....	2,127	26.6	15.7	8.4	75.9
Semiprofessional workers.....	331	4.1	63.7	1.8	34.4
Managers and officials.....	186	2.3	71.5	3.2	25.3
Clerical workers.....	752	9.4	18.0	62.2	19.8
Sales workers.....	402	5.0	63.4	9.0	27.6
Service workers.....	563	7.0	36.2	31.6	32.1
Skilled workers.....	1,393	17.4	88.8	4.6	6.6
Semiskilled workers.....	1,730	21.6	79.4	15.6	5.0
Unskilled workers.....	507	6.3	84.8	12.2	3.0
Total.....	7,991	100.0	53.9	15.9	30.2

TABLE 3.—Industry and starting date—Job vacancies by industry group and starting date

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF JOB VACANCIES

Industry group	Starting date										Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
	Immediately	Later in February 1965	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	January 1966		
Durable manufacturing.....	2,168	98	191	32	16	13	13	1	3	2	2,537	83.6
Nondurable manufacturing.....	385	19	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	408	10.4
Construction.....	302	0	0	112	552	0	0	0	0	0	1,966	183.0
Public utilities and transportation.....	91	5	0	284	0	28	0	0	0	0	2,408	201.0
Trade, retail and wholesale.....	882	71	17	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,010	143.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	180	12	73	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	266	50.1
Services, other than education.....	598	123	19	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	747	150.0
Education, public and private.....	135	0	6	9	0	0	112	0	1,057	0	1,319	42.8
Government.....	248	0	0	1	0	80	1	0	0	0	330	15.7
Total, Monroe County.....	4,989	328	306	1,479	1,569	125	126	11	1,066	12	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total.....	246	48.4	41.2	208	136	0	0	0	42.8	0	358	

HORIZONTAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Industry group	Immediately	Later in February 1965	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	January 1966	Total
Durable manufacturing.....	85.5	3.9	7.5	1.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0	0.1	0.1	100.0
Nondurable manufacturing.....	94.4	4.7	0	.2	0	.7	0	0	0	0	100.0
Construction.....											(1)
Public utilities and transportation.....											(2)
Trade, retail and wholesale.....	87.3	7.0	1.7	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	67.7	4.5	27.4	0	.4	0	0	0	0	0	100.0
Services, other than education.....	80.1	16.5	2.5	0	0	.1	0	.8	0	0	100.0
Education, public and private.....	10.2	0	.5	.7	0	0	.5	0	80.1	0	100.0
Government.....	75.2	0	0	.3	0	24.2	.3	0	0	0	100.0
Total.....	62.4	4.1	3.8	6.0	7.1	1.6	1.6	0	13.3	0	100.0

VERTICAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Industry group	Immediately	Later in February 1965	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	January 1966	Total
Durable manufacturing.....	43.5	29.9	62.4			10.4	10.3		0.3		31.7
Nondurable manufacturing.....	7.7	5.8	0			2.4	0		0		5.1
Construction.....	6.1	0	0			0	0		0		12.1
Public utilities and transportation.....	1.8	1.5	0			22.4	0		0		5.1
Trade, retail and wholesale.....	17.7	21.6	5.6			0	0		0		12.6
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	3.6	3.7	23.9			0	0		0		3.3
Services, other than education.....	12.0	37.5	6.2			.8	0		.6		9.3
Education, public and private.....	2.7	0	2.0			0	88.9		99.2		16.5
Government.....	5.0	0	0			64.0	.8		0		4.1
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	(1)	(1)	100.0	100.0	(1)	100.0	(1)	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

<sup>2</sup> Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.

TABLE 4.—Occupation and sex—Job vacancies by occupation group and sex

Occupation group	Estimated number of vacancies open to—				Standard error of total number of vacancies	Percent distribution of total number of vacancies
	Males	Females	Either sex	Total		
Professional workers.....	333	179	1,615	2,127	44.40	26.6
Chemists.....	16	1	40	57	2.45	.7
College faculty.....	15	0	105	120	13.40	1.5
Engineers.....	216	0	211	427	12.00	5.3
Electrical.....	109	0	34	143	11.50	1.8
Mechanical.....	56	0	98	154	3.46	1.9
Musicians and music teachers.....	0	0	30	30	7.75	.4
Social and welfare workers.....	3	9	111	123	5.48	1.5
Primary and kindergarten teachers.....	2	87	409	498	36.20	6.2
Secondary teachers and principals.....	4	13	307	324	15.50	4.1

TABLE 4.—Occupation and sex—Job vacancies by occupation group and sex—Continued

Occupation group	Estimated number of vacancies open to—				Standard error of total number of vacancies	Percent distribution of total number of vacancies
	Males	Females	Either sex	Total		
Semiprofessional workers.....	211	6	114	331	13.20	4.1
Draftsmen.....	72	0	16	88	6.00	1.1
Laboratory technicians.....	61	6	63	130	2.45	1.6
Managers and officials.....	133	6	47	186	34.60	2.3
Clerical workers.....	135	468	149	762	77.10	8.4
Clerks:						
General office.....	8	85	37	130	14.50	1.6
File.....	1	16	2	19	2.45	.2
General industry.....	12	24	1	37	11.50	.5
Operators, office machines.....	9	31	4	44	5.48	.6
Clerk, shipping and receiving.....	15	2	1	18	2.45	.2
Stenographers and typists.....	4	72	30	106	17.00	1.3
Stock clerks.....	25	2	1	28	2.45	.4
Sales workers.....	255	36	111	402	77.70	5.0
Salesmen:						
Insurance.....	6	3	90	99	21.40	1.2
To consumers.....	6	9	0	15	4.24	.2
Service workers.....	204	178	181	563	71.10	7.0
Maids and housemen.....	10	1	0	11	2.45	.1
Waiters and waitresses.....	0	94	1	95	20.30	1.2
Kitchen workers.....	43	5	1	49	15.90	.6
Practical nurses and midwives.....	12	17	63	92	13.90	1.2
Skilled workers.....	1,237	64	92	1,393	180.00	17.4
Machinists.....	109	0	4	113	21.60	1.4
Tool and die makers.....	75	0	36	111	24.30	1.4
Electricians.....	59	0	0	59	9.49	.7
Masons.....	204	0	0	204	59.90	2.5
Carpenters.....	124	0	0	124	36.30	1.6
Chauffeurs and drivers.....	7	0	17	24	6.48	.3
Mechanics <sup>1</sup> .....	70	0	1	71	4.24	.3
Foremen, manufacturing.....	7	3	0	10	2.45	.1
Semiskilled workers.....	1,373	270	67	1,730	262.00	21.6
Textile fabricators <sup>1</sup> .....	7	127	61	195	3.46	2.4
Laundry workers.....	10	45	19	74	18.30	.9
Warehouse workers.....	14	0	0	14	2.45	.2
Machinists' apprentices.....	91	0	0	91	14.90	1.1
Unskilled workers.....	430	62	15	507	84.40	6.3
Laundry workers.....	3	9	2	14	4.24	.2
Public service workers.....	20	0	4	24	7.75	.3
Laborers:						
Packing and filling.....	4	11	6	21	5.48	.3
Transportation equipment.....	60	0	0	60	17.30	.8
Warehouse.....	101	0	0	101	24.10	1.3
Total, Monroe County.....	4,311	1,269	2,411	7,991	358.00	100.0
Standard error of total.....	341.00	82.60	73.20	358.00		

<sup>1</sup> Not elsewhere classified.

