H.R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lolita Lerma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1967. A bill for the relief of Dr. John James Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Mary B. Baylis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1969. A bill for the relief of John J. Tavormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1970. A bill for the relief of Sui Tsai Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Juraj Mikan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1972. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Manuel Cabral do Rego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Antonio Coelho Morgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1976. A bill for the relief of Isaura Maria Carreiro da Silva and Luiz Leonardo da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Henrique Botelho de Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Manuel da Mota Fragata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Shigeo Tokoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Dai Hwan Pang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Satya P. Sood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1982. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pureza Flor Monzon Gaerlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Ben Huie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felipe and Flora Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1985. A bill for the relief of Miss Zaida Zapata deDios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Yerzy Clemens Gzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Dr. Narciso C. Bauzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1989. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Glowacka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ibrahim Faruk Sarac, his wife, Fatma Nukhet Sarac, and their two daughters, Ayes Hulya Sarac and Fatma Nil Sarac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelo A. Manubay and his wife, Eugenia B. Manubay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Emma Hairapetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Francesca Bacino Boccella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1994. A bill for the relief of Ottillia Sophie Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Sister Fara (Giuseppina Perrone); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1996. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Stratigeas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1997. A bill for the relief of Luciano Di Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1998. A bill for the relief of Dr. Silvino B. Muneses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1999. A bill for the relief of Chan Yoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Anna Oleksiejuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 2001. A bill for the relief of Julio Sorio and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2002. A bill for the relief of Nadezda Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2003. A bill for the relief of Gholamali Homayoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2004. A bill for the relief of Cho Seung Man and Kim Chul Hee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laurette Mae Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2007. A bill for the relief of Stella Braha Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Mr. Liem Gien Tjwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2009. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Lopez Mendez, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liem Gien Tjwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2011. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hamaka Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2012. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2013. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Swift-Train Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 2015. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Clark, Arthur E. Field, Edward M. Leonard, Bradford A. Turcott, and Fred J. Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2016. A bill for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 2017. A bill for the relief of Lourdes C. Villareal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

58. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the supreme secretary, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., requesting local and national governmental leaders to call upon every moral fiber which they possess to preserve the heritage and tradition of our American way of life; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1965

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Our Father God, in the toils and troubles of time Thou hast set eternity in our hearts. Scorning the cheap cant of secular panaceas and partisan shibboleths, give us to see that we cannot house our spirits even in ornate barns—that really to live we must ever be building more stately habitations for our own souls and for Thy children under all skies.

As we come in a high hour of human destiny, solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught, empower Thy servants in this forum of governance to rise above all that is base and small, and to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation, and of all the peoples of this stricken earth, who will unite in mutual good will determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind.

We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 4, 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. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–630, the Speaker, on November 18, 1964, appointed Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, Mr. BERRY of South Dakota, and Mr. SKUBITZ of Kansas as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission on the part of the House.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Herbert Clark Hoover, former President of the United States, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ORDER FOR INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND SUBMISSION OF RESOLUTIONS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to introduce bills and submit resolutions that would be referred to the appropriate standing committees of the Senate without prejudicing the rights of any Senator as regards the parliamentary situation affecting any proposed amendment to the Senate rules, and that that procedure be continued today so long as any Senator desires to be recognized, and that statements during that period be limited to 3 minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I understand, that is the procedure which was adopted in 1963. At that time there was no difficulty with the procedure in connection with the proposed amendment of the rules.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that Senators will have only 3 minutes in which to make remarks in connection with the introduction of bills?

Mr. MANSFIELD. During the morning hour.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May Senators make statements thereafter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. When the Senate returns from the joint meeting, the morning hour will have been concluded and discussions at greater length can then be undertaken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If remarks on the introduction of a bill or the submission of a resolution are made during the morning hour and the speech in connection with such introduction or submission is concluded after the morning hour, will it be in order that the entire speech be inserted in the RECORD at the point at which the morning hour proceedings appear?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has there been a ruling on my request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has ruled. There being no objection, the request has been agreed to.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF PEACE CORPS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the third annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1965.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1965.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 43)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the Fifth Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1963) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on construction at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 3)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON SUMMARY OF ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the summary of organization and procedures for the operation and administration of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, dated December 1963 (in three parts) (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON AGREEMENTS UNDER TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, signed during September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, signed during the months of October and November 1964, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on the work of the cooperative Farm Credit System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two letters from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Ten letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President,

dated September 28 (2), September 29, September 30 (2), October 5, October 31, November 27, November 28, and December 12, 1964, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated December 22, 1964, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON APPROVAL OF LOANS BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Dairyland Power Cooperative, of LaCrosse, Wis., for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Corn Belt Power Cooperative, of Humboldt, Iowa, for the financing of certain transmission facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperation Corporation of Winchester, Ky., for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON ON GUARANTEES OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS

Three letters from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., dated November 16, November 19, and December 9, 1964, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that bank of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., dated December 15, 1964, reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that bank of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON SHIPMENTS INSURED BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that shipments to Yugoslavia, insured under the short-term export credit insurance program, totaled $3,502, for the month of November 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of September 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded by the Air Force without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1965, September 30, 1964, there was an aggregate of 2,183 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPOSED DONATION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY TO STAR-SPANGLED BANNER FLAG HOUSE ASSOCIATION, INC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed donation of certain surplus property to Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DONATION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY TO STAR-SPANGLED BANNER FLAG HOUSE ASSOCIATION, INC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, relating to an executive communication transmitted to the Senate in November 1964, pertaining to the donation of certain surplus property to the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROCUREMENT RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the period January-June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the military construction of certain Army National Guard Armories (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, dated December 17, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the critical materials stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN HYOSCINE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice to be published in the Federal Register on the proposed disposition of approximately 2,100 ounces of hyoscine now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the third quarter of 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July–September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July-October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July–August 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OUTSTANDING VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PROGRAMS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuing review of the outstanding

voluntary agreements and programs under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, as of November 9, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CERTAIN LIQUIDATION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL PLAN FOR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "The National Plan for Emergency Preparedness" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON MOBILE TRADE FAIR ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on mobile trade fair activities, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. Travel Service, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STEAM-ELECTRIC PLANT CONSTRUCTION COST AND ANNUAL PRODUCTION EXPENSES, 1962–63 SUPPLEMENT"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a publication entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1962–63 supplement" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON NATIONAL POWER SURVEY

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on National Power Survey—1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON PERMITS AND LICENSES FOR HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the map "Major Natural Gas Pipelines, as of June 30, 1964" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1962, Publicly Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1963" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS ON REAL PROPERTY EXEMPTED FROM TAXATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on real property exempted from taxation in the District of Columbia, during the calendar year 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON CERTAIN PROPERTIES EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain properties exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, during fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMBINED STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, AND BALANCES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON BALANCES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES ACQUIRED WITHOUT PAYMENT OF DOLLARS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON U.S. EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. exchange program, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

A letter from the Chairman, the Advisory Committee on the Arts, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Committee, for the year July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERPRETATION OF THE CHAMORRO-BRYAN TREATY

A letter from the Legislative Reference Service (Senate Library) transmitting a translation of the conclusions of a commission to report to the National Congress of Nicaragua on the Chamorro-Bryan Treaty, relating to the construction of a canal in Nicaragua (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ANALYTICAL TRANSLATION OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS OF THE AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

A letter from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of

the Senate, the following analytical translation of official documents of the American Interparliamentary Union, which with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

1. Bulletin No. 1 of the American Interparliamentary Union, which contains (1) statute of the American Interparliamentary Group, approved during the Second Plenary Session on February 5, 1964, at the Pan American Union in Washington, (2) the Interparliamentary Declaration of Washington (of the Third I–P Conference); (3) a resolution on the creation of an American Parliament; and (4) a list of the Executive Committee of this group.

2. The agenda of the Latin American Parliament, which will meet in Lima in December 1964.

3. An informational bulletin on the December 1964 meeting of the Latin American Parliament, in Lima, Peru.

4. The legal basis of the coming Latin American meeting in Peru.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research grants awarded by that Department, during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR TURKEY

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a report (B–133026) on examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

IMPROPER RETENTION OF DOLLAR COLLECTIONS ON LOANS MADE BY CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a report (B–133220) on improper retention of dollar collections on loans made by Corporate Development Loan Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADDITIONAL INTEREST COSTS TO THE UNITED STATES BECAUSE OF PREMATURE RELEASES OF FUNDS TO SOCIAL PROGRESS TRUST FUND

A letter from the Acting Director, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a report (B–146937) on additional interest costs to the United States because of premature releases of funds to the social progress trust fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the General Accounting Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (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 cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by General Dynamics/Astronautics, a division of General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif., Department of the Air Force, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement from A–C Spark Plug Division of General Motors Corp. of bombing-navigational system components manufactured by International Business Machines Corp., Department of the Air Force, dated September 1964 (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 inadequate policies and practices relating to the relocation of families from urban renewal areas, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated September 1964 (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 excessive allocation of costs of certain streets and related facilities to the northside urban renewal project, Kansas City, Mo., Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated September 1964 (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 use of private executive aircraft rather than commercial aircraft resulted in unwarranted charges to Government cost-reimbursable-type contracts by Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated October 1964 (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 excessive costs resulting from delayed purchase of automatic data processing equipment, Federal Aviation Agency, dated October 1964 (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 expense incurred by producing basically similar motion picture films, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated October 1964 (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 cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by General Electric Co., Missile and Space Division, Valley Forge, Pa., Department of Defense, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred by not considering transportation expenses as an element of procurement cost, Panama Canal Company, dated October 1964 (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 excessive ocean transportation costs incurred for shipments under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Department of Agriculture, dated October 1964 (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 inadequate planning resulting in ineffectual utilization of the automatic data processing system at National Flight Data Center, Federal Aviation Agency, dated October 1964 (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 retention of uneconomical units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, Departments of the Army and Air Force, dated October 1964 (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 weaknesses in administration of the hospital survey and construction grant program, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated October 1964 (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 uneconomical proposed procurement of a fire alarm system by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated October 1964 (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 unwarranted allowance for material price increases to Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va., for construction of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise*, Department of the Navy, dated October 1964 (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 revenues due the Government illegally expended for rehabilitation and improvement of concession facilities at Mount Rainier National Park, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, dated October 1964 (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 excessive costs incurred by leasing rather than purchasing certain telewriting equipment, Federal Supply Service,

General Services Administration, dated October 1964 (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 inadequacies in the administration of right-of-way activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of New Jersey, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from failure to consolidate the leasing of intercity communications lines of certain civil agencies, General Services Administration, dated October 1964 (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 excessive Federal contributions to veterans' life insurance trust funds because of inadequate administration of extra-hazard provisions of law, Veterans' Administration, dated October 1964 (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 employment opportunities in federally aided projects generally restricted to individuals having funds to invest in business venture, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (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 questionable need for stockpiling cordage fibers, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in sole-source procurement of portable radar sets, Department of the Army, dated October 1964 (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 deficiencies in the award and administration of timber sales contracts in the California region (region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated October 1964 (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 cost and pricing data not obtained for determining the reasonableness of prices for weapons components procured from the Aluminum Company of America by the Bendix Corp. and ACF Industries, Inc., Atomic Energy Commission, dated October 1964 (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 excessive costs to the Government in the sale and leaseback of an electronic data processing system by the Aerojet-General Corp., Sacramento, Calif., Department of Defense, dated October 1964 (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 uneconomical practices relating to the distribution of press releases and other informational material issued by the Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (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 improper issuance of service-disabled veterans life insurance, Veterans' Administration, dated October 1964 (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 proceeds from sale of land improperly retained under the control of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, dated October 1964 (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 overcharges included in prices negotiated for change orders issued under fixed-price contracts awarded to Avondale Shipyards, Inc., New Orleans, La., Department of the Navy, dated October 1964 (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 overpricing of valves purchased from the Garrett Corp., Air Research Manufacturing Division, Phoenix, Ariz., by General Dynamics Corp., Astronautics Division, San Diego, Calif., for the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, Department of the Air Force, dated October 1964 (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 weaknesses in administration of the national fish hatchery program, Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, dated October 1964 (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 potential savings available through purchasing rather than leasing certain office copying machines, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, dated October 1964 (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 violation of statutes governing Federal employment and excess costs incurred under a contract for technical writing and related services awarded by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated October 1964 (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 per diem payments made to military personnel assigned to temporary duty at Bath, Maine, Department of the Navy, dated October 1964 (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 accelerated public works assistance approved for areas under consideration for termination of eligibility, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (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 disposal of spare components procured for the Hawk air defense guided-missile system, Department of the Army, dated October 1964 (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 the unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by Defense Electronic Products, Radio Corporation of America, Camden, N.J., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (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 interest on U.S. owned foreign currencies in the Republic of China (Taiwan), Treasury Department, Department of State, and Agency for International Development, dated November 1964 (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 overstated cost estimates included in target prices negotiated for B–52G airplanes produced by the Boeing Co., Wichita Branch, Wichita, Kans., Department of the Air Force, dated November 1964 (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 the status of findings and recommendations included in prior report on audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, dated November 1964 (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 vacancies in available Capehart, Wherry, and other Government-owned family housing at Fort Knox, Ky., Department of the Army, dated November 1964 (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 the failure to construct District of Columbia Stadium in accordance with the financial plan submitted to the Congress, District of Columbia Armory Board, dated November 1964 (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 the unnecessary costs resulting from indirect procurement of transmitters from Hamilton Standard Division of United Aircraft Corporation, Department of the Air Force, dated November 1964 (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 overpayments to vendors by San Francisco Regional Office, General Services Administration, dated November 1964 (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 the uneconomical use of facilities by the Hawaii National Guard, Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (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 the improper payment of Colombian port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, dated November 1964 (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 the unnecessary transportation costs for small arms ammunition components purchased for the military assistance program, Department of the Army, dated