TABLE 5.—Occupation and education—Job vacancies by occupation group and minimum education requirement  
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF JOB VACANCIES

Occupation group	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	0	11	0	7	250	439	1,625	180	182	2,644	57.9
Clerical and sales workers.....	0	29	32	108	852	72	61	0	0	1,154	103.0
Service workers.....	35	175	102	80	94	71	6	0	0	563	71.1
Skilled workers.....	14	238	466	131	490	51	3	0	0	1,393	180.0
Semiskilled workers.....	195	70	140	669	655	1	0	0	0	1,730	262.0
Unskilled workers.....	93	104	150	84	76	0	0	0	0	507	84.4
Total, Monroe County.....	337	627	890	1,079	2,417	634	1,695	130	182	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total.....	35.6	97.4	181.0	221.0	174.0	38.3	64.7	13.6	0	358.0	

HORIZONTAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Occupation group	Years of schooling required									Total	Median years of schooling
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	0	0.4	0	0.3	9.5	16.6	61.5	4.9	6.9	100.0	16
Clerical and sales workers.....	0	2.5	2.8	9.4	73.8	6.2	5.3	0	0	100.0	12
Service workers.....	6.2	31.1	18.1	14.2	16.7	12.6	1.1	0	0	100.0	8
Skilled workers.....	1.0	17.1	33.5	9.4	35.2	3.7	2	0	0	100.0	8
Semiskilled workers.....	11.3	4.0	8.1	38.7	37.8	1	0	0	0	100.0	10
Unskilled workers.....	18.3	20.5	29.6	16.6	15.0	0	0	0	0	100.0	8
Total.....	4.2	7.8	11.1	13.5	30.2	7.9	21.2	1.6	2.3	100.0	12

TABLE 5—Occupation and education—Job vacancies by occupation group and minimum education requirement—Continued  
VERTICAL PERCENT DISTRIBUTION

Occupation group	Years of schooling required									Total	Median years of schooling
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	0	1.8	0	0.6	10.3	69.2	95.9	100.0	100.0	33.1	
Clerical and sales workers.....	0	4.6	3.6	10.0	35.3	11.4	3.6	0	0	14.4	
Service workers.....	10.4	27.9	11.5	7.4	3.9	11.2	.4	0	0	7.0	
Skilled workers.....	4.2	38.0	62.4	12.1	20.3	8.0	.2	0	0	17.4	
Semiskilled workers.....	57.9	11.2	15.7	62.0	27.1	.2	0	0	0	21.6	
Unskilled workers.....	27.6	16.6	16.9	7.8	3.1	0	0	0	0	6.3	
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Professional occupations were most in demand, in the Rochester area, followed closely by semiskilled and skilled occupations. The professional occupations reflect a large demand for teachers and engineers (table 4). The vacancies for semiskilled and skilled workers, on the other hand, were divided among a large number of specific occupations. In table 4, only those occupations are shown for which the number of vacancies was reasonably large relative to the corresponding standard error; the sum of the vacancies in specific occupations does not add to the group totals therefore.

More than one-half of total vacancies were open only to men, 16 percent only to women, and the balance, 30 percent, to either. The proportion of vacancies for men was highest in the manual occupations, skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers, as one might expect. Equally without surprise is the finding that job openings for women were relatively most important in clerical occupations. Jobs open to either sex were most commonly found in the professional occupations, reflecting vacancies for teachers and several other specific occupations (table 4).

The occupation title is often inadequate in describing a job or job opening. This is true for the jobseeker, for example, who wishes to compare his qualifications to employers' requirements. In order to provide a reasonably complete description of available vacancies, we obtained the sex, education, and experience requirements for each vacancy. The minimum acceptable number of school years and the minimum acceptable period of related experiences were requested from employers in an attempt to obtain realistic measures.

A large number of job vacancies were available to persons who had not graduated from high school (table 5). One-fourth of all vacancies, on the other hand, required at least 4 years of college. Jobs for those without high school diplomas were concentrated in the manual occupations—service workers and the three skill groups. Jobs requiring some college training were concentrated in the professional, semiprofessional, and managerial group.

Years of schooling required	Total vacancies	
	Number	Percent distribution
Fewer than 12.....	2,933	36.6
12.....	2,417	30.2
13 to 15.....	654	7.9
16 or more.....	2,007	25.1
Total.....	7,991	100.0

Another way of considering the relation between occupation and education requirements is the percent of vacancies in an occupation group that requires high school graduation, college graduation, etc. This reveals that most of the vacancies (73 percent) in the professional, semiprofessional, and managerial group require college graduation; all but 15 percent of the vacancies

in the clerical and sales group require high school graduation; a large proportion (60 percent or more) of the vacancies in the service and other manual occupations are open to persons who have not completed high school.

Fifty-eight percent of the job vacancies in Rochester required no related experience of prospective workers (table 6). Most vacancies for skilled workers (90 percent) required experience; one-half required 4 or more years of related experience. The semiskilled occupations and the clerical and sales occupations frequently had experience requirements ranging from 1 month up to 2 years or more. In all occupation groups other than skilled workers, however, less than 50 percent required any related experience. It seems clear, therefore, that employers with unfilled job vacancies in the Rochester area have more stringent requirements with respect to formal schooling than to practical experience.

Formal schooling and practical experience are substitute qualifications, to some extent. The employers we interviewed frequently expressed this view, both informally and by stating alternative job requirements. For example, one job called for either (a) 12 years of schooling and 3 years of experience, or (b) 14 years of schooling and no experience.<sup>2</sup> Additional evidence for this statement is presented in the following summary (derived from table 7). Here we see that vacancies with low education requirements tend to have above-average experience requirements while vacancies with low experience requirements tend to have above-average education requirements.

Related experience required	Years of schooling required				
	Fewer than 12	12	13 to 15	16 or more	Total
None.....	28.6	28.9	9.3	33.2	100.0
1 to 11 months.....	60.6	29.0	9.1	1.2	100.0
1 or 2 years.....	41.0	38.7	7.9	12.4	100.0
3 years or more.....	49.9	26.7	3.4	20.0	100.0
Total.....	36.7	30.2	7.9	25.1	100.0
Percent of vacancies with stated experience requirement					
None.....	28.6	28.9	9.3	33.2	100.0
1 to 11 months.....	60.6	29.0	9.1	1.2	100.0
1 or 2 years.....	41.0	38.7	7.9	12.4	100.0
3 years or more.....	49.9	26.7	3.4	20.0	100.0
Total.....	36.7	30.2	7.9	25.1	100.0
Percent of vacancies with stated schooling requirement					
None.....	44.9	55.1	67.2	76.2	57.6
1 to 11 months.....	10.0	5.8	6.9	.3	6.0
1 or 2 years.....	19.9	22.8	17.8	8.8	17.8
3 years or more.....	25.2	16.4	8.0	14.7	18.6
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>2</sup> In each case where two or more alternatives were given for schooling and experience, we used the alternative with the lower schooling requirement in preparing our tables. This tends to reinforce the statement made above that education requirements are more strin-

gent than experience requirements in the Rochester area. Many persons have suggested that the unfilled job openings in the files of the offices of the U.S. Employment Service might serve as good measures of total job vacancies. In order to investigate this possibility, we requested that the New York State Division of Employment provide us with the number of unfilled job openings in Monroe County on February 12, 1965. The data which were kindly made available to us are shown below. It is interesting to note that while the NICB survey estimated a total number of vacancies almost five times the number in the State file,<sup>3</sup> the percent distributions by occupation group do not differ greatly. The State file has a relatively large percentage of openings for service workers and clerical and sales workers, while the NICB survey has relatively more openings for professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers and for manual workers. The greatest differences are in the service group (more important in the State file) and in the semiskilled group (more important in the NICB survey).

Percent of vacancies in stated occupation group

Occupation group	Years of schooling required				Total
	Fewer than 12	12	13 to 15	16 or more	
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	0.7	9.5	16.6	73.3	100.0
Clerical and sales workers.....	14.7	73.8	6.2	5.3	100.0
Service workers.....	69.6	16.7	12.6	1.1	100.0
Skilled workers.....	61.0	35.2	3.7	.2	100.0
Semiskilled workers.....	62.1	37.8	.1	0	100.0
Unskilled workers.....	85.0	15.0	0	0	100.0
Total.....	36.0	30.2	7.9	25.1	100.0

Occupation group	New York State Employment Service, job openings		NICB survey, estimated vacancies	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	447	27.8	2,644	33.1
Clerical and sales workers.....	314	19.5	1,154	14.4
Service workers.....	379	23.5	593	7.0
Skilled workers.....	248	15.4	1,393	17.4
Semiskilled workers.....	145	9.0	1,730	21.6
Unskilled workers.....	74	4.6	507	6.3
Total.....	1,607	100.0	7,991	100.0

gent than experience requirements in the Rochester area.

<sup>3</sup> The total for the State may be slightly understated, since job orders do not always specify the exact number of workers sought. In such cases, only one opening is included in the State tabulation. There were only three such cases.

TABLE 6.—Occupation and experience  
JOB VACANCIES BY OCCUPATION GROUP AND MINIMUM EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT

Occupation group	Minimum period of related experience												Total	Standard error of total number of vacancies
	Less than 1 year				1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years	6 years	7 to 9 years	10 years or more		
	None	1 to 3 months	4 to 6 months	7 to 11 months										
Estimated number of job vacancies														
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	1,837	8.0	2.0	1.0	158.0	215	109.0	115.0	119.0	17	36	27	2,644	57.9
Clerical and sales workers.....	696	21.0	83.0	25.0	134.0	117	30.0	13.0	32.0	1	2	0	1,154	109.0
Service workers.....	437	0	12.0	12.0	19.0	74	1.0	7.0	0.0	1	0	0	563	71.1
Skilled workers.....	133	4.0	13.0	48.0	166.0	141	144.0	383.0	133.0	191	35	2	1,393	180.0
Semiskilled workers.....	1,003	104.0	140.0	3.0	43.0	352	70.0	8.0	7.0	0	0	0	1,730	262.0
Unskilled workers.....	497	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	507	84.4
Total, Monroe County.....	4,603	139.0	251.0	92.0	523.0	900	354.0	526.0	291.0	1210	173	129	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total.....	209	42.5	34.4	26.2	55.4	222	64.1	58.4	31.5	141	0	6	358	-----
Horizontal percent distribution														
Professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers.....	69.5	0.3	0.1	0	6.0	8.1	4.1	4.3	4.5	0.6	1.4	1.0	100.0	-----
Clerical and sales workers.....	60.3	1.8	7.2	2.2	11.6	10.1	2.6	1.1	2.8	.1	.2	0	100.0	-----
Service workers.....	77.6	0	2.1	2.1	3.4	13.1	.2	1.2	0	.2	0	0	100.0	-----
Skilled workers.....	9.5	.3	.9	3.4	11.9	10.1	10.3	27.5	9.5	13.7	2.5	.1	100.0	-----
Semiskilled workers.....	58.0	6.0	8.1	.2	2.5	20.3	4.0	.5	.4	0	0	0	100.0	-----
Unskilled workers.....	98.0	.4	.2	.6	.6	.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	-----
Total.....	57.6	1.7	3.1	1.2	6.5	11.3	4.4	6.6	3.6	2.6	.9	.4	100.0	-----
Vertical percent distribution														
Professional, semiprofessional and managerial workers.....	39.9	5.8	0.8	1.1	30.2	23.9	30.8	21.9	40.9	-----	-----	-----	33.1	-----
Clerical and sales workers.....	15.1	15.1	33.1	27.2	25.6	13.0	8.5	2.5	11.0	-----	-----	-----	14.4	-----
Service workers.....	9.5	0	4.8	13.0	3.6	8.2	0.3	1.3	0	-----	-----	-----	7.0	-----
Skilled workers.....	2.9	2.9	5.2	52.2	31.7	15.7	40.7	72.8	45.7	-----	-----	-----	17.4	-----
Semiskilled workers.....	21.8	74.8	55.8	3.3	8.2	39.1	19.8	1.5	2.4	-----	-----	-----	21.6	-----
Unskilled workers.....	10.8	1.4	.4	3.3	.6	.1	0	0	0	-----	-----	-----	6.3	-----
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	(1)	(2)	(2)	100.0	-----

<sup>1</sup> Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.

<sup>2</sup> Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

TABLE 7.—Education and Experience  
JOB VACANCIES BY MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

Minimum period of related experience:	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of job vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
	Estimated number of job vacancies										
Less than 1 year: None.....	212.0	311.0	276	518	1,331	426.0	1,355.0	66.0	108	4,603	209.0
1 to 3 months.....	17.0	0.0	24	39	52	4.0	3.0	0	0	139	42.5
4 to 6 months.....	95.0	8.0	28	27	51	40.0	2.0	0	0	251	34.4
7 to 11 months.....	0	0	2	52	37	0	1.0	0	0	92	26.2
1 year.....	0	79.0	24	29	273	62.0	22.0	1.0	33	523	55.4
2 years.....	3.0	65.0	46	338	277	51.0	101.0	18.0	1	900	222.0
3 years.....	0	96.0	73	12	78	13.0	67.0	10.0	5	354	64.1
4 years.....	0	0	271	22	152	5.0	46.0	16.0	14	526	58.4
5 years.....	0	66.0	4	23	92	28.0	64.0	9.0	5	291	31.5
6 years.....	0	2.0	142	11	41	0	12.0	2.0	0	1210	141.0
7 to 9 years.....	10.0	0	0	8	23	2.0	16.0	6.0	8	173	0
10 years or more.....	0	0	0	0	10	3.0	6.0	2.0	8	129	6.0
Total, Monroe County.....	337.0	627.0	890	1,079	2,417	634.0	1,695.0	130.0	182	7,991	358.0
Standard error of total.....	35.6	97.4	181	221	174	38.3	64.7	13.6	0	358	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Education and Experience—Continued  
JOB VACANCIES BY MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