November 1964 (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 excessive costs incurred in acquiring a building site and in renting space, Federal Aviation Agency, dated November 1964 (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 deficiencies in the award and administration of contracts for construction of Federal-aid highway projects in the State of New Jersey, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (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 the unnecessary costs to the Federal Government as a result of supplanting existing employment services by federally financed services, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, dated November 1964 (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 the weaknesses in administration of the student loan program under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated November 1964 (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 the unnecessary costs to the Government for commercial long-distance telephone calls made by Federal agencies in the Dallas region, between cities served by the Federal Telecommunications System, General Services Administration, dated November 1964 (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 deficiencies in appraising southern pine sawtimber sold in the southern region (region 8), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated November 1964 (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 the failure to require adherence to specifications for materials used in forest highway projects in certain Western States under the direct Federal highway construction program, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (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 overpayments for rental of automatic data processing machines caused by inaccurate recording of machine use time, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated November 1964 (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 unwarranted financial risks assumed under the Federal ship mortgage insurance program, because of inadequate evaluation of economic soundness of proposed tanker operations, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (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 imprudent action taken in approving loans to assist the Roustabout Co., of Frackville, Pa., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (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 excessive prices for powerpack assemblies purchased from Sparton Corp., Jackson, Mich., by various prime contractors, Department of the Army, dated November 1964 (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 inventions not disclosed and confirmatory royalty-free licenses not obtained under selected research and development contracts with Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Division of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (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 overstatement of target cost of AN/FPS–7 radar equipment under fixed-price incentive contracts AF 30(635)–12300 and AF 30(635)–11072, with General Electric Co., Heavy Military Electronics Department, Syracuse, N.Y., Department of the Air Force, dated November 1964 (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 cost to the Government in the leasing of electrical accounting machines by General Dynamics/Astronautics, San Diego, Calif., and Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (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 expensive operation of mountain recreation facilities at Armed Forces Recreation Center, Kilauea Military Camp, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (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 weaknesses in controls over dollar refunds due Commodity Credit Corporation for adjustments in amounts financed on cotton exported under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, dated November 1964 (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 the sale of hydroelectric power by the Department of the Interior, under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, at rates not approved by the Federal Power Commission, dated November 1964 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 reduction in costs and acceleration of training of the unemployed available through increasing the number of instructional hours per week, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated November 1964 (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 the award of procurement contracts by formal advertising procedures without obtaining effective competition, Post Office Department, dated November 1964 (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 inventions not disclosed and conformatory royalty-free licenses not obtained under selected research and development contracts with certain divisions of Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (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 review of decisions reached by the Department of Agriculture on various problems affecting storage of cotton by the Commodity Credit Corporation, dated November 1964 (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 increased operating costs resulting from conversion of post office branches to independent post offices, Boston postal region, Post Office Department, dated December 1964 (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 financial assistance provided to ineligible Cuban refugees in the Miami, Fla., area, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated December 1964 (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 questionable validity of $32 million estimate of funds needed to complete Inter-American Highway, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated December 1964 (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 inadequate analysis of employment opportunities to be provided by a federally assisted project, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated December 1964 (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 AN/APN–99A radar system components resulting from failures of Warner Robins Air Materiel Area to make excess spare components available for installation on new aircraft, Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in negotiated procurements of batteries for aircraft ground support equipment by Rome Air Materiel Area, Rome, N.Y., Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (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 overstaffing of civilian personnel at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nev., Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (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 inadequate consideration

of economies possible through consolidating operations and reorganizing service areas, Post Office Department, dated December 1964 (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 further comment on overpricing of the nuclear frigate U.S.S. *Bainbridge* purchase from the Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (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 unauthorized use of military personnel and Government property at Fort Gordon, Ga., for activities related to the Masters' Golf Tournament, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (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 overstated costs included in price of turbojet engine parts purchased from Solar Aircraft Co., San Diego, Calif., by General Electric Co., West Lynn, Mass., Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (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 overcharges for long-distance telephone channels leased by the 8th U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (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 unauthorized expenditures for converting a bull barn into a research laboratory at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., Department of Agriculture, dated December 1964 (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 illegal payments of hazardous duty submarine pay to military personnel assigned to submarine force command staffs, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (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 ineffective supply management causing shortages and excesses of end items and repair parts in Okinawa, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (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 proposed acquisition of unnecessary and expensive property for developing a low-rent housing project by the St. Louis Housing Authority, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1964 (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 failure to consider available assets resulting in overstated needs for avionics test equipment by the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (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 high costs of unnecessary daily compilation of statistical data by use of automatic data processing equipment, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (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 inadequate management action results in excessive payments of compensation benefits, Veterans Benefits Office, Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration, dated December 1964 (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 annual costs of about $1.4 million incurred because of inappropriately assigning flight data processing duties to Assistant Air Traffic Controllers, Federal Aviation Agency, dated December 1964 (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 overpricing of buffer amplifiers purchased from HRB-Singer, Inc., State College, Pa., by the Boeing Co., Wichita Branch, Wichita, Kans., for B–47 aircraft, Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (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 failure to recover unpaid royalties retained by Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Department of Defense, dated December 1964 (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 inadequate management action to collect debts resulting from default of housing loans made in Florida under the loan guaranty program, Veterans' Administration, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of selected subsystems and accessories for F–4 and other types of aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (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 excessive Federal matching of administrative expenses for public assistance programs in the State of New York, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated December 1964 (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 potential savings to the Government if bonding of Federal employees is discontinued, dated December 1964 (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 ineffective actions taken in approving and administering a loan to Vineland and South Jersey Cooperative Egg Auction and Poultry Association, Inc., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Secretary of the Senate

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Report on Application for Loan Under Small Reclamation Projects Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of an application from the Brown Canal Co. of Graham County, Ariz., for a Small Reclamation Projects Act loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports on Project Proposals, Under Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal from the Brown Canal Co. of Graham County, Ariz., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal from the Nevada Irrigation District of Grass Valley, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Concession Contracts

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract under which Hill Wheatley Enterprises, Inc., will be authorized to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to authorize Dr. Rafael Garbayo to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services in Grand Canyon National Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Amendments to Certain Concession Contracts

Sixteen letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated October 12, 26, 27, 30 (4), November 2, 3, 16, 23, December 1, 4, 7 (2), and 23, 1964, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed amendments to certain concession contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Cancellation of Charges Against Certain Tribes of Indians

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders relating to the cancellation of charges against certain tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Farwell Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, Nebraska

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Farwell unit, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Reclassification of Lands Within Fort Shaw Irrigation District, Sun River Project

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that a reclassification had been made of the lands within Fort Shaw Irrigation District, Sun River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECLASSIFICATION OF LANDS WITHIN MALTA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law on the reclassification of lands within the Malta Irrigation District of the Milk River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN INDIAN CLAIMS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claim of the Creek Nation, plaintiff, the Creek Nation East of the Mississippi, intervenor, v. the United States, defendant, docket No. 21 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Treasury during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON TORT CLAIMS PAID AND CLAIMS SETTLED UNDER MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army, for fiscal year 1964, and a report on claims settled under the Military Personnel Claims Act, for fiscal year 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PROPERTY LOSS SUSTAINED BY EMPLOYEES OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on claims paid for property loss sustained by employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for the year 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON COMPETITION IN THE SYNTHETIC RUBBER INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on competition in the synthetic rubber industry for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, during the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 14th annual report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE LEGION OF VALOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

A letter from the national corporation agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of that legion covering the period August 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the executive vice president of the American Society of International Law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual audit report of that society covering the period April 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON FINDINGS IN CASE OF ROCHESTER IRON AND METAL COMPANY AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of that court's opinion and findings in the case of the *Rochester Iron and Metal Company* v. *The United States*, Cong. 1–59 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 23–24, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PETITIONS TO ACCORD FIRST PREFERENCE STATUS TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on approved petitions to accord first preference status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR TRAINING TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Advisory Committee for Training Teachers of the Deaf, under Public Law 87–276 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONVENTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting, for the consideration of the Senate, copies of the convention and recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at Geneva, in June 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the year 1964 there were no new positions established for scientific and professional positions in that Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, additional information relative to eight scientific or professional positions in that Department as reported to the Senate in a letter dated January 7, 1964; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–18, GS–17, AND GS–16 EXISTING IN CALENDAR YEAR 1964

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–18, GS–17, and GS–16, existing in calendar year 1964 (covering positions in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grades) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON THE PROBLEM OF AIR POLLUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

"Concurrent resolution to petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution reserving to the States exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems and providing that all rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens relating to public school education shall be determined solely by State courts

"Whereas there is an urgent necessity for clarification and settlement by law questions relating to the powers and rights reserved to the people and the several States under article X of the amendments of the U.S. Constitution as such powers and rights relate to the operation, management, and control of public schools in the several States: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives thereof concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned, under authority of article V of the U.S. Constitution, to call a convention, as therein provided, to propose an amendment to article X of the amendments to the U.S. Constitution by adding a proviso thereto as follows:

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

"Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution shall be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, to the presiding officers of the separate houses of the legislatures of the several States, to the Governors of the several States, and to the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

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

"VAIL M. DELONY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution requesting the U.S. Post Office Department to issue a stamp commemorating Governor Spotswood's expedition to the Valley of Virginia

"Whereas Alexander Spotswood, who was Colonial Governor of Virginia, and his Knights of the Golden Horseshoe made their famous expedition into the area now known as the Shenandoah Valley in 1716 and crossed the Blue Ridge Mountains at Swift Run Gap September 5, 1716; and

"Whereas Governor Spotswood's exploration of the valley area led to its settlement a few years later and also contributed to the development and settlement of the American frontier; and

"Whereas Governor Spotswood's exploration and the interest shown by members of his expedition focused attention on the vast untapped areas of the new world; and

"Whereas the year 1966 will mark the 250th anniversary of Governor Spotswood's famous expedition into the valley: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Virginia (the House of Delegates concurring), That the General Assembly of Virginia requests that the U.S. Post Office Department issue a 5-cent Alexander Spotswood commemorative postage stamp on September 5, 1966; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the senate is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Postmaster General of the United States, 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.

"Agreed to by the senate December 2, 1964.

"BEN D. LACY,
"Clerk of the Senate.

"Agreed to by the house of delegates December 3, 1964.

"GEORGE R. RICH,
"Clerk of the House of Delegates."

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

"JOINT RESOLUTION 126A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to apply the provisions of or, alternatively, to extend the coverage of the Federal antitrust laws to major league baseball

"Whereas major league baseball today is a big business which should be subject to the Federal antitrust laws; and

"Whereas major league baseball officials have taken certain actions, including the arbitrary relocation of major league teams, which could be construed to constitute a violation of those laws; and

"Whereas such actions are likely to be continued in the future in the absence of any effective legislative or judicial prohibition; and

"Whereas such actions are detrimental to professional baseball as a whole, as well as to the loyal followers of baseball and the individual communities which support major league teams; and

"Whereas the stanch followers of the Milwaukee Braves baseball team in the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin, who have actively supported the team during its 11 years in Milwaukee, will be adversely affected by the pending relocation of the team; and

"Whereas legislative regulation is badly needed in the field of professional baseball to prevent current as well as future abuses arising from violations of the Federal antitrust laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to enforce the provisions of the antitrust laws in regard to major league baseball or, alternatively, to extend the coverage of the Federal antitrust laws to major league baseball; and, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives Committee on Judiciary, to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress, to the members of the County Board of Milwaukee County and to the members of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee.