	Years of schooling required									Total	Standard error of total number of job vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Horizontal percent distribution											
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None	4.6	6.8	6.0	11.3	28.9	9.3	29.4	1.4	2.3	100.0	
1 to 3 months	12.2	0	17.3	28.1	37.4	2.9	2.2	0	0	100.0	
4 to 6 months	37.8	3.2	11.2	10.8	20.3	15.9	.8	0	0	100.0	
7 to 11 months	0	0	2.2	56.5	40.2	0	1.1	0	0	100.0	
1 year	0	15.1	4.6	5.5	52.2	11.9	4.2	.2	6.3	100.0	
2 years	.3	7.2	5.1	37.6	30.8	5.7	11.2	2.0	.1	100.0	
3 years	0	27.1	20.6	3.4	22.0	3.7	18.9	2.8	1.4	100.0	
4 years	0	0	51.5	4.2	28.9	1.0	8.7	3.0	2.7	100.0	
5 years	0	22.7	1.4	7.9	31.6	9.6	22.0	3.1	1.7	100.0	
6 years										(1)	
7 to 9 years										(2)	
10 years or more										(3)	
Total	4.2	7.8	11.1	13.5	30.2	7.9	21.2	1.6	2.3	100.0	
Vertical percent distribution											
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None	62.9	49.6	31.0	48.0	55.1	67.2	79.9	50.8	59.3	57.6	
1 to 3 months	5.0	0	2.7	3.6	2.2	.6	.2	0	0	1.7	
4 to 6 months	28.2	1.3	3.1	2.5	2.1	6.3	.1	0	0	3.1	
7 to 11 months	0	0	.2	4.8	1.5	0	.1	0	0	1.2	
1 year	0	12.6	2.7	2.7	11.3	9.8	1.3	.8	18.1	6.5	
2 years	.9	10.4	5.2	31.3	11.5	8.0	6.0	13.8	.5	11.3	
3 years	0	15.3	8.2	1.1	3.2	2.1	4.0	7.7	2.7	4.4	
4 years	0	0	30.4	2.0	6.3	.8	2.7	12.3	7.7	6.6	
5 years	0	10.5	.4	2.1	3.8	4.4	3.8	6.9	2.7	3.6	
6 years	0	.3	16.0	1.0	1.7	0	.7	1.5	0	2.6	
7 to 9 years	3.0	0	0	.7	1.0	.3	.9	4.6	4.4	.9	
10 years or more	0	0	0	0	.4	.5	.4	1.5	4.4	.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

<sup>1</sup> Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.  
<sup>2</sup> Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

NOTE.—(1) Data in all tables relate to Monroe County, N.Y. and to Feb. 12, 1965.  
(2) Components do not necessarily add to totals owing to rounding.  
(3) Unless otherwise stated, the source for all tables is the NICB survey. (See text.)  
(4) All standard errors are rounded to 3 significant digits.

The sample for the NICB February survey was designed to obtain reliable information from employers of all sizes and in all major industry groups. Nine different size groups (in terms of employment) were used in the sample design. In addition, 10 different industry divisions were separately sampled. All employers with 250 or more employees were included in the sample. Of 416 employers chosen, 10 were found to be out of business on the survey date, 3 were seasonally closed, 3 refused to provide information, and 1, a very small employer, could not be contacted by an interviewer. Substitutions were made for two of the refusals, in medium-sized firms. Of those employers available to respond, 99 percent did so. Of those responding, 48 percent reported one or more job vacancies.

The interviews were carried out by six members of the staff of the conference board and eight employees of Bernardine Slade Market Research, Inc. Prior to the February survey a number of extensive exploratory interviews were conducted with Rochester employers. A pretest of 45 small- and medium-sized employers was conducted in January. Also, a conference board employee conducted a postenumeration quality check after the February survey of 14 employers previously interviewed.

Our experience with these surveys has led us to the tentative conclusion that the collection of job vacancy statistics is a feasible operation when the information is obtained by interview and the groundwork in the community has been carefully prepared. Employers were cooperative in almost all cases and readily understood the concepts and definitions. A preliminary analysis of the results indicates that they are reasonable and consistent with other information. Our final judgment, however, must wait upon

the results of the two additional sample surveys in Monroe County, one in May and the other in August 1965.

JOHN G. MYERS,  
Senior Economist, Special Projects,  
Office of the Chief Economist.

**AMERICAN PUBLIC PATIENCE BIG REQUIREMENT FOR SUCCESS IN VIETNAM**

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, Edward T. Folliard, a columnist for the Washington Post, has written a thoughtful and wise article on the great importance of patience and stamina on the part of the American public with regard to Vietnam. He says, in part:

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire 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:

**PATIENCE, STAMINA: VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS**  
(By Edward T. Folliard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States.

In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 6 or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775-83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will "not be defeated" and will "not grow tired." Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will if necessary carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war "a police action."

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was "decadent."

#### L.B.J. IN SANTO DOMINGO NOT TOO LITTLE OR TOO LATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 30, Eric Sevareid discussed the Santo Domingo situation. He said, in part:

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor, and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and

supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire 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:

#### DOMINGO REDS NEVER A MYTH

(By Eric Sevareid)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reporters and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fall to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present. In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that former President Juan Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the

United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime, the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

#### INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 28, 1965, issue of the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., entitled "Justice Action on Baker Overdue."

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

#### JUSTICE ACTION ON BAKER OVERDUE

Well over a year ago, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, had urged continued Senate investigation of Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats. He wanted the Senate to be free of criticism that "someone high in the Government" was being protected.

Senator WILLIAMS also noted then that it was time for the Department of Justice to begin criminal prosecution in the Baker case.

Earlier in 1964 the head of the Justice Department's criminal division had said his office was conducting an important investigation into Baker's affairs "to ascertain the possibility of false statements, conflict of interest, bribery, fraud against the Government and conspiracy."

Then late last year it was revealed that a Federal grand jury in the national capital had started an investigation of conflict of interest and other charges against Baker.

The onetime protege of Lyndon B. Johnson had refused, under 5th amendment protections, to testify and to provide requested information before the Senate Rules Committee. His refusal was legally proper because of the possibility of court action against him.

The whole series of revelations—still far from complete—came after a civil suit had been filed against Baker in September of

1963, a suit charging that he had used political influence in the award of contracts in defense plants for a vending machine firm. Since then there have been out of court negotiations for settlement of this case.

It is no wonder now that Senator WILLIAMS is concerned over a pending summary report from the Senate Rules Committee. From unofficial leaks, he has come to the belief that a desperate effort is being made to discredit him while the committee's majority Democrats and the Johnson administration are trying "to save Baker from legal prosecution at all costs."

There is no question that the Department of Justice Criminal Division has had plenty of time to probe the Baker case for possible violations of Federal laws governing the conduct of Federal employees.

Baker is reputed to have built up a fortune of about \$2 million before he was forced to resign his \$19,000-a-year job for the Senate Democrats—a job to which he was appointed originally in 1955 shortly after Mr. Johnson became majority leader of the Senate.

Senator WILLIAMS has displayed great courage in demanding a complete Senate investigation of the Baker case—which now seems impossible.

Senator WILLIAMS has displayed even greater courage in demanding Justice Department action—which now is long overdue.

Diversivory smears against the Republican Senator from Delaware are no substitute for honest prosecution of the Baker case, and impartial enforcement of the law if there has been substantial evidence of law violation.

Obviously, the next move is up to the Department of Justice.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with a certain degree of reluctance that I take the floor to express my doubts and uncertainties about the pending measure which would authorize total expenditures for the following year of \$5,196 million for space exploration.

As I look through the specific purposes for which the authorization would seem to be directed, it is apparent that the overwhelming proportion of the authorization would be for the purpose of landing a man on the moon within the next decade and returning that man or men to the earth. The Apollo project, which is quite explicitly for this purpose, would authorize \$2,978 million. The Gemini program, which will kick off on Thursday, would authorize \$242 million. There are various other authorizations contained in the bill, the precise effect and purpose of which are not easy to determine. However, they seem to be very closely connected with the proposal to land men on the moon and return them to the earth.

This authorization of \$596 million for administrative purposes seems to be

largely devoted to this purpose. I believe that it is probably safe to estimate, therefore, that at least \$4 billion of the \$5 billion would be devoted to the purpose of landing a man or men on the moon in the next decade.

I know of course that this bill will be passed. I know that, to the degree that public opinion is awakened, it supports this measure. Nevertheless, I do feel that it is my duty to express my doubts.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the need to put a man on the moon. However, I have had an opportunity to study the bill.

The bill would authorize the giving away of private patents in the amount of \$4,533,350,000 on research. The giving away of that much money for new research could uncover something that might be worth many times that much money. We never know what will be found in the course of research. Frequently, something is discovered that is worth more than that which we tried to discover in the first instance.

While I may have some doubts with regard to whether we should put a man on the moon and spend this much money for it, I have no doubt that we have no justification whatever for giving away private patents on research, particularly in the willy-nilly fashion in which the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration has proposed doing. He would propose to sign contracts to give away contract rights before he knows what he is giving away.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I expect to support the Senator from Louisiana on this issue, as I have done in the past.

It is perfectly true that research may very well have byproducts. However, the subject matter of the research makes a great deal of difference.

I believe that the incidental results to be derived from trying to put a man on the moon would be less than if we were to spend a fraction of the \$5 billion on fundamental research in astronomy or in the ultimate nature of energy.

I shall support the Senator from Louisiana. However, I do not believe that we would be justified in spending \$5.2 billion primarily in putting a man on the moon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the course of doing that, there may, and probably will, be contracts to develop something like a fuel cell. A fuel cell is a new type of generating power which could make the use of oil and gas obsolete.

As I understand, with a fuel cell, a person could manufacture all the power he wanted with the use of water and air. If that development were to be successful, it might well be that it would make all the modern automobiles and airplanes, as we know them, totally obsolete. Such a development would be an entirely new means of providing

power. It could be a basic patent that might control the transportation and fuel industries of the United States and foreign nations.

If any such fantastic development should be discovered with public funds, it would seem to me that that development should be freely available to all people so that they might all benefit from its development, rather than have someone charge 40 times the cost of a product. This happened recently when an individual engaged in health research came forth with a patent on a little device which had to do with rendering assistance to mentally retarded children.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I am not arguing against research in the field of outer space. From the information I have been able to collect, the same results could, however, be obtained by the expenditure of a fraction of the amount called for in this bill.

As I have said, I have consulted with a number of scientists about the worthwhileness of putting a man on the moon. I am informed that, as they see it, there is no military value in putting a man on the moon; that if the purpose is to hit some spot on the earth, that spot could be hit just as well from another spot on earth as by going up into the heavens and being in a position to rocket bomb a particular area. In other words, it is not necessary, for military purposes, to put a man on the moon.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am reminded of the story of the dog that kept chasing automobiles when a highway was built through a certain town. Every time a car came through, the old dog would jump up and chase the car. One of the oldtimers of the town said, "I wonder what he is going to do if the old mutt ever catches one of those cars."

I suggest, if we succeed in getting a man on the moon, what are we going to do when he gets there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Exactly. Scientists say also that there can be no scientific value to be gained by getting a man on the moon. There would be value in getting unmanned instruments on the moon which would send back a sampling of the geological construction of the moon.

We have already obtained valuable information by photographing the moon at various distances and from different angles, but there apparently is no scientific value connected with this program of landing a man on the moon and then returning him.

The real argument that is advanced for placing a man on the moon is that the Russians want to get a man on the moon, so we must get there ahead of them, or not very far behind them. In other words, it is a question of prestige.

I never thought we should spend a great deal of money in keeping up with the Joneses when it will not be of any value either to the Joneses or to us to do what they aim to do. It will not help us



to put a man on the moon. It will not help the Russians to put a man on the moon. But if the Russians are going to do it, it is said, we should do it and not be left behind. Why should we race to get to a place where neither of us gains by arriving there?

If the Russians, therefore, were to carry on experiments by cutting off a part of a man's leg to see if it could be grafted to the rest of the man's leg, it might be said that we should also cut men's limbs off to see if they could be grafted back on again. These were experiments performed by surgeons in Nazi Germany.

What is the use in competing with other countries in experiments that have no importance either to military security or to human improvement and where the benefits are highly conjectural and doubtful?

Five billion, two hundred million dollars is an enormous sum of money, of which probably \$4 billion can be earmarked as being connected with the attempt to put a man on the moon. The technical difficulties are tremendous. The surface of the moon changes from extreme heat to extreme cold. There is probably an absence of oxygen on the moon. These are very difficult problems to solve, but we spend enormous amounts of money to solve difficult problems which have no value should we solve them.

Think of what could be done with the \$4 to \$5 billion each year. This is an annual appropriation. It is now 1965. We aim to get a man on the moon by 1970. That means an expenditure of at least \$20 to \$25 billion in the next 5 years. Think of what that amount of money would do in the field of public health, what it would do in the field of education, what it would do in the war on poverty. We could make of this country a very much better Nation with the expenditure of those funds.

I think it is a pity to have us largely waste these resources when they could be turned to better account. If the money were left in the pockets of the people, they could use it to build extra rooms in their houses, for example, to send their children to college, to take a vacation with their families, to develop a garden, to contribute to their church, and for a myriad of worthwhile purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Or it could be used to relieve the shortage of housing in colleges.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it could be used to eliminate such shortages; to give education to the needy; and to improve health. We could do all those things to make this a better Nation.

I wish to express my thoughts and uncertainties on this point. I remember that when I first heard of this proposal some 4 years ago I expressed doubts, and was immediately reminded that the same doubts had been expressed when \$50,000 was expended in the 1840's to help S. B. Morse start work on the telegraph. It was said that much good had come from that. So it is said that \$5 billion a year

spent to put a man on the moon might turn out to be good, also.

Mr. President, there is a big difference between \$50,000 and \$5 billion a year.

Somehow I think the American people have been so influenced by space, so mesmerized by the great accomplishments of science in sending capsules into orbit, and with the romance of the whole procedure—and, of course, I admit it is romantic—that I believe it is time to question the fundamental assumptions upon which this enormously costly venture is based. So as a humble American citizen and as only one of a hundred Senators, I want to show my concern. When the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning carries my remarks, I want to indicate that there is at least one American who doubts whether the flame is worth the candle.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S FORTHRIGHT ACTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD recent expressions of editorial opinion in support of the President's forthright action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. These expressions were published in the San Diego, Calif., Union and the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal.