"JACK B. OLSON,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"ROBERT HAASE,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"KENNETH E. PRIEBE,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of the so-called Douglas truth in lending bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the 1964 annual convention of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, at Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Colusi County Historical Society, of Corning, Calif., relating to the designation of the Tehama-Colusa Canal as the Will S. Green Canal; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide medical care for the aged through the social security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the North Dakota Peace Officers Association, at Bismarck, N. Dak., relating to the report of the President's Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers' Association, relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Erie County (N.Y.) Association of Chiefs of Police, at Amherst, N.Y., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland Law Enforcement Officers, Inc., Baltimore, Md., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Sheriffs' Association of New Jersey, relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions, of Boston, Mass., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the officers of the Georgia Association of Chiefs of Police, at Athens, Ga., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Oklahoma State Legislative Council, relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Democratic Party of Guam, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the election of the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Edgar M. Powers, of Flat Rock, N.C., relating to the printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a petition for a redress of grievances which he transmitted to the Senate in September 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Reginald B. Naugle, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, relating to the legality of the election of November 3, 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of John Boldt, of Kingston, N.Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, relating to poverty; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Mildred Lemon, of Seattle, Wash., relating to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes the States to enact right-to-work laws prohibiting compulsory unionism; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, at Asheville, N.C., on October 14, 1964, commending the Congress for the enactment of the National Defense Education Act, and recommending careful review of budgetary provisions to insure full implementation of the act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, favoring the continuation and expansion of the Public Works Acceleration Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Consulting Engineers Council, Washington, D.C., signed by Donald A. Buzzell, executive director, relating to the use of consultant

engineering first in the administration of the highway program; to th Committee on Public Works.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Allan Hoover, of New York, N.Y., expressing thanks to the Senate for the flowers sent at the death of the late President Herbert Hoover, and also for the joint resolution commemorating his 90th birthday, together with the flags, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 13) authorizing the continuation of certain studies and the initiation of others by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and submitted a report (No. 2) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 13

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, with particular emphasis upon (a) the feasibility of greater use of modernized equipment and the development of more efficient processing techniques, (b) continuation of a study of parcel post as required by law with a view to insuring a reasonable cost-revenue balance and at the same time maintaining rates within an area commensurate with the basic purpose of the parcel-delivery system, (c) postal rates generally, and

(2) the civil service system, investigations and studies including (a) the merit system, (b) the civil service retirement system and the continually increasing unfunded liability of the retirement fund, along with a study of means by which the system can be improved, (c) the Federal health benefits program, taking into account the rising costs of hospitalization and other medical care, (d) Federal pay, including the practical effects of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, (e) and the Federal employees life insurance program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 3)

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ one additional assistant, and submitted a report thereon, which resolution, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 14

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. GORE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 3. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 4. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 5. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for student grants, loan insurance, and work-study; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 6. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 8. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. SMITH, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. FONG, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. BAYH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 9. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. TOWER):

S. 10. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 11. A bill to prohibit strikes by employees employed in certain strategic defense facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. TOWER):

S. 12. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE):

S. 13. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and southern districts of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. FONG, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 14. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 15. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 16. A bill for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 17. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 18. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1916, so as to provide a standard for a dry 1½-quart container; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 19. A bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 20. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 21. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HART, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 22. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. McGEE, and Mr. McGOVERN):

S. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 24. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 25. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

S. 26. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; and

S. 27. A bill to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 28. A bill to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN):

S. 29. A bill authorizing modification of the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir, White River Basin, Ark., in the interest of recreational development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. RIBICOFF):

S. 30. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 31. A bill for the relief of Jafar Shoja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 32. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 33. A bill to prohibit the fixing of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. McGOVERN and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 34. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 35. A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of Federal judicial service of the Honorable Walter H. Hodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 36. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 37. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of

the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 38. A bill to repeal the interest equalization tax; and

S. 39. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a 7 per centum increase in the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 40. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 41. A bill for the relief of Susana Juh-Mei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 42. A bill for the relief of George Tilson Weed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Cato Brothers, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 44. A bill for the relief of Jao Fernandes Nunes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 46. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans for waste disposal systems and other facilities providing community services, and for additional financial aid; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 47. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 so as to extend to employees of State agricultural stabilization and conservation service committees credit for annual and sick leave purposes for service performed as employees of county agricultural stabilization and conservation service committees; and

S. 48. A bill to provide for allowance of credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act for service as a member of a county committee established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 49. A bill to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States and its territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 50. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, so as to permit Federal cost sharing for certain uses of water stored in reservoir structures constructed or modified under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilhan Baki Taskin; and

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Wang Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 53. A bill to provide for retroactive payment of annuities payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act to the survivors of Members of Congress who died between February 29, 1948, and March 5, 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 54. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States at Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 55. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; and

S. 56. A bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 57. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the Ryukyu Islands shall be treated as a separate quota area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David S. Fedson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 60. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. O. Small, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 62. A bill for the relief of George John Sarris and Marie George Sarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 63. A bill to provide for the temporary free entry of certain electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Basilios Captain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 65. A bill to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Barnes;

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Smith and his wife, Dorothy Smith;

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Heravi; and

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 70. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 71. A bill to amend the act of September 22, 1961, providing for the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Hanover irrigation district of Worland, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 73. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pandelis Salvaris; and

S. 74. A bill for the relief of Juan Miguel Apezteguia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. FANNIN):

S. 75. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 76. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland;

S. 77. A bill for the relief of Pejo Topolic;

S. 78. A bill for the relief of Lia Novelli;

S. 79. A bill for the relief of Leonard F. Rizzuto;

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Zuzanna Kobielusz; and

S. 81. A bill for the relief of Constantina (Mihas) Michia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians;

S. 83. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fossil Butte National Monument; and

S. 84. A bill to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 85. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 86. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 87. A bill to determine the claims of certain prisoners of war permanently disabled, and to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims in the event of disagreement as to such claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 88. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require the labeling of certain imported meats, poultry, and fish; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 89. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 90. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 91. A bill to provide premium compensation for work performed on Saturday or Sunday by employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 92. A bill to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 93. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623; 20 U.S.C. 53a), to authorize appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution for the purchase of reprints from technical journals or other periodicals and the payment of page charges for the publication of research papers and reports in such journals; and

S. 94. A bill to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress, and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 95. A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest

acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes; and

S. 96. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HART):

S. 98. A bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 99. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as not to exclude from the benefits provided by such act areas which includes structure of twelve thousand five hundred or less acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 100. A bill to establish a Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 101. A bill to provide for a connecting road between three units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 102. A bill to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 103. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic site, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 104. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 105. A bill authorizing certain improvements in the State of Hawaii for navigation purposes; and

S. 106. A bill authorizing certain improvements in the State of Hawaii for navigation purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

S. 107. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as "wilderness" the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. TOWER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DODD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. FONG):

S. 108. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 109. A bill to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 110. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provision of the Public Works Acceleration Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. FONG, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BASS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HART, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 111. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 112. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make real estate mortgage loans on leased lands in Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 113. A bill to authorize an investigation relating to the restoration and preservation of certain cultural and historical artifacts of the Ryukyuan people; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 114. A bill to amend the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 115. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the duty-free entry of certain articles grown, manufactured, or produced in the Ryukyu Islands;

S. 116. A bill to amend title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide for the establishment of fair and reasonable minimum wage rates for workers employed on sugar farms, and for other purposes; and

S. 117. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow gas tax refunds due for gasoline used by aerial applicators serving farmers to be refunded to the aerial appplicators providing such service to farmers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 118. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility of establishing a Pacific International House on Sand Island, Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 119. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; and

S. 120. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 121. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 and the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the submission of certain claims and the reinstatement of certain claims;

S. 122. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances to judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska and Hawaii;

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Anthony;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Gervacio V. Aranca;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Eusebio R. Balmilero and Rosa R. Balmilero;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia B. Briones;

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Manuela Cabasag;

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela Alcon Calamaan;

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Felicidad Caletena;

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Carl H. Carson;

S. 132. A bill for the relief of Anita P. Daoang;

S. 133. A bill for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.;

S. 134. A bill for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota;

S. 135. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu;

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Angel Lagmay;

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Rosauro L. Lindogan;

S. 138. A bill for the relief of Pauline D. McLaughlin;

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiku Matsuhashi;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Mesepa (Naesepa) and Tuileau, both of Aloau Village, American Samoa;

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Fred R. Methered;

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Gus Nihoa;

S. 143. A bill for the relief of the estate of Yoshito Ota;

S. 144. A bill for the relief of Masayoshi Onaka;

S. 145. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pascual;

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Delma S. Pozas;

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Antonio G. Ancheta;

S. 148. A bill for the relief of John Puli, Mrs. Salote Puli, Sharon Puli, Anna Puli, and Benjamin Puli;

S. 149. A bill for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 150. A bill for the relief of Teresa Isidro Raneses;

S. 151. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiki Sakurai;

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Eishin Tamanaha;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Matsusuke Tengan;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez;

S. 155. A bill for the relief of Miss Min Min Wong;

S. 156. A bill for the relief of William Wong;

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ryo H. Yokoyama;

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Legarda Koh;

S. 159. A bill for the relief of Manzo Kawashima;

S. 160. A bill for the relief of George K. Aikala, Lu Ella Marie Aikala, Vernis J. K. Fish, Verson S. Fish, Vivian A. Ahmad, and Velma Solomon;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Chiyo Shitanishi;

S. 162. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction under a treaty shall be regarded as a separate quota area; and

S. 163. A bill to adjust the retirement benefits of certain retired district judges for the district of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 164. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, to restore to certain

veterans in Alaska or Hawaii the right to receive hospital care;

S. 165. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to make certain benefits under that act available to teachers in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools; and

S. 166. A bill to provide a method of regulating and fixing wage rates for ungraded employees in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 167. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to industrial and commercial plans;

S. 168. A bill authorizing the project for harbor improvements at Honolulu Harbor and Barber's Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii; and

S. 169. A bill to require bidders for public works construction contracts to disclose the identity of proposed joint contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. FONG):

S. 170. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the standard deduction in the case of certain departing aliens, and for other purposes;

S. 171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; and

S. 172. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, and Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 173. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 174. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a price-support program for coffee produced in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 175. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 176. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to provide for the furnishing of medical assistance for the aged to eligible residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 177. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Miss Caterina Gadoni; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 179. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 180. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 181. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Martha Huber Vavra;

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Raymond Ku; and

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Miss Fructuosa Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 185. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 186. A bill to provide for the free entry of one digital polarimeter for the use of Smith College; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Franca D'Orazio Allocca;

S. 188. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Araujo;

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Michelina Lanni;

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Carnetta Germain Thomas Hunte;

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Jordan V. Peyev; and

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Speros L. Saites;

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Emanuel E. Bloch;

S. 195: A bill for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Georges Fraise;

S. 197. A bill for the relief of Trifun Suljic; and

S. 198. A bill for the relief of Irene Andreadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 199. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 200. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mira and his wife, Maria Mira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 201. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 202. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend to imported tangerines the restrictions imposed by such section on certain other imported commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 203. A bill to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 204. A bill to confer jurisdiction on U.S. district courts to hear and render judgment on certain claims;

S. 205. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Martinez y Corpas;

S. 206. A bill for the relief of Gerys Dessalernos (also known as Gerassimos Dessalernos);

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose S. Lastra; and

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Branko (Bronco) Balic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 209. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities; and

S. 210. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act with respect to the settlement of labor disputes involving common carriers by air; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 211. A bill to designate one of the locks in the Cross Florida Barge Canal as the Bert Dosh Lock; and

S. 212. A bill to designate a navigation lock and flood control structure of the central and southern Florida flood control project in the State of Florida as the W. P. Franklin lock and control structure; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 213. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 214. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging for recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 216. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 217. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

S. 218. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 219. A bill to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide coach bodies shall not be subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on motor vehicles;

S. 221. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits thereunder even though she has not attained retirement age;

S. 222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; and

S. 223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for repair, maintenance, alterations, and additions to his residence; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 224. A bill to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 225. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission; and

S. 226. A bill to establish Huron Cemetery, Kansas City, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 227. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria Colavolpe Massie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 228. A bill for the relief of Miss Luisa Fernandez Perez;

S. 229. A bill for the relief of the Campbell Oil Co.;

S. 230. A bill for the relief of John C. Cadwell; and

S. 231. A bill for the relief of James W. Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 232. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for recomputation of annuities where persons otherwise eligible to receive survivor annuities predecease the annuitants;

S. 233. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to eliminate the provisions requiring termination of annuities of surviving widows or widowers upon remarriage;

S. 234. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families;

S. 235. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birthday of Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick; and

S. 236. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 237. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide an additional 150 miles of highway in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Antonio Catazariti;

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Julius Byula Ferenczy and his wife, Shara Ferenczy;

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Dr. Presentacion Medina Foronda;

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Anna Gerodimos;

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim;

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Kalliope Kostides;

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Charles Chung Chi Lee and Julia Lee;

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Athanasia Nikolopoulos and Soterios Kikolopoulos;

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Olga Milanovitch;

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Susan Targett Sexton;

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Violet Shina; and

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Eleni Euthimos Svolos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 250. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 251. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 252. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 253. A bill to authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved; to permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 254. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 255. A bill to provide for the reduction over a 3-year period of the excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 256. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 257. A bill to modify the reduction in group life insurance of retired employees who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer for each dependent son or daughter under the age of 23 who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 259. A bill with respect to the proof of value necessary in the case of certain mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955; and

S. 260. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 261. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 262. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 263. A bill for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra; and

S. 264. A bill for the relief of Marko Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 265. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 266. A bill for the relief of Wong Chuck Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 267. A bill to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 268. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional personal exemption for a taxpayer or a spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 270. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Dreyspring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 271 A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families;

S. 272. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended; and

S. 273. A bill to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 274. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Hartwell Dam project, South Carolina and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

S. 275. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Clarks Hill Dam and Reservoir project, South Carolina, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; and

S. 276. A bill to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 277. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport passengers between the United States and Puerto Rico to attend the seventh assembly of the World Convention of Churches of Christ; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 278. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to provide for reductions in aid to countries in which property of the United States is damaged or destroyed by mob action; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Christenson and Patricia Christenson;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Jack L. Curtis; and

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Shek Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 282. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. McGEE):

S. 283. A bill to amend section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Ilias Stilianidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 285. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 286. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers, and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

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

S. 287. A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 288. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents; and

S. 289. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S. 290. A bill to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases; and

S. 291. A bill to effectuate the provision of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 292. A bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; and

S. 293. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 294. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 295. A bill to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. HOLLAND):

S.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the budget and the economic report; considered and passed, without amendment.