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

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, May 4, 1965]

#### ULTIMATUM TO COMMUNISM: REDS MUST QUIT HEMISPHERE

The United States now has assumed policing duties that idealists had hopefully placed with the United Nations.

The U.N. Security Council can talk and argue but with both the free world and the Communist world having a veto over each other's decisions, nothing much can come out of it.

And the more representative General Assembly has been paralyzed by refusals to pay special assessments for policing actions.

With the necessary assumption of an enlarged responsibility against various forms of aggression, in South Vietnam as well as in the Dominican Republic, has come at last the frank reacknowledgement that communism is an international conspiracy directed against all of the free world and that it advances in proportion to our reluctance to face up to that fact.

President Johnson decided the time had come to act first and talk later. Mr. Johnson told the Nation that:

"The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit establishment of another Communist government in this hemisphere."

It could not have been made more simple or more direct.

The beginnings of the revolt in the Dominican Republic are as yet not fully explained but it was all too clear that the Communists had moved into a chaotic situation and that a second Cuba was in the making.

By the time the United Nations had talked this one out, the Western Hemisphere would have witnessed a second takeover by the international Communist conspiracy.

The "germ" of Cuba had not been isolated, as claimed, and the seizure of the Dominican Republic would have marked another vital step in the closing off of the Windward

Passage that connects us by the sea with Latin America.

This administration seems to have rid itself of an inherited burden that also paralyzed our own reaction to the enemy's avowed threat to bury us.

Too many of us had begun to half accept the propaganda that atheistic communism is merely another economic system. We were told that it is not an international conspiracy but arises spontaneously in individual countries as a result of social conditions, and that the hostility between us and the Soviet Union is due mostly to mutual misunderstandings and suspicions.

But Mr. Johnson called communism an international conspiracy and that is that.

He most certainly will be accused of oversimplifying world situations. To him, things are either good or bad. Barry Goldwater suffered under a similar attack. He too saw the enemy as an enemy.

The United States will have to go on defending itself in all of the world forums, including the United Nations. The United Nations is the proper place, and we must do it with pride and vigor. Mean and false charges will be leveled against us, and particularly from some countries which maintain their independence only because of our power.

This country is strengthened by its long record in the cause of freedom for all peoples and independence for all nations.

We should have no apologies to offer for guaranteeing the freedom of the Dominican people.

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, May 2, 1965]

#### FIGHT IN ALL DIRECTIONS

President Johnson and many Americans had hoped for a peaceful world.

The news proves that this Nation is embroiled or involved any direction the citizen cares to look.

The situation is global. However, the complications for the Dominican Republic get us as close to home as any island in the Caribbean could be.

Castro still runs his island. And Castro has been named several times as the instigator of revolutions or attempts to overthrow governments throughout all the Latin American nations. His funds and weapons come from Communist nations which can supply money and munitions. There are only two such—Red China and the Soviet Union.

The poor Chinese doesn't care much about conditions of the poor Dominicans. He doesn't know. The richer Russians should be reminded that this Nation, the United States of America, has been helping wherever possible to improve living conditions in the neighboring nations.

Marines moved into Santo Domingo to protect lives of Americans there.

President Johnson asked: "Why must this Nation hazard its ease, its interest, and its power for the sake of a people so far away?" He referred then to the conflict in southeast Asia. He answered his own question by saying: "We fight because we must if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom finally be secure."

The United States and each of its citizens is committed as a leader in world affairs.

The Dominican people don't feel so strongly about their government that so many Dominicans should get killed. The record proves Communists prefer to agitate and furnish some money and some guns. But they have no responsibility for the economy, education, or welfare of the people. Cuba is the prime example. Living was good under the previous dictator.

If and when the United States must use troops and weapons anywhere on the globe, then full support of those who believe in freedom is necessary. There can be dispute on strategy but there is little doubt as to the enemy. Communists do this to us.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I approve emphatically of the expressions of support which these editors express, except for the statement of the Rapid City Journal, that conditions under the previous dictator of Cuba were praiseworthy.

The tragedy which has befallen the Cuban people under Castro does not, unfortunately, mean that the plight of the common people of Cuba was ideal before Castro came to power.

#### GIVEAWAY OF PRIVATE PATENT RIGHTS BY NASA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have pending at the desk an amendment to H.R. 7717, seeking to prevent the giveaway of private patent rights on research done by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. When the authorization act for NASA first became law, there was a difference between House and Senate over the measures which passed with regard to patent rights. The provision of one body asserted that there would be no private patents on Government research under NASA. The provision of the other body asserted that it was silent on the subject, which presumably would permit private patents to exist in Government research.

In conference, the conferees agreed to language which would provide that the Administrator of NASA should have the power to waive patent rights when he determined it to be in the national interest.

Subsequently, representatives of NASA came before the various committees of Congress and asked that they be permitted to change their authorization so that they could waive private patent rights without having to have a finding that it was in the national interest. They argued that some large concerns, many of which had been found guilty of anti-trust violations in one respect or another, might not be interested in doing research for the government unless they could obtain private patents on government research.

We studied their recommendation, and so far as committee experience was concerned, I assured them that any proposed legislation that would involve a waiver of patent rights without knowing what was being waived would be resisted to the utmost by those of us who felt that this was public research and that the public, having paid for it, was entitled to its full benefits.

So we turned them down.

Nevertheless, they proceeded to undertake a policy of merely waiving patent rights in advance, without knowing what they were waiving.

This was done on the theory that monopoly was good for the public, and that the public should tolerate a monopoly which would charge them higher prices and impose upon them all the evils asso-

ciated with the inefficiency of monopolistic power, including the right to withhold from the public the public's rights over private patents.

The Administrator of NASA, Mr. Webb, proceeded to issue an order that he was going to commence waiving in advance the patent rights on Government research without knowing what he was waiving patent rights on.

Mr. President, when one waives rights to the fruits of research at the time of contracting, he does not know what he is waiving. It may be that a small research contract might turn up something of great value. It may be that something will be discovered in research completely different from what one sets out to find in the first instance.

For example, sulfanilamide was a real breakthrough in antibiotics which came about in Germany in the effort to find a better dye. Someone was looking for a better dye for clothes and brought about, instead, the greatest breakthrough of the century in the field of medicine.

Therefore, a similar amount of effort, such as was invested in finding a better dye for cotton materials, could well result in a discovery that might be worth billions of dollars.

But here comes Administrator Webb, finding that it is in the national interest to waive the fruits of research without even knowing what will be waived.

That situation should be stopped. It is against the law. The only way on earth one could conclude such an attitude to be in the national interest—to waive the fruits of research without even knowing what one would be waiving—would be on the theory that monopoly must necessarily be good for the public. The experience of most Americans has been to the contrary.

There are some who try to contend that if the Government were to waive patent rights to a private concern, the private concern would put a product on the market more quickly. All experience has been to the contrary.