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

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

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to designate the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets SW., as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize the distribution in the United States of the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCGEE:

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; and

S.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to determine the susceptibility of minerals to electrometallurgical processes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. MORTON, Mr. FONG, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. PROUTY):

S.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT):

S.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct a memorial to James Madison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MILLER:

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to vacancies in the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am honored today to make a speech on the Reorganization Act which I hope will become the Reorganization Act of 1965. I am especially honored that my distinguished, fine, and brilliant young junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is presiding for the first time over the Senate, as I introduce legislation, which I think will in the passage of time become one of the most important acts of the present Congress. The junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is the first of this year's Senate class to act as Presiding

Officer and, other than the President pro tempore and the Acting President pro tempore, is the first Senator to occupy the chair this session.

Oklahoma is very proud of the record of the present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Oklahoma. Mr. HARRIS not only adds to our backlog of Phi Beta Kappa representatives from the State of Oklahoma in the Senate, but he also is a member of the Order of Coif, which is, of course, comparable to the Phi Beta Kappa, in the law school. It is an honor to have him preside at the time when I make my first speech this session. I know that the junior Senator from Oklahoma will be of great assistance in resolving the many difficulties and troublesome issues which will be before this Congress.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table until January 8 in order to permit other Members who may wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the table as requested by the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, submitted by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than 120 days after the effective date of this concurrent resolution. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to announce that 47 Members of the Senate have indicated a desire to be listed as cosponsors. I am deeply grateful for this support. These Senators are: Senator PROXMIRE, Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator MOSS, Senator EDWARD LONG of Missouri, Senator HARRIS, Senator SMITH, Senator BARTLETT, Senator MCCLELLAN, Senator NEUBERGER, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator RIBICOFF, Senator METCALF, Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator SMATHERS, Senator STEPHEN YOUNG of Ohio, Senator MORSE, Senator MCINTYRE, Senator PEARSON, Senator BENNETT, Senator GRUENING, Senator BOGGS, Senator MORTON, Senator MUSKIE, Senator DOMINICK, Senator MILLER, Senator MCGOVERN, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator BIBLE, Senator NELSON, Senator THURMOND, Senator MUNDT, Senator HARTKE, Senator MCGEE, Senator BAYH, Senator BURDICK, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Senator TYDINGS, Senator CHURCH, Senator HART, Senator KUCHEL, Senator HRUSKA, Senator FONG, Senator SCOTT, Senator BREWSTER, Senator CURTIS, Senator ALLOTT, and Senator PELL.

Mr. President, I hope other Senators who wish to sponsor this resolution creating the bipartisan commission will add their names to it by January 8.

I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The resolution would carry with it the designation of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. Could it continue to have that designation, if it should lie on the table for additional cosponsorship until January 8?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can be done.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Chair.

In respect to the letter I wrote to each Member of the Senate, enclosing a copy of the resolution, 47 Senators have indicated a desire to be cosponsors. I am greatly heartened by the support for this resolution.

The resolution provides for a committee composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House appointed by the Speaker. Not more than three Members from each House could be of the majority party. The committee would be directed to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress and to submit recommendations designed to strengthen and streamline congressional procedures and operations with a view toward improving the relationship of Congress with the other branches of our tripartite National Government. Constitutional responsibilities of the Congress will thus be maintained in an improved manner.

As I have previously stated, this resolution is almost identical to the concurrent resolution sponsored by the late Senator La Follette and myself which was passed by the Congress in 1945. The differences are of a technical nature and relate to expenses of the committee and limitations on staff and stenographic help. The joint committee established in 1945 made recommendations which were the basis for the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—which was the first major reorganization of Congress in 60 years. Now that 20 years have passed, the Congress is again in need of major reorganization.

Congress has always been, and I hope Congress always will be, an institution capable of adapting to new conditions and new needs. The work of Congress changes as the world changes. To a major degree, the responsibilities of the Members of the Congress have become far more complex as our society and our economic system have increased in complexity. In this era of fantastic technological and engineering advancement Congress must deal with myriad problems and matters as diverse as the elements that go into the makeup of our civilization and social order.

Without hesitation we now must delve into the difficulties associated with the great adventures of our time, discussing lunar landings and fly-bys past Mars and supersonic airplanes that will span the Atlantic in 2½ hours. We must appropriate billions upon billions for missiles with intercontinental ranges and for hundreds of other terribly important defense and security items. Yet Congress maintains, and must always maintain, the beautiful and orderly traditions, precedents and procedures that are the heritage of the legislative branch

from the great days of Webster and Calhoun and other illustrious leaders of the past.

This proposed study of various means of renovating and updating our congressional operating techniques need not do violence or damage of the slightest kind to either the traditions or the more efficient aspects of the Congress. We revere the traditions such as the snuff-boxes there in the front of the Chamber. These nice but uncomfortable chairs, these old-fashioned but charming mahogany desks, the blotting sand and the archaic inkwells—these are great traditions and they do not detract to the slightest degree from the diligent pursuit of our duties.

However, there are other aspects of the Congress not so charming and not so visible as its furnishings and decor. Some of these traditions now interfere with our work to a degree that they should be examined at length.

Certainly the American people expect the Congress to improve its performance. Many citizens are convinced that there are better ways to handle, or perhaps even to balance, the $100 billion budget through modern accounting and computer techniques.

Many citizens wonder why the Congress, with so much on its agenda, continues to hold a Tuesday to Thursday schedule most weeks. Thousands upon thousands of Capitol visitors have been puzzled when they visit the galleries expecting to hear a debate on a tax bill that has been publicized widely throughout the land, but instead find one or two lonely Members on the floor of this Chamber discussing something entirely different—say, perhaps, an amendment to the fishing laws for the District of Columbia. We who serve in Congress have always found ourselves to be consistent targets for jokesters and cartoonists. The lampoonings and caricatures, however, are beginning to wear thin. There is a strident and persistent demand for improved congressional practices.

I need not remind any of my colleagues that the problems of 1965 are far different from the problems of 1955 or 1945 or 1925 or 1905. There was a time when Congress would ordinarily meet for only 3 or 4 months each year. It would take up a few bills, some about tariffs, some about rivers and harbors, maybe passing legislation to build a few new post offices, and then adjourn for 9 months.

Our workload in this era defies simple description. The Congress must be responsible for policies affecting virtually every facet of human affairs. This is a big country and it is growing. Its problems have grown larger as it has expanded to become the leader of the free world. We cannot expect our problems to grow any easier or our solutions to be less difficult to arrive at. Congress must be prepared for the responsibilities ahead. As the Nation grows in strength and security, so must Congress prove stronger and more efficient as a bulwark of our national system.

I hardly need remind you also that the 100 Senators with staff assistants and the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and their assistants total fewer than the number required to run the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The cost of operating the entire Congress, $89 million—Members' and staff assistants' salaries and other associated expenses, exclusive of building costs—totals less than the cost of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, $110 million.

Yet, Congress is expected to hold up its share of the responsibility in our tripartite system of government. It must hold hearings and allocate the funds for all 2,300 departments, agencies, offices, and bureaus of government, containing nearly two and a half million employees. It must by law raise the necessary taxes to meet these costs, plus the tens of billions needed for global defense and the exploration of space. It must be as expert as possible on whether our Gemini or Apollo capsules can compare with their Russian counterparts.

It must provide for trade policies that will build up our exports, yet guard against tariffs so low that they destroy domestic markets. It must maintain a balance of payments favorable to the United States, but at the same time permit huge expenditures, both public and private, in dozens of foreign countries.

Proposals dealing with the taxes, trade, transportation, and health of our 190 million Americans account for a large proportion of bills. But on top of this duty is the enormous problem of passing on appropriations bills to allocate funds for all the Government agencies and installations. With the budget now ranging toward $100 billion, this job alone is enough to consume nearly half the time of the Congress, if we are to justify every item and ask all the questions that might reveal any waste or extravagance.

Only through specialization can Members of Congress qualify as experts in any single field of governmental activity. Yet every Member of Congress, regardless of whether he has undertaken a specialty or not, has to assume responsibility in connection with the entire gamut of Federal problems, domestic and international. This across-the-board responsibility sometimes gives the executive branch an advantage, for most of our people in the various executive departments work only in limited and specialized fields. Their programs and plans take form usually after long intra-agency conferences and considerations. By contrast, the work of the Congress, from the beginning of hearings on a bill until its final passage, is done in a goldfish bowl under the glare of worldwide news media coverage. When a department or agency miscues, it often can make quiet corrections behind the scenes. But when Congress makes a boo-boo, it is on the 6 o'clock news and the front pages everywhere.

When Senator Robert M. La Follette and I started to work on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, we thought that the capacity of the Congress then had been stretched to the limit. Coming out of World War II, we had little idea that the workload, which then seemed enormous, would continue to grow with each new year.

Twenty years ago, about the time the first Reorganization Act was being launched, the Congress received 6,539 bills. This was in the 1st session of the 78th Congress.

Ten years later, in 1953, the 1st session of the 83d Congress received 10,695 bills, and, in 1959, in the 1st session of the 86th, it received a total of 13,847 bills in both Houses. In the 1st session of the 88th a total of 14,168 bills were introduced.

I am reciting these figures as proof that Congress needs to remodel its legislative machinery, with proper procedures for committee action and floor debate, to do a better job on the mammoth problems that are thrust upon it for settlement each year. These are the problems that require days and sometimes weeks of study to be sure that the jokers and mistakes are discovered and eliminated before a new law is passed.

There are many ways in which Congress could improve its machinery—some involving major changes, others of a minor nature. The proposed joint committee could take testimony on these suggested changes and make recommendations to the Congress. The areas of major importance, in my opinion, which require immediate attention are:

First. Congressional procedure for dealing with the Federal budget.

Second. Committee operation.

Third. Earlier adjournment or specified recess periods.

Fourth. Reducing the individual Member's caseload.

In addition to these major changes, there are many minor changes which could be made to strengthen Congress and simplify its operation. Among them are:

First. Hiring an architect for the Capitol who is really a distinguished architect in his own right—someone with great talent and imagination.

Second. Hiring a construction manager to oversee all construction work on Capitol Hill or calling upon the services of the Corps of Engineers or the GSA's building department.

Third. Hiring a business manager who would be responsible for the operations of all Capitol buildings and would keep them as clean as the capitol buildings in many of the smaller nations as a result of diligent housekeeping work.

Fourth. Putting the Capitol guides under civil service—and with retirement for their accumulated service.

This, perhaps, is the only capitol in the world where the people—who pay the expenses of running the government—are charged a 25-cent fee for the privilege of viewing the operation of the people's branch of the Government, which is the Congress.

All of these things—both major and minor—should be considered by a joint committee of the Congress.

The greatest problem the Congress has is dealing annually with a Federal budget of $100 billion. Congress does not have the proper tools to do the job.

Today, the Appropriations Committees and their staffs wrestle with a task that is impossible with our present machinery. We are literally attempting to run a business 10 times as large as A.T. & T., the Santa Fe Railroad, and General

Motors combined, with machinery as obsolete as a quill pen, a slanting bookkeeper's desk and an old-fashioned high stool.

There are ways in which automatic data processing could be brought in to serve as an invaluable aid in assembling, comparing, and consolidating Government expenditure figures, bringing them in line with good management practices. I am not an auditor, but I am sure we would find the talent to give such modernization and automation a good try. Hundreds of thousands of accounts must be examined. The magnitude of the task by the old method of oral testimony is beyond the capacity of the human mind to absorb the hundreds of thousands of words that are taken down in shorthand and transcribed at all these various hearings.

The primary function of the Congress is still the exercise of power of the purse. I repeat, the powers of the purse rest only in the Congress.

If we use this power well, we can and will be able to control the size of Government, its activities, and the number of people who find their way on or off the payroll. This is the major responsibility given to the Congress by the Constitution. We dare not fail in this assignment.

In addition to seeking ways to improve accounting machinery through automation, many good, bad, and mediocre suggestions have been made along many lines. They should be studied carefully. Only such a study can separate the good suggestions from the bad.

First. Establish a joint committee on the budget, composed of both House and Senate Members and a joint staff of experts. They could advise and assist the regular Appropriations Committees in fixing the funding levels of Government agencies.