Experience has shown that when a new product is developed, it will be marketed more quickly if all competitors are free to put a similar product on the market more quickly. The more competition there is, the more rapidly each competitor will try to get his product on the market first, so that he will get a head start and gain prior acceptance for his product. That is the experience in the field of commerce.

In addition, by permitting competition in the field, lower prices can be obtained. An example of that came to light the other day. A doctor working with public funds in the field of mental retardation for small children, who had no interest in patents one way or the other, was persuaded that he should apply for a patent on a little kit which he had developed for testing children for a certain disease which could lead to mental retardation.

The cost of manufacturing the kit was approximately \$6, which included the profit.

Miles Laboratories succeeded in getting an exclusive license from this doctor, and wanted to charge \$262 for the kit,

compared to the cost of \$6 at which the kit was being manufactured in Louisiana and Massachusetts by the hospitals there. Compared to the cost at which the doctor had been able to produce the kit, Miles Laboratories was still charging an extravagant price for such a product and was still trying to get it, even though the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare moved in and asserted its rights under provisions which protect the Government's rights to research.

I am glad to state that this kind of highway robbery is no longer continuing. However, we have had innumerable examples down through the years of how holders of private patents charge as much as 100 times the cost of production of a product over a long period of time. They contend that the price they charge depends upon the maximum profit that could be made, having no relationship whatever to the interests of the American people, or the people of any other nation, insofar as they have a complete patent monopoly on their product.

Mr. President, I am not quarreling with the right of a person to own a patent. I am not even arguing his ability to deny the public the benefits of something he discovered, because he might have discovered it first. That is not the issue. It is his right, even though he found the idea 5 minutes sooner than someone else, and had a patent properly prepared, to deny the public its benefits for 17 years, even though someone else had been working on the same idea and discovered the idea 5 minutes later. That is the penalty, I believe, for urging and encouraging the American people to spend their money and devote their efforts to developing new products and new commodities. I am not quarreling with that. It is an accepted fact of life, and I do not question it at this point.

But it is also an accepted business practice that whoever pays for the research is entitled to the patent rights involved. If the people of the United States pay for the research, the contractor gets a contract for it and hires the men and women who, in turn, do the research. Those who do the research do not get the patent rights, just as those who do research for the Federal Government do not get the private patent rights. The patent rights should go to those who pay for them. If we did business the way a businessman would do it, that is, if we operated the government the way a businessman would operate his private business, we would insist that 192 million people in this country, having paid their taxes to make the research possible, should have the benefits, instead of one person who might be a government favorite and obtained the contract without bidding for it—as often-times has been the case with an individual who has been found guilty of criminal violations of the law. The General Electric Co. was found guilty of violating the law and defrauding the Government over a period of 10 long years, and taking from the Government untold millions of dollars, and then sending one executive to court to plead guilty or nolle contendere with the sentencing judge stating that the whole corporation is

just as guilty. Such corporations and such people have enough influence even to obtain tax relief, so that they can pay the treble damages that they are required to pay. Such concerns are Government favorites to the extent that they can get such contracts.

Then they want private patent rights on many billions of dollars. That is not right. It can be no more justified than it could be justified to give the public domain to someone who had been permitted to go on it and wander around on it, and give it to him at a guaranteed profit, plus expenses.

What I propose in the amendment is, first, that we prevent the waiver of property rights on U.S. inventions made under NASA contracts until the inventions are made, so that we will know to what we are waiving the patent rights.

In other words, there would be no pig-in-the-poke advance waivers. Such a procedure was never intended by law anyway.

Second, the amendment would require compliance by the Administrator of NASA, along with the other executive agencies, with section 207 of the Federal Property Act. In other words, the Administrator of NASA would be required to submit a proposed waiver to the Attorney General of the United States, for advice as to antitrust implications. If one of these inventions, developed with the \$4½ billion, should be something like a fuel cell, which would give the holder of a private patent a monopoly on the whole transportation industry, or would displace automobiles as we know them today, or airplane engines as we know them today, or over the entire world transportation industry, as we know it, with resulting fantastic antitrust implications, the Administrator of NASA should have the advice of the man who is responsible for protecting the taxpayers with regard to antitrust implications, namely, the Attorney General of the United States.

This is required with regard to Federal agencies generally, and should be with respect to the proposed giveaway by NASA. There is no requirement that the administration follow the advice of the Attorney General, but at least he should know what the advice is. We have a right to complain about it if the giveaway occurs.

In addition, the amendment would require that the Administrator, before giving a waiver, should find that the equity justifies the waiver. It should be found that the person obtaining the waiver of patent rights would have done more than merely spend Federal money on a guaranteed profit basis plus expenses. He would have had to put some of his own money into it, either before or after the contract, and he would have had to make a contribution over and beyond the Federal money he has received in order to justify the waiver.

The amendment would also provide that the waiver would promote the use of the invention in the interest of the United States. This relates to the specious argument of those who contend that waivers are justified because a monopoly would place a product more rap-

idly on the market than would be the case if competition prevailed. The argument is unsound. In any event, there should not be a waiver of private patent rights under a Government research contract when the result of the waiver is to deny the public for possibly 17 years the benefit of that for which it paid. If these people are to argue that they can make better use of Government research and Government patents than by making them available to the public, it is only fair to insist that they not withhold discoveries from the public and then play "dog in the manger" as a result of having obtained private patents on the research efforts of the people of the United States and paid for by the public.

That is the least we can ask. It would still be possible to have a waiver on private patents on Government research, but at least we would get the camel's nose from under the flap of the tent of giving away something without knowing what we were giving away. We would have some advice as to what the antitrust implications would be, and we would insist that there be some equity to justify it, and we would insist that the invention subject to the waiver be not denied the public as a result of the waiver.

That is the minimum that could be requested. I would like to see a great deal more done. In the future I shall try to do more on this subject. However, now, in trying to stop gross abuses in this field, I am hopeful that the Senate will support my amendment to prevent the giving away of private patents on the \$4½ billion Government research program.

In line with the argument made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with respect to putting a man on the moon, which is a somewhat dubious program at the best, and a somewhat questionable program, it would probably mean spending \$25 billion between now and 1976, and it is entirely possible that this \$25 billion could be of fantastic value to the people of this country, in the domestic economy alone. It is for us to decide whether the \$25 billion are to be used for the benefit of the 190 million people of this country or for the benefit of the Government favorites who obtain contracts without price competition, sometimes as the result of great influence, and sometimes even as the result of munificent campaign contributions.

Should such persons be permitted to take unto themselves the overwhelming advantage for everything they can squeeze from the fruits of research, paid for by 190 million people, to the tune of \$25 billion? In my judgment the answer is "No." The public, having paid for the research, is entitled to the full benefit of it.

My amendment does not guarantee it, but it is a substantial step in that direction.

I hope Senators will read the RECORD tomorrow and alert themselves to my argument. I shall undertake to respond to the arguments that have been made by others and that will be made.

For example, it will be contended that some corporations might not want to do

research for the Government unless they could have private patents on the research.

General Electric has always been the bell cow in making that argument. General Electric had about 15,000 patents that barred people from going into competition with it. In World War II General Electric was the big hog in suggesting that it did not want to do any research for the Government, at a time when men were sacrificing their lives, unless they were given the right they had been given previously to make fantastic wartime profits.