Second. Prepare a legislative budget. This was provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but it was never carried out. It would empower the Congress to set a ceiling for its total appropriations at the outset of each session in order to fit the separate bills into the overall plan and into a balanced budget.

Third. Consolidate our present 13 separate appropriations bills into a single annual consolidated general appropriation act, carrying funds for all Government departments.

This was tried once in the fifties and was abandoned, I believe, after one session.

Fourth. Divide appropriation bill responsibility between House and Senate. Each House would originate half the bills, thus avoiding delay in passage until late in the session each year. This perhaps would be another controversial suggestion, but it is offered only as another suggestion that may be available for study.

Fifth. Establish in the Bureau of the Budget a special personnel section, whose principal duty would be to screen minutely—I repeat, screen minutely—requests for additional Federal employees. They should also plan for better utilization of existing Government workers.

Sixth. Provide for a separate session each year to consider only the appropriation bills.

Seventh. Extend appropriation bills to cover 2-year periods so that Congress could concentrate on legislation in one session and appropriations in the next, with provisions for emergencies.

Eighth. Require all legislative bills to authorize new expenditures to be accompanied by a report specifying the annual cost of such program.

Ninth. Amend House rules to restrict back-door spending.

Tenth. Limit the use of supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills to emergency needs.

Eleventh. Require a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriation bills.

I again emphasize that these are only a few of the many proposals that may be suggested and considered carefully at the hearings.

Certainly the passage of appropriation bills before the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1 would encourage better management of Government departments. With the public closely aware of the congressional duty to control the expenditures of Government, the failure properly to exercise this most important function has brought heavy criticism upon the Congress.

At fault, primarily, are the systems used to control expenditures. The staff members for the appropriations committees of both Houses are of highest caliber and experience. But no matter how skilled or experienced any staff member is—or any Congressman or Senator for that matter—he is unable to get on top of and know every item in an appropriation bill totaling $50 billions of dollars, or in the case of other than defense appropriations, ranging downward from that figure to amounts ranging from $5 to $10 billion.

An improvement in systems, with data processing and other accounting aids, plus the addition of auditors to simplify the budget and to reveal clearly the expenditures provided by the bills, is long overdue. A few dollars spent for added staff and added organization of the budget requests into clearly understandable accounts would pay off 100 times its cost.

Under such a system, if it can be worked out, we can quickly identify the peaks and valleys of costs, and place individual responsibility for high costs on the administrators of such departments. Today we have no comparative analysis whatsoever. The administrative spenders and the administrative savers all look alike in today's appropriation system.

The level of appropriations and the care with which funds are granted influence the quality of government as much as any regulatory laws that are passed. Reform in this field would bring great credit upon the Congress.

Another area where great improvement could be made is in committee operations. The committees are the heart and key to any improvement in congressional machinery. As the committee work is improved, the speed and efficiency of handling legislation will be greatly accelerated. The holdup of our legislative program last session in the Senate, and I suspect in the House, was often caused by logjams in the committees. Until the bills are reported to the House or Senate by the standing committees, they cannot be considered on the floor.

The key point in the passage of all legislation is at the committee level. Ninety-five percent of the bills approved by committees are passed by the House or Senate, and the committee versions generally remain 95 percent unchanged. No bill is likely to pass unless it has committee approval. Therefore, the quality of committee work and the expedition of its business are of primary importance to the legislative process.

This importance is recognized in the great variety of proposals for improving committee procedures. Two proposals were adopted by the Senate in the last Congress—one to permit committees to sit during the morning hour and the other establishing a rule of germaneness. Both are helpful in speeding up the handling of bills.

Other proposals among many for improving the committee system that may be studied include:

First. The selection of committee chairmen by secret ballot rather than by the rules of seniority. A few hazards of the present system are evident. Those Senators who can continue to be reelected move inexorably toward the chairmanship, where they can prevent or at least delay consideration of major legislation referred to their committees, regardless of the overwhelming national interest. Yet most of the substitutes, including the proposed selection by secret ballot, have their own hazards, and can split the committee members into splinters of special interest. Perhaps some plan or compromise that would retain the rule of seniority but limit the chairman's term, perhaps by years. At the end of his term the chairmanship could be passed along to the next senior member. I have seen the suggestion that the chairmanship should be limited by age—65 or 70. Certainly care should be taken so only future chairmen would be affected by such suggestions.

Second. Permit a majority of a committee to convene meetings, consider matters within their jurisdiction, and end debate by moving the previous question; in other words, bring the matter to a vote. This is another way of limiting the power of the chairman.

Third. Changing the method of assigning Members to committees. The majority members of the Ways and Means Committee perform this task in the House and seem to meet with little criticism. In the Senate, however, the party steering committees make the decisions, and our system is under heavy attack.

These first three proposals shouuld be studied and thoughtfully considered, although their attainment would be difficult since they are so loaded with political controversy.

Turning to the more attainable, we should perhaps consider:

First. Realining some of the committee jurisdictions to achieve a better balanced workload.

Second. Limiting as near as possible House Members to one major committee,

and Senate Members to two major committees.

Third. Providing more time for committee hearings early in the session.

The convening of certain committees, say on December 1, to hold hearings and be ready to report proposed legislation when the Senate and the House are organized on January 3 or 4 would certainly start us off to work when we are bright-eyed and full of vim and vigor, instead of getting underway on the legislative program about March 1 or 15.

Fourth. Providing more staff specialists for committees dealing with technical matters—military, space, medical research.

Fifth. Establishing more careful rules for the conduct of committee investigations.

In a representative form of government, it is extremely important that elected representatives have firsthand knowledge of the views and desires of their constituencies. Under our tripartite system the Congress is the only truly representative branch of government. Its Members are the only officials whom the people can get close to. Members of Congress must be able to spend a considerable amount of time in their districts and States.

Because of increased workload and national crises it has been impossible for Members of Congress to spend much time outside Washington in the past two or three Congresses. But a lot of the blame must fall on the Congress itself and not on the workload or national crises.

Congress could save at least 2 months time if it would get busy at the start of the session when the Members are full of fire and bright-eyed. As Senators well know, we often spin our wheels from the beginning of Congress until about March 1, waiting for committees to have hearings and report bills.

Perhaps committees could be recalled, with travel provided, to meet from about December 1 to December 20. That way we would have bills ready for the Senate and House calendars for floor action immediately after the President's state of the Union address. Under our present system, usually the Lincoln Day recess forestalls any floor action until about March 1.

We could save a lot of time if we abandoned the 3-day, Tuesday-to-Thursday workweek and went on a 5-day, Monday-to-Friday workweek. We could break this up by scheduling one long weekend a month.

We have to abandon the practice of avoiding rollcalls and delaying action on bills because too many Members are out of town during the week giving speeches. We must make the committee chairman responsible for the bills reported out of his committee and require that he be on hand whenever the leadership deems it advisable to call up his bills.

We must permit our committees to sit while the Senate is in session. One Member should not be able to block all committees from meeting. Because of a misinterpretation of the act of 1946 this situation prevails today. We need to clarify this rule so that our committees can operate efficiently and with greater dispatch.

This proposed study of congressional operations must examine the nonlegislative workload of the Members. I believe it has grown tenfold during my years in the House and Senate. In 1939, one secretary could easily handle the task of correspondence and the departmental problems of constituents. Today most Congressmen have 6 or more secretaries and Senators average between 10 and 20.

While legislators should concentrate on their lawmaking duties, I would estimate that most senatorial staffs devote 75 percent of their time and energy to the errands, problems, and inquiries from constituents or from their States' public agencies. These include veterans' problems, public works programs, farm crop quota adjustments, and a thousand and one other problems that seem to get lost or pigeonholed in Washington, and for which help is asked of Members of Congress.

We have given ourselves an ever-increasing number of assistants, but the workload grows faster than the staff. The administrative assistant, recommended in the Reorganization Act of 1946, has helped materially; but he and other staff aids have been unable to take over the complete staff workload. Much of it still rests upon the Congressman or the Senator.

In an effort to make sure that the primary legislative task is performed effectively and not buried by this other service to the State, 66 Senators have already appointed legislative assistants, many equal in authority and salary to the administrative assistant. Yet, unlike the position of administrative assistant, legislative assistants as such are not authorized by statute or Senate rule, and no extra salary funds are available for the position. It is time to recognize this need for specialized service in the legislative area.

Many other suggestions have been made to lighten the congressional workload. These are worthy of the joint committee's study. Among them are suggestions to:

First. Provide for elective officials and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Second. Remove the authority of Congressmen and Senators to appoint postmasters and candidates for the military academies.

Third. Turn over for executive determination the settlement of certain immigration and claims bills.

Fourth. Provide advisory committees of scientists to assist Congress on a part-time basis.

Fifth. Create a high-level commission for the continuous study of differences between the two Houses, and the adjustment of them when they occur.

Sixth. Provide for Senate and House leadership conferences to work out a schedule of hearings, markup, and floor action on important administrations bills as well as others.

Let me emphasize at this point an outstanding provision of this resolution. This is the proviso which would prohibit the committee from making any recommendation with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices and/or precedents of either House or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. This same proviso was included in the resolution that created the joint committee of 1945. Each House must be responsible for its own rules, and neither desires to be involved in any way in determining the rules of the other. But this joint committee would be free to hear testimony on matters relating to rules and procedure without invading the prerogatives and responsibilities of the separate Houses insofar as rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, precedents, and floor procedures are concerned.

I hope that those Members who have not yet had a chance to study this very brief resolution will do so in time to meet the January 8 deadline for cosponsorship. This is a practical and realistic approach to our congressional organizational needs of 1965, just as it was in 1945. Many other approaches have been tried and have been found wanting during the past 20 years. Many, many hours of hard work will be required in order to gain the objectives sought by this resolution, but they are objectives worthy of the effort. Let us proceed now to make 1965 a banner year for the legislative branch, exceeding the very worthy achievements of 1964 and other past years.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the progress of all mankind toward a brighter world hinges to a major degree on how well we in the Congress perform our assigned duties as servants of a free and well-motivated people. The reforms that will become self-evident in the course of a congressional reorganization study can contribute materially to the further growth and development of our democratic institutions that light the way for all men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield. I appreciate the cosponsorship of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma on his presentation of this concurrent resolution. It is not only a source of pride for me to be a cosponsor of the resolution on the basis of its substantive value, but also a great privilege to be a cosponsor under the leadership of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

I have said, out of his presence, on many platforms of America that I think the LaFollette-Monroney Act, with the reforms that it brought about, is probably the greatest piece of procedural legislation that has been enacted by Congress in my time. I am sure that the legislative results of the concurrent resolution that the Senator from Oklahoma has just submitted will far surpass in effectiveness the pace-setting program known as the LaFollette-Monroney Act. All America should be indebted to the Senator from Oklahoma for submitting the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am deeply appreciative of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon,

who has always been one of our most thoughtful students and advisers on legislation, and who, like the senior Senator from Oklahoma, has insisted on maintaining in our system of government the constitutional place that the Founding Fathers established for the legislative branch. The Constitution provides that the membership of Congress may be changed only by a vote of the people. Even a few thousand or a few hundred votes can change the representation of the Members of the House. We have seen Senate races in many States turn on as low as 200 or 300 votes. It is the right of the people to change the membership of their Congress for any good reason, for any bad reason, or for no reason at all. This is democracy at its best. Democracy, under the congressional or parliamentary system, has survived longer in history than any other form of government. Its development has been indigenous to this country. It has been copied somewhat from parliaments but has been changed to some degree. We look upon it as a kind of compromise. Although it has been changed through the years, we can properly claim to have the longest established system of government in continuous operation.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his compliment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has been almost 20 years since the Congress has acted upon a concurrent resolution authorizing a full study of congressional organization by a joint committee. The recommendations of the joint committee convened in 1945 led to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which has by and large proved to be successful.

I believe that it is once again time that Congress authorize a joint committee to take a long and objective look into the matter of congressional organization, free of any predetermined bias toward any particular matter. I am sure that there will be many suggestions made to such a joint committee by Members of Congress themselves as we all have some ideas of our own in this area. I am sure that we would all welcome such a study, but each of us must reserve our rights concerning any recommendations which might be made. The joint committee is empowered to recommend, but it will then be up to Congress as a whole to implement these recommendations. At that time, each individual Member of Congress will be able to determine for himself the feasibility and desirability of implementing any particular recommendation. With this caveat, it is a pleasure for me to cosponsor the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATIVE TO ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mrs. SMITH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 132. (a) Effective with the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress, in each even-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 15, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 15 in that year, or the following Monday if November 15 falls on Saturday or Sunday; and in each odd-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 1, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 1 in that year, or the following Monday if November 1 falls on Saturday or Sunday.

"(b) The consent of the respective Houses is hereby given to an adjournment of the other for the period specified in subsection (a)."

DISTRIBUTION OF FILM ENTITLED "JOHN F. KENNEDY—YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, several weeks ago I was privileged to attend, along with other Members of Congress and public and governmental officials, a special premiere showing of a new memorial film on the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy.

The movie, entitled "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," was produced by the U.S. Information Agency for distribution overseas. The documentary has recently been released by USIA for distribution in more than 30 languages to some 114 foreign countries all over the world. From the outset, worldwide reaction to this brilliant film has been most favorable.

Under existing law the U.S. Information Agency does not have the authority to exhibit its films in the United States. All of its appropriations, including those which paid for the memorial film's preparation, are intended strictly for use overseas. These prohibitions are designed in part to prevent the party in power from glorifying itself at Government expense. Because of them, the film cannot be shown in this country without a special congressional authorization.

There is, however, no partisanship in the Kennedy film. It is a drama that grows out of the life of the American people. I am, therefore, introducing for myself and Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CHURCH, COOPER, DOUGLAS, ERVIN, GRUENING, HARRIS, HOLLAND, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCINTYRE, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, NELSON, PASTORE, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SMATHERS, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH, a concurrent resolution which will make it possible for every American to see this stirring and thought-provoking new film. A clear expression of congressional intent from both Houses of the Congress will secure domestic release of the film.

The resolution which I am introducing exempts the movie from the existing ban on domestic use of USIA products. It expresses the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Information Agency should arrange to make the memorial film available for viewing within the United States. Distribution would be through both educational and commercial media. I am hopeful that educational and nonprofit organizations, as well as commercial movie theaters, will arrange showings of the film. The broad wording of the resolution is intended to cover such possibilities as television release for the film and recordings which might be made from the film's sound track.

The resolution further expresses the sense of the Congress that any proceeds collected by the media showing the film should be contributed to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C. This is not a mandatory requirement, but I can think of no more appropriate way to aid the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts than to have the media and organizations which show this exceptional memorial film donate any proceeds received to the Center. In this way, we will be further enriching the culture of generations to come.

"Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," a full-length, hour-and-a-half film, is a personal and historical review of our late President and his 2 years and 10 months in the White House. It met with the unanimous praise of the distinguished film critics who attended the premiere showing. Bosley Crowther, noted drama critic of the New York Times, described it as "a superior documentary that articulately and artfully combines a comprehension of the basic aims of the murdered President and an eloquent elegy for him."

Richard Coe, drama critic for the Washington Post, said:

> This masterfully imaginative hour-and-a-half length documentary is the first full-length feature and by all odds the finest film I've seen by the U.S. Information Agency * * * USIA's major contribution * * * is its foresight to end our year of mourning with the affirmation that those who say yes to life are its heroes. The nay-sayers drift away with the wind.

I personally found the color superb, the narration of Gregory Peck rich and forceful, and the musical score by Bruce Herschenson excellent.

President Kennedy's life is a continuing inspiration to Americans all across our land. It would be unfortunate if our citizens were to be denied the opportunity of viewing this dramatic story of his brief years in the White House. It is a message of inspiration directed to all peoples of the world, perhaps especially to the American people. It is a part of the history of our Nation which every American citizen is entitled to share.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD and that it lie on the table for 5 legislative days for the benefit of any additional Senators who may wish to join in cosponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is a continuing inspiration to American citizens all across our land; and

Whereas the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" is a part of the history of our Nation which every American citizen is entitled to share: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) The people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums";

(2) The United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make such film available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States; and

(3) Any proceeds collected by such media should be contributed to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, District of Columbia.

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MORTON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which, under the rule, was ordered to lie over 1 day, as follows:

S. RES. 6

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifth of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 7); which, under the rule, was ordered to lie over for 1 day:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That S. Res. 262, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States), is hereby amended on page 3, line 8, by striking out "$512,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$540,500.00".

SEC. 2. S. Res. 266, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964, to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, is hereby amended on page 2, line 15, by striking out "$135,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$145,000.00".

SEC. 3. S. Res. 274, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency), is hereby amended on page 3, line 2, by striking out "$188,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$211,000.00".

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and in accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States and the advisory rulings of the Chair that were rendered at the opening of the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses, I send to the desk a resolution. I ask that it not be read, but that it be printed.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 8) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section 3 as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this section, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays, legal holidays, and nonsession days) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea and nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter, debate upon the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions with respect thereto, shall be limited in all to not more than 100 hours, of which 50 hours will be controlled by the majority leader, and 50 hours will be controlled by the minority leader. The majority and minority leaders will divide equally the time allocated among those Senators favoring and those Senators opposing the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and the motions affecting the same; provided, however, that any Senator so requesting shall be allocated a minimum total of one hour. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time. The above provisions for time in this paragraph are minimum guarantees and the motion to bring the debate to a close may specify additional time for debate. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"*Resolved, further*, That section 3 of the Standing Rules of the Senate be redesignated as section 4."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The resolution would amend rule XXII of the rules of the Senate, by providing for cloture under certain conditions by a majority vote.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Inasmuch as objection has been entered, I send to the desk notice of motion to amend certain rules of the Senate. I do not ask that it be read, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

There being no objection, the notice of motion to amend certain rules of the Senate was ordered printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CERTAIN SENATE RULES

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following particulars, namely:

Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section 3 as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this section, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays, legal holidays, and nonsession days) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea and nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter, debate upon the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions with respect thereto, shall be limited in all to not more than 100 hours, of which 50 hours will be controlled by the majority leader, and 50 hours will be controlled by the minority leader. The majority and minority leaders will divide equally the time allocated among those Senators favoring and those Senators opposing the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and the motions affecting the same: *Provided, however,* That any Senator so requesting shall be allocated a minimum total of one hour. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time. The above provisions for time in this paragraph are minimum guarantees and the motion to bring the debate to a close may specify additional time for debate. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 3. Redesignate section 3 of the Standing Rules of the Senate as section 4."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is:

To provide for bringing debate to a close by a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn after full and fair discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for his submission of his proposed change in rule XXII, which provides for a three-fifths vote on cloture.

In no sense are we rivals in this matter. I congratulate the Senator on his action. I hope that if the majority-rule provision is not adopted by the Senate that the three-fifths provision will be adopted.

ORDER FOR THE PRINTING OF OFFICIAL COPIES OF BOOKLET "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 9), as follows:

S. RES. 9

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate fourteen thousand additional copies of House Document numbered 103 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session, entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", compiled by Charles J. Zinn, S.J.D., Law Revision Counsel, House Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 9) was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12); which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1966.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $213,000 from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1966.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY OF MATTERS RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $133,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for myself, Mr. GORE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to increase social security cash benefits and to make other needed improvements in the social security program. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk for 3 days so that Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill will lie at the table for 3 days, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I feel certain that historians will mark this year as the turning point in our long struggle to solve the major part of what has become one of the most urgent issues of public policy—the problem of financing the costs of hospital care for the aged, costs which now represent the major remaining cause of personal financial disaster among our aged citizens. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate that my bill is designed S. 1, for as one of the major pieces of unfinished business of the previous Congress, social security hospital insurance has moved to the forefront of public policy debate, and has unquestionably become a major legislative item on the agenda of this Congress.

As Senators will immediately recognize, the bill I have introduced is substantially the same bill which the Senate passed last September 2, by a vote of 49 to 44. I am again proposing the social insurance approach because the need of the aged for adequate insurance protection against the costs of expensive illness has not diminished; if anything, the need grows greater and more urgent with each passing day. As the proportion of the aged in the population continues to rise, the problem increases in dimension and the plight of our aged citizens becomes increasingly a humiliation for our society.

Every month that we delay in providing the needed protection means that more and more elderly persons will be forced to look to public welfare programs for help in getting the health care they need. Such programs necessarily do little to relieve indigency because they help older people meet their health care costs only after they have used up most of the financial resources they may have, and sometimes only after their children have demonstrated that they cannot help further. The tragedy is not just that the older person must sacrifice his pride and prove he can no longer pay his own way. The real tragedy is the hopelessness of his situation, for once an aged person has exhausted his resources to the point where he can qualify for assistance, it is practically impossible for him to replenish them and again become self-reliant.

Nostalgic statements about the virtues of individual responsibility for all of one's needs, about the rewards and joys of old age are no substitutes for concrete facts and reasoned programs. For those aged Americans who must face the harsh reality that they may well be reduced to a state of destitution as a result of a prolonged illness—which experience demonstrates that most aged people can expect to occur—benign assurances of those who urge greater thrift or sole reliance on public assistance and those who tell us private insurance alone can do the job, have a hollow ring.

The problem which confronts our senior citizens requires little further documentation—this problem has probably attracted more public attention and intensive study than any other current domestic issue. Since 1946, the average cost for 1 day of hospital care has risen from $9 to nearly $40. This situation is compounded by the fact that the aged hospital patient, on the average, spends three times as long in the hospital as a younger person. To make things worse, 55 percent of these aged have annual incomes of less than $1,000.

In their working years, when sickness is less frequent, workers can generally meet costs of current care for themselves and their families—directly or through insurance—out of their current employment income. The aged, however, generally cannot do this because the higher costs associated with old age occur at the very time income is greatly reduced because of retirement.

Private health insurance, which has made large health costs manageable for people in the working groups, has not proved to be an effective means of protecting older people against financial ruin. Despite great efforts and much ingenuity on the part of the voluntary insurance organizations, today only a

relatively few older people—perhaps 1 in 20—have insurance covering as much as 40 percent of their average health costs. Almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all—not even inadequate coverage. The number of older people without any health insurance protection at all is nearly as large as it was 5 years ago.

Most of the aged who now have some form of health insurance are those who are still working, those in good health, and those in the higher income group. Thus, it is extremely unlikely that many of the elderly people who are not now insured will ever have meaningful health insurance protection through private sources.

While the much higher hospital costs of older people as compared with younger people is the major reason why hospital insurance rates are higher for the aged, the cost of such insurance is further increased for most older people because of the high cost of selling and administering insurance on an individual basis. The result is that an individually written policy for the aged may cost four times as much as comparable protection furnished under a group coverage plan to younger people.

The conclusion appears inescapable. The only solution is to provide a system under which people can contribute from earnings during their working years to help pay for hospital care and related services that will be needed later on when the risk is higher and income curtailed. The only way such a system can be set up to guarantee that practically everyone will have hospital insurance protection in old age is by applying the social insurance method. This is the system that has proved its effectiveness over 3 decades of the social security retirement program.

Mr. President, this week the Advisory Council on Social Security, a distinguished group of business, labor and professional leaders, including a former member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet and a former high official in that Republican administration, recommended a Government program of hospital and hospital-related-care insurance.

I am in complete agreement with the Advisory Council on Social Security that social insurance should not cover all the costs of illness during old age. The American approach to income security has traditionally involved a cooperative partnership of private effort and governmental measures. Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, for example, is supplemented by employer and trade union plans, by private insurance, and by individual savings and investments, and all contribute to the common goal of personal and economic independence throughout the later years. Backing up this combination of measures for individual self-support are the Federal-State public assistance programs which aid those who have needs which are still unmet.

I believe that this same pluralistic approach can be used effectively in meeting the costs of major illness in old age. With social insurance meeting, on the average, at least half the costs associated with the most expensive illnesses—that is, meeting the costs of hospitalization—the older person will be in a much better position than he is today to meet, on his own and through private insurance, the costs of physician services, drugs, and other medical supplies and services. Also, with social insurance providing basic protection, it should be practicable to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs so as to meet more fully the health costs incurred by older people whose needs are not fully met in other ways, the Advisory Council on Social Security declared.

ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN

The hospital insurance plan embodied in my bill places primary emphasis on the coverage of hospital care. The reason for this emphasis is clear in the Advisory Council's report:

> The cost of hospitalization affects practically all older people. Of every 10 persons who reach age 65, 9 will be hospitalized at least once during their remaining years and most will be hospitalized two or more times. In the case of aged couples, the chances are about even that the husband and wife will each be hospitalized two or more times.
>
> Not only is hospitalization a virtually universal occurrence among older people but there is a high correlation between hospitalization and large total medical expenses. Older people who are hospitalized in a given year are the ones who have the big expenses. While medical care costs for all aged couples averaged about $442 in 1962, the medical expenses of aged couples with one or both members hospitalized averaged $1,220; for nonmarried elderly people, average medical expenses for the year were $270, whereas for those who were hospitalized, the average was $1,038. Both the averages and the differentials would be even higher now.

While the greater part of the benefit cost of the program would be for hospital benefits, the proposal also provides coverage for three additional types of services: First, extended care following hospital care in an institution which is equipped to provide high quality convalescent services and which has an arrangement with a hospital for a timely transfer of patients and needed medical information; second, home health care services which are furnished by qualified nurses and other specialized medical personnel under a plan established by a physician covering the use of such services; and third, hospital outpatient diagnostic services covering the full use of the hospital's facilities and personnel but not covering the diagnostic services of the patient's private physician.

A major consideration that guided the selection of services to be covered by the plan was that the program should support the principle that, in each case, health services should be tailored to the health needs of the patient. Provision for the aforementioned four types of benefits—hospital care, extended care outside the hospital, organized home nursing care, and hospital outpatient diagnostic services—would make available to the older person the kinds of services appropriate for his individual situation. The benefit structure would thus offer a continuum of institutional and home nursing services and would permit the progressive care of individuals who require extended care of a somewhat lesser degree of intensity than that provided for hospital inpatients.