General Electric sent people before our committee to suggest that it was not interested in doing research if it could not have private patents. We found that they were practically breaking down the door to get NASA to give them research contracts, even though they could not get private patents. It will be found that this same corporation is doing research for the Atomic Energy Commission—I believe I am correct about this—even though that agency is not permitted to give them private patents on the research that is being done for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Oh, no, Mr. President. Those people do not wish to let anyone else get some of the Government money to do research. They want to get all of it. And they—that is, the largest ones—will take it upon whatever terms may be necessary in order to get the research money. Having obtained it, they wish to take every conceivable advantage they can of it. If they cannot get enough advantage as a result of the monopolies achieved at public expense, they will steal it—and they have been caught stealing it by conspiracies lasting over a period of 10 years. They proceed to surrender some dispensable vice president, and he takes the fall for it, as though he were responsible for all of it. No one but the president, the chairman of the board, and the other executives theoretically can do anything about such a plan of conspiracy between themselves and their competitors. That practice has gone on over a long period of time.

Now they say that they are the great guardians of the public interest. They would not be interested in doing research unless they could be assured of every conceivable hammerhead and advantage over the public once they find or develop something. When we call their hand, we find what we suspected. They were not telling the truth. It was a big falsehood. And yet they are up in front, the first in line at the pie counter, once there are some goodies to be passed on to someone who may have signed on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

Mr. President, I shall debate the amendment further tomorrow. I hope Senators will review my remarks in the RECORD.

#### EXPANSION OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 196)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of

the United States. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and will be appropriately referred.

The President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The American people want their Government to be not only strong but compassionate. They know that a society is secure only where social justice is secure for all its citizens. When there is turmoil anywhere in our own country, our instinct is to inquire if there is injustice. That instinct is sound. And these principles of compassion and justice do not stop at the water's edge. We do not have one policy for our own people and another for our friends abroad.

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle. We will continue to back that intention with practical and concrete help.

In southeast Asia today, we are offering our hand and our abundance to those who seek to build a brighter future. The effort to create more progressive societies cannot wait for an ideal moment. It cannot wait until peace has been finally secured. We must move ahead now.

I know of no more urgent task ahead. It requires more of us, more of other prosperous nations, and more of the people of southeast Asia.

For our part, I propose that we expand our own economic assistance to the people of South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos.

I propose we start now to make available our share of the money needed to harness the resources of the entire southeast Asia region for the benefit of all its people. This must be an international venture. That is why I have asked Mr. Eugene Black to consult with the United Nations Secretary General and the leaders of the poor and advanced nations. Our role will be vital, but we hope that all other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union, will participate.

To support our own effort, I ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate for fiscal year 1966 an additional \$89 million for the Agency for International Development for expanded programs of economic and social development in southeast Asia.

This money will serve many purposes:

1. Approximately \$19 million will support electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns—Long Xuyen, Datal, and Nha Thang—in South Vietnam. Co-ops, which have been so important to the lives of our rural people, will bring the benefits of low-priced electricity to more than 200,000 Vietnamese. We hope this pattern can be duplicated in towns and villages throughout the region. I will ask that we provide further support if the pattern meets the success we believe possible.

2. Five million dollars will be used to provide the first installment of our contribution to the accelerated development

of the Mekong River Basin. This is an important part of the general program of regional development which I outlined at Johns Hopkins University on April 7. This money will enable us to meet a request for half the cost of building the Nam Ngum Dam, which the international Mekong Committee has marked "top priority" if the Mekong River is to be put to work for the people of the region. This will be the first Mekong power project to serve two countries, promising power to small industry and lights for thousands of homes in northeast Thailand and Laos. The funds will provide also for:

Powerlines across the Mekong linking Laos and Thailand;

Extensive studies of further hydroelectric, irrigation, and flood control projects on the Mekong main stream and its tributaries;

Expansion of distribution lines in Laos.

3. Seven million dollars will help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. South Vietnam is tragically short of doctors; same 200 civilian physicians must care for a population of 15 million. In Laos the system of AID-supported village clinics and rural hospitals now reaches more than a million people. But that is not enough. We propose to extend the program in Laos, assist the Thailand Government to expand its public health services to thousands of rural villages, and to organize additional medical and surgical teams for sick and injured civilians in South Vietnam.

Better health is the first fruit of modern science. For the people of these countries it has far too long been an empty promise. I hope that when peace comes our medical assistance can be expanded and made available to the sick and wounded of the area without regard to political commitment.

4. Approximately \$6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos. In many parts of Asia the chance of the villager for markets, education, and access to public services depends on his getting a road. A nearby water well dramatically lightens the burdens of the farmer's wife. With these tools and skills local people can build their own schools and clinics—blessings only dreamed of before.

5. Approximately \$45 million will be used to finance increasing imports of iron and steel, cement, chemicals and pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy. This money will allow factories not only to continue but, through investment, to expand production of both capital and consumer goods. It will provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing. And it will maintain production incentives and avoid inflation. It is not easy for a small country, with a low income, to fight a war on its own soil and at the same time persist in the business of nation building. The additional import support which I propose will help Vietnam to persevere in this difficult task.

6. An additional \$7 million will supplement the present program of agricultural development and support additional government services in all three countries, and will help in the planning of further industrial expansion in the secure areas of Vietnam.

Much of the additional assistance I request is for Vietnam. This is not a poor and unfavored land. There is water and rich soil and ample natural resources. The people are patient, hard-working, the custodians of a proud and ancient civilization. They have been oppressed not by nature but by man. The failures of man can be redeemed. That is the purpose of the aid for which I now ask additional authorization.

We are defending the right of the people of South Vietnam to decide their own destiny. Where this right is attacked by force, we have no alternative but to reply with strength. But military action is not a final solution in this area; it is only a partial means to a much larger goal. Freedom and progress will be possible in Vietnam only as the people are assured that history is on their side—that it will give them a chance to make a living in peace, to educate their children, to escape the ravages of disease and, above all, to be free of the oppressors who for so long have fed on their labors.

Our effort on behalf of the people of southeast Asia should unite, not divide, the people of that region. Our policy is not to spread conflict but to heal conflict.

I ask the Congress, as part of our continuing affirmation of America's faith in the cause of man, to respond promptly and fully to this request.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 1, 1965.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 1, 1965:

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas D. Davies	Thomas J. Rudden, Jr.
Fillmore B. Gilkeson	Charles D. Nace
John R. Wadleigh	Paul A. Holmberg
Burton H. Shupper	Lloyd R. Vasey
Frederick E. Janney	Ernest W. Doble, Jr.
Robert B. Erly	Dick H. Guinn
Valdemar G. Lambert	Maurice F. Weisner
Frank C. Jones	Roy M. Isaman
Ben B. Pickett	Frederick H. Michaelis
Leslie J. O'Brien, Jr.	Roy G. Anderson
George C. Bullard	William E. Lemos
William N. Leonard	Gerald E. Miller
Walter L. Small, Jr.	Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.
Lucien B. McDonald	Donald M. Showers
Leroy V. Swanson	James F. Calvert
Frank W. Vannoy	Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.