Particularly for the aged, the next step in the care of a person who had been hospitalized for a serious illness may be a period of medically supervised treatment in an extended-care facility rather than the intensive care furnished to hospital inpatients. The coverage of important alternatives to hospitalization would remove some of the undesirable financial considerations from the decision, shared in by the doctor, patient, patient's family and institution, on whether inpatient hospital care or another form of care would be best for the patient. The benefits provided in the bill would give financial support to the provision of institutional and noninstitutional services at the most appropriate level of intensity for patients who require care of extended duration. Covering each of the stages of required care is conducive to careful planning of the long-range treatment of those suffering serious illnesses.

Mr. President, the hospital insurance program provided for in my bill is the culmination of years of serious study.

A great many people, including those who have had objections to one or another element of the original proposal, have made a constructive contribution to public understanding of the issues and the formulation of my bill. I have had the benefit of extensive research and study by many experts, within and without the Government. Independent groups of responsible and knowledgeable representatives of all segments of our community, like the National Committee on Health Costs of the Aged, sponsored by my colleague, Senator JAVITS, and directed by Dr. Arthur Flemming, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, have contributed greatly to the fund of knowledge from which I have drawn heavily in preparing my proposal.

Moreover, as everyone knows, my proposal has been subjected to thorough scrutiny by public and private experts in insurance, medical economics, and medical care, by committees in both the House and Senate in public hearings and executive sessions, on the floor of the Senate and in conference committee. It has been so shaped and molded in this process that it is fair to say that my bill is the product of an extended, and I believe fruitful, joint effort of scientific research, professional study, and public discussion. It is medically, socially, and financially sound. The list of sponsors and supporters shows it is bipartisan.

Mr. President, even though my proposal has now gained such widespread support that I believe its enactment this session is virtually assured, I must say that we have never ceased trying to perfect the proposal. Throughout the years of study and deliberation we have sought to preserve an open mind on all elements of the proposal, and we have welcomed constructive comments and criticisms from any source whatever. I believe that our hopes for a sound and just solution are more likely to be realized

because we have taken nothing for granted, left no stone unturned in our search for a sound and meaningful solution to the problem. The few changes which have been made in the present bill are a result of recommendations which emerged from the deliberations of the Advisory Council on Social Security and the advice of professional people whose sole interest is to improve the proposal.

The bill, as I have indicated, provides coverage for services furnished in extended care facilities. I agree with the Advisory Council on Social Security that it is necessary to assure the coverage of facilities which are designed primarily to render convalescent services. Services of this kind are essential in the overall treatment of many illnesses, including terminal illnesses, following their acute stage and prior to the time when a person can be transferred to his home or to a custodial institution. The bill also provides, as recommended by the Advisory Council, for coverage of hospital care for up to 60 days without a beneficiary option. A change has also been made in the utilization review provision to make it clear that reviews conducted by a group established by a local medical society would be acceptable as an alternative to hospital staff review.

In addition, the bill incorporates the proposal to authorize the creation of associations of private insurers to encourage the development of policies covering costs—primarily physician's fees—not met under the Government program. I have always tried to assure ample room for private complementary insurance and to provide encouragement for private insurers to assume that role. This suggestion is therefore a welcome and beneficial addition to the bill.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my statement material describing the provisions of S. 1. This will include actuarial tables showing the financial status of the social security system under my bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, our social insurance system has shown a remarkable facility for improvement. It has effectively met the successive challenges involved in the monumental task of providing Americans with protection against some of the major threats to their financial security—loss of income due to old age, death, or disability. Our social insurance system is a true product of the American temper—flexible, humane, responsive to the changing needs of our people and fiscally sound. Despite the anxieties that were expressed in the early days of social security and as improvements were proposed, the program has performed well every task assigned to it. When the disability program was initiated we took another step toward preserving individual independence and security in the face of the severest catastrophes in life. As one physician has said:

The fear of insecurity in old age today has supplanted the fear of death in 1900.

We in this Congress must take the remaining major step to relieve insecurity in old age without imposing Federal control over the practice of medicine. Providing a social security hospital insurance program for the aged is the only way that we can effectively combine the special contributions of different elements of the community, public and private, to meet this goal.

Mr. President, in addition to hospital insurance for the aged, S. 1 provides for a 7-percent increase in monthly case benefits for some 20 million social security beneficiaries. Had the conference committee reached agreement last October on hospital insurance, these beneficiaries would have received increased benefits beginning January 1, 1965. My bill provides that on passage monthly benefits would be retroactive to that date. In this way, those of us who would not accept a social security bill in conference that did not include hospital insurance and thus barred an increase in cash benefits will be keeping faith with America's aged. They will not have been financially hurt by the deadlocked conference.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

A. HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

1. Eligibles:

(a) Persons age 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits (numbering about 16⅔ million).

(b) Other persons who are age 65 and over (about 2 million) or who will reach age 65 within the next few years, but with the cost for them being paid from general revenues.

2. Benefits (payable July 1, 1966, except for extended care):

(a) Hospital inpatient services for 60 days in a benefit period, with a "deductible" of the national average cost of 1 day of care to be paid by the patient.

(b) Posthospital extended care (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for timely transfer of patients and medical information about patients) for 60 days in a benefit period. The services would be covered only in the case of transfer from a hospital. (Effective January 1, 1967.)

(c) Home health services (such as a visiting nurse) up to 240 visits a year.

(d) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services (such as X-ray and laboratory services) with a deductible for services in any one month, equal to one-half of the deductible for inpatient hospital services, to be paid by the patient.

3. Financing:

(a) A completely separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury. This trust fund would be separate from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund. An earmarked allocation from the social security contributions would be made to the separate hospital insurance fund.

(b) Allocations to the fund: Amounts equal to the following percentages of earnings would be allocated to this separate fund:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Total, employer and employee	Self-employment
1966	0.30	0.30	0.60	0.45
1967–68	.38	.38	.76	.57
1969 and after	.45	.45	.90	.675

The allocation for 1966 would enable a fund to be built up before benefits became payable. It is estimated that the fund would be about $600 million as of July 1, 1966.

(c) Actuarial status of the fund: The allocation of contributions provided in the bill have been determined by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration to be sufficient to cover all the costs of the benefits (and administration) for persons entitled to social security benefits. The actuarial estimates are based on the assumptions recommended by the Advisory Council on Social Security that hospital costs will continue to rise faster than earnings for the next 10 years.

(d) Illustrative costs: The amount allocated during 1967–68 and during 1969 and later years for hospital insurance—0.38 of 1 percent and 0.45 of 1 percent, respectively, on the employee—amounts to the following for employees earning the annual amounts shown:

Annual earnings	Hospital insurance cost (1967–68)			Hospital insurance cost (1969 and after)		
	Weekly	Monthly	Annually	Weekly	Monthly	Annually
$4,000	$0.29	$1.27	$15.20	$0.35	$1.50	$18.00
$4,800	.35	1.52	18.24	.42	1.80	21.60
$5,000	.37	1.58	19.00	.43	1.88	22.50
$5,600	.41	1.77	21.28	.48	2.10	25.20

4. Administration: By the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the social security program. Hospitals could elect to be represented by a private organization (such as Blue Cross) to negotiate their contracts. The Secretary could also delegate to such organization the functions of receiving payments from the social security program.

Payments would be made to hospitals and other providers of services on a cost basis. The cost of hospital services would be based on semiprivate accommodations (two,three, or four-bed rooms).

5. Complementary private insurance: The bill includes the Javits amendment (modified somewhat) to authorize creation of an association of private insurance carriers to sell, on a nonprofit basis, approved policies covering health costs not covered under the social security plan. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws.

B. SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

1. A 7-percent benefit increase to the 20 million social security beneficiaries equal to about $1.3 billion a year; the same increase over present law would be given to those who became beneficiaries in the future. The minimum primary benefit would thereby be increased from $40 per month at present to $42.80; the maximum from $127 to $135.90. The average primary benefit, which is currently about $77.50, would be increased to about $83.

2. Benefit increases would be paid retroactively to January 1, 1965. If the law is enacted in June 1965, this would result in retroactive payments of about $750 million in the fall of 1965.

3. The maximum annual earnings on which taxes and benefits are computed would be increased from $4,800 to $5,600 a year, effective January 1, 1966. The maximum primary benefit would thereby be further increased to $149.90 and maximum benefit for a family would be increased from $254 at present to $312.

4. The social security contribution schedule (combined for social security and

hospital benefits) would be changed to be as follows:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Self-employed
1966-67	4.25	4.25	6.4
1968-70	5.0	5.0	7.5
1971 and after	5.2	5.2	7.8

5. Self-employed physicians and tips are covered.

C. WELFARE AMENDMENTS

The public assistance titles of the Social Security Act would be amended as follows:

1. The Federal share under all State public assistance programs is increased a little more than $2.50 a month for the needy aged, blind, and disabled and about $1.25 for needy children effective January 1, 1966. Cost: from general revenues, for the last 6 months of the fiscal year 1966, about $75 million.

2. Federal funds to the States would be authorized for aid for the needy aged in mental or tuberculosis institutions. Cost: about $38 million from general revenues for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1966.

3. Earned income to the needy aged which is disregarded is increased slightly. Cost: about one-half million dollars for fiscal year 1966 from general revenues.

4. Amendment to Kerr-Mills program relating to the Federal share being paid for both cash and medical services to needy aged in the first and last month of care in a medical institution. Cost: $1 million in fiscal year 1966 from general revenues.

Employee and employer contributions

Average annual earnings	Under present law	Under King-Anderson bill		
		OASDI	Hospital insurance	Total
1966:				
$2,000	$82.50	$79.00	$6.00	$85.00
$3,000	123.75	118.50	9.00	127.50
$4,000	165.00	158.00	12.00	170.00
$4,800	198.00	189.60	14.40	204.00
$5,600 plus	198.00	221.20	16.80	238.00
1967:				
$2,000	82.50	77.40	7.60	85.00
$3,000	123.75	116.10	11.40	127.50
$4,000	165.00	154.80	15.20	170.00
$4,800	198.00	185.76	18.24	204.00
$5,600 plus	198.00	216.72	21.28	238.00
1968:				
$2,000	92.50	92.40	7.60	100.00
$3,000	138.75	138.60	11.40	150.00
$4,000	185.00	184.80	15.20	200.00
$4,800	222.00	221.76	18.24	240.00
$5,600 plus	222.00	258.72	21.28	280.00
1969-70:				
$2,000	92.50	91.00	9.00	100.00
$3,000	138.75	136.50	13.50	150.00
$4,000	185.00	182.00	18.00	200.00
$4,800	222.00	218.40	21.60	240.00
$5,600 plus	222.00	254.80	25.20	280.00
1971 and after:				
$2,000	92.50	95.00	9.00	104.00
$3,000	138.75	142.50	13.50	156.00
$4,000	185.00	190.00	18.00	208.00
$4,800	222.00	228.00	21.60	249.60
$5,600 plus	222.00	266.00	25.20	291.20

Income and outgo under H.R. 1, by calendar years

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1964	$15,840	$15,610	+$230	$18,710
1965	16,380	17,590	−1,210	17,500
1966	18,750	18,530	+220	17,720
1967	19,520	19,350	+170	17,890

Income and outgo under H.R. 1, by calendar years—Continued

DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1964	$1,200	$1,420	−$220	$2,010
1965	1,230	1,630	−400	1,610
1966	1,700	1,700		1,610
1967	1,850	1,750	+100	1,710

HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

1965				
1966	$1,310	$800	+$510	$510
1967	1,980	1,780	+200	710

Actuarial balance under H.R. 1, expressed as percentages of taxable payroll

COMPUTATIONS ON PERPETUITY BASIS

Item	OASDI	Hospital insurance	Total
Actuarial balance of present system	−0.24		−0.24
Earnings base of $5,600	+.31		+.31
Revised contribution schedule	+.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+.03		+.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent [1]	−.60		−.60
Hospitalization and related benefits		[2] −.84	−.84
Total effect of changes	−.06	+.05	−.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	−.30	+.05	−.25

COMPUTATIONS ON 75-YEAR COST BASIS [3]

Actuarial balance of present System	+0.01		+0.01
Earnings base of $5,600	+.31		+.31
Revised contribution schedule	+.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+.03		+.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent [1]	−.58		−.58
Hospitalization and related benefits		[2] −.84	−.84
Total effect of changes	−.04	+.05	+.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	−.03	+.05	+.02

[1] The 7-percent increase applies only on the first $400 of average monthly wage.

[2] Following is a breakdown of the 0.84-percent cost of the health benefits:

	Percent
Hospitalization benefits	0.78
Extended care benefits	.02
Outpatient diagnostic services	.01
Home nursing care	.03
Total	.84

[3] Basis recommended by Advisory Council on Social Security.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and others in cosponsoring this bill, S. 1 providing hospital and nursing home care for older citizens. It very rightly has priority in the legislative work of the 89th Congress because it presents a reasonable and practical solution to the health problems and worries of senior Americans.

This bill offers a workable combination of social security protection, private insurance help, and Federal Government backing. It is based on the sound concept of insurance programs—that an individual pays a relatively small amount regularly—no more than 5.2 percent of his earnings for all social security coverage including the added medical benefits—throughout his working life. His employer pays the same amount. Then when he retires, he has what amounts to a paid-up insurance policy to cover the hospital expenses that may arise later in life when his income will be smaller but his health expenses will probably be greater. This pay-as-you-go insurance program is a typical example of the practical approach to national problems which has characterized American growth from earliest pioneer days. It offers people a chance to be self-sufficient without denying them the opportunity to select their own doctors, their own hospitals, and their own private insurance to supplement the basic social security payments if they wish.

This approach was enthusiastically endorsed by the Advisory Council on Social Security in its recent report. With only one dissenting voice, the committee concluded that the monthly cash payments now provided by social security are not enough to provide real protection against high and unpredictable costs of health care. They recommended an insurance program, under social security, to help Americans pay their health bills by paying their premiums during the years when they are best able to do so.

The fact is that expensive illnesses are much more likely and frequent in old age. Every year, one out of six persons over 65 is hospitalized. Nearly everyone who reaches age 65 is hospitalized at least once during his later years and most are hospitalized two or more times. On the average, an older person requires almost three times as much hospital care as a younger one.

Yet, over the last decade, costs of medical care have risen 36 percent and hospitalization expenses have risen 65 percent. The median income of aged couples in 1962 was only $2,875. Many people, especially in rural areas, must get along on a fraction of that amount. For them, a major illness or even a fall or similar accident can wipe out the savings of a lifetime because they are no longer able to go to work and use their earning power to replenish savings.

Today there are over 18 million persons age 65 or older in the United States. These senior citizens deserve and are entitled to the best health care in their later years that our Nation can give them. These citizens are able and willing to pay for such care—not in sudden catastrophic medical bills, during their later years but in regular annual insurance payments, through their working years, under the social security system.

That is the approach that this bill offers. It has been carefully studied, revised, and improved over the last few years. Now, I believe it is a sound plan to help people help themselves, to reduce dependence on welfare and means tests, and to provide better health care for our senior citizens. I am very glad to cosponsor S. 1.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR OF MEDICARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I assure Senators that I shall take only a moment. I appreciate the presence in the

Chamber of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], because today he introduced the administration's bill for medical care for the aged, in which I feel it an honor to have joined with my colleagues the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. President, as introduced, the bill contains the private sector amendment which has been identified with my name. I believe that that fact has not been adequately noted in respect to the introduction of the bill today. I believe that it should be very carefully noted because it is a critically important part of the bill. The reason is the following:

First, the bill originally, as the King-Anderson bill, provided a limited amount of health care—with nothing more—in the form of hospitalization, and concerned many people who might otherwise have supported it on the ground that the process of political "bidding up" might cause a far greater intrusion, in their view, into the health field by the Government than would be justified either by the social security taxes which were being paid or by the preservation of the integrity of the doctor-patient relationship.

The private sector amendment would provide a built-in guarantee that at every stage an effort would be made to do that. The private enterprise system can compete in carrying the additional responsibility, and it seems to me that that is one of the surest guarantees and assurances to those who might have some doubts on the question as to whether the tendency will be to limit the Federal Government's role very strongly to the hospitalization provision.

Second, the provision would follow the concept of self-help, because 80 percent of the aged, based upon their incomes, could pay a reasonable premium for health care coverage—and these are the important words—when it is added to the hospitalization feature under social security, which is the most expensive element of the whole program.

Then, at a modest cost, a possibility would be opened. A great committee which I inspired, which was headed by Arthur Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, spent a year studying the subject and reported a cost in the area of $2 per person per month, which would come within the competence of 80 percent of the aged, leaving the other 20 percent to the possibility of the Kerr-Mills bill, if need be.

In that way, in the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and many other Senators there would be presented a complete program for health care for the aged with a magnificent role for the private sector.

Here is the important point, and upon this note I wish to conclude: In my judgment, the proposal offers one of the most challenging opportunities ever extended to the insurance companies of the United States. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is himself in the insurance business and is fully cognizant of it. Something must be done about the problem of medical care for the aged. If we are to keep Government within reasonable limits, and if we are to keep the social security tax within reasonable limits, only a relatively modest amount can be done by Government. That amount is estimated at about 30 percent of the total cost of health care for the aged.

The overwhelming bulk of it must be done by the private enterprise system. I say to all Senators, especially to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that at the time when we consider the measure—and I have no doubt that this is the most auspicious time we have ever had for its consideration—I shall do everything I can, and I hope other Senators will feel exactly the same way—to bring about a situation in which, when the measure is passed, we shall have before us at one and the same time a proposal from the great insurers of the United States to pick up the private sector option and really make the bill operative, so as to provide not only limited health care and hospitalization, but total health care, that the overwhelming bulk of the older people, especially people over 65 years of age, can pay for.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the Senator from New York that the panel which he inspired, organized, and had established was a helpful group.

Many of us had tried to find a solution to this problem by seeking a way to encourage insurance companies to participate in the medical care program. It was very difficult; but the panel which the able Senator from New York assembled, including Marion B. Folsom, Arthur Larsen, and Arthur Flemming—many of them of a different political belief from my own—have devised a wonderful program, made great contributions, and reached conclusions with which, although I may not finally agree with them, were the result of a search for a good solution.

Many times I have commended privately, and also in public, the able senior Senator from New York for bringing together this group of men, to make certain that their contributions were ready. Since they were ready, we tried to draft a bill this year, and we hope that when the bill is finally passed, it will contain the very fine provisions that the Javits panel has worked out.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement issued by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and myself on yesterday with reference to our cosponsorship.

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

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS CASE, JAVITS, AND KUCHEL TO COSPONSOR MEDICARE BILL

We are proposing to cosponsor the administration's bill for medical care for the aged because we believe it is in substance the plan which passed the Senate in the last session. It contains a major role for the private sector in affording not only limited hospital care under social security financing, but providing the opportunity for total health care for all aging citizens. We consider this plan to be creative and constructive. Such a major role in medical care for the aging on the part of the private sector was the basis of the Republican initiative taken in the introduction of our public-private medical care for the aging bill in the last Congress.

The private sector provision of the current bill allows private insurance carriers and health service groups to cover medical and surgical costs on a nonprofit basis over and above the limited hospital insurance of the King-Anderson bill, and on a basis of cost low enough to be available to the overwhelming majority of our aging citizens. This private sector provision also acts as a built-in governor against unlimited Federal expansion in the medical care for the aging field.

The four points which we have long felt should be included in an acceptable medical care plan for the aging are incorporated in the bill which we will cosponsor. They are: (1) inclusion of the estimated 2½ million Americans over 65 not covered by the social security system; (2) provision for participation by the private insurance industry to make up total health care; (3) provision for use of approved private organizations and State bodies in the administration of the program; and (4) establishment of a separate health insurance trust fund into which all Federal health care funds shall be deposited.

We consider the chances for passage of this bill to be auspicious in this session. We consider the effort to be bipartisan, as it was the private sector provision which provided that Republican support in 1964 and provided the margin required to pass the Anderson-Gore-Javits amendment in the Senate.

We believe this is the time to provide an effective program for medical care for the aging fully consistent with the encouragement of private enterprise, the satisfaction of the national need and the protection against excesses. We believe also that the fundamental structure which this bill provides is the sound basis upon which private sector interest in medical care for the aging can be enlisted in the total effort.

Other Republican Senators are also giving consideration to cosponsoring this measure.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his thoughtful approach to this subject. It does much to provide a good bill and affords an opportunity to the medical profession to have a privately operated program that can function in harmony with the proposal which will be made in the Gore amendment to modify the King-Anderson bill.

CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, once again I submit, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and 34 other Members of the U.S. Senate, a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. This proposed legislation is well known to many Members of this body, since between 1952 and 1964, the Senate has approved similar or identical measures, overwhelmingly, on six occasions.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in our appropriation procedures and in the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes, in my judgment, a positive approach toward the elimination of

extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

The purpose of this bill is to provide the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities with respect to the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government. It seeks to accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of members of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, which would assist the Congress is exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government. This proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be staffed with nonpartisan fiscal experts and technicians who would be engaged in making continuing studies of programs and expenditures proposed by the executive branch, 12 months of the year. The establishment of this joint committee would provide the Congress with the same type and caliber of detailed, technical information, in the appropriation field, as the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation provides for the revenue committees of the Congress, and as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch.

One of the most serious problems confronting our Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the national defense requirements of the cold war and the atomic and space age. Our national expenditures budget has grown from $67.5 billion in fiscal year 1954 to an estimated $98.4 billion in fiscal year 1964, and an estimated $97.9 billion for fiscal year 1965. Present indications are that they will be in the neighborhood of $100 billion in fiscal year 1966. Thus, we are rapidly moving toward an annual expenditures budget in excess of $100 billion, and toward annual expenditures in all categories that will exceed $150 billion, bearing in mind that approximately $25 billion in annual spending does not appear in the appropriation budget. Finally, our national debt, as of June 30, 1964, has reached an alltime high of $311.7 billion, and is expected to reach approximately $317 billion by June 30, 1965.

Mr. President, this matter is of the gravest concern to the Congress, since, from the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood that the Constitution vested in the Congress—and the Congress alone—the exclusive right to appropriate money for the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purposes for which the money shall be used.

Although we are now operating in an era of annual expenditures budgets in the neighborhood of $100 billion, the procedures used by the Congress in carrying out these vital responsibilities are practically no different than those used 25 or 50 years ago. In other words, the methods and procedures which we now use in the appropriation processes are simply inadequate to meet present-day needs and requirements.

In January 1950, after having served 1 year as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I became convinced that under procedures then in use, which were no different than those presently followed, the Appropriations Committees of both Houses were laboring under a tremendous disadvantage in their efforts to pass upon budget requests for Federal expenditures. The fundamental problem which I found to exist at that time—and it still exists today—is due to the fact that the Congress, which is most generous in equipping the executive branch agencies with personnel to handle its affairs, has simply failed to provide itself with adequate machinery to carry out one of its most vital functions and responsibilities—the appropriation of funds for the conduct of the Government.

Instead of equipping itself with an adequate number of experts and technicians to examine every detail of the appropriation requests submitted by executive branch agencies and departments, the Congress has been content to limp along without the staff assistance and fiscal data and information it requires. Thus, aside from the overburdened housekeeping staffs of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which cannot possibly make the kind of analysis of budget requests which is necessary in the time available, members of the Appropriations Committees are forced to rely upon the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their purposes. Furthermore, they usually tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose.

Accordingly, on January 19, 1950, I introduced a bill, S. 2898, which was similar, in many respects, to the pending bill. The committee studied the bill and revised it, but took no further action on it during the 81st Congress. Thereafter, the committee reported favorably, and the Senate passed, in the 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 87th, and 88th Congresses, virtually identical bills proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. On each occasion, following Senate passage, the measure was permitted to die in the House of Representatives.

In each Congress, these bills were cosponsored by a substantial majority of the Members of the Senate. In the 85th Congress, 71 Members of a total of 96 cosponsored the measure; in the 87th Congress, there were 67 cosponsors; and in the 88th Congress, the bill had the largest number of sponsors it has ever had—77 Senators.

As majority leader in the Senate, President Johnson gave his active support to this proposed legislation, which passed the Senate unanimously in each of these Congresses. In his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 4, 1965, the President set out as a part of his national agenda, a proposal to "make an allout campaign against waste and inefficiency." The President stated that he would submit special messages with detailed proposals for national action with this objective in mind. I know of no better way for the Congress to support the President's program for promoting economy and efficiency in Government than by the passage of this bill. It conforms specifically with his stated objective that "we will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy."

This bill is also in accord with the President's statement that wherever waste is found in Government, it will be eliminated. This legislation, if enacted into law, will aid the President in attaining this objective.

President Kennedy joined as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, as a U.S. Senator, in the 85th Congress. President Eisenhower, on December 2, 1959, released a memorandum prepared by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget setting forth proposals directed toward effecting improvements in budgeting, which included the proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget stating that its "objective is in line with the viewpoint expressed in the budget message," as a budget reform requiring congressional initiative and action. The proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget was also approved by Mr. Frederick Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the Truman administration.

It appears perfectly clear that the conditions which prompted the introduction of this measure, in 1950, and its initial passage by the U.S. Senate, in 1952, have in no way diminished. On the contrary, they have increased with the rising cost of Government and the swelling of the national debt. We have only to compare our national expenditures budget of $39.5 billion in fiscal year 1950, and $65.3 billion in fiscal year 1952, with the fiscal year 1965 estimate of $97.9 billion, to get the full impact of the current picture. If that is not sufficient, compare, if you will, our national debt of $257.3 billion in 1950, and $259.1 billion in 1952, with the $312 billion which constituted our national debt as of June 30, 1964—an increase since June 30, 1952, of in excess of $53 billion in the national debt alone.

An additional important factor to be considered in connectoion with this bill is the breakdown in our appropriations procedure which occurred during the 87th Congress, and which is a matter of the greatest concern to all of us. It is my firm conviction that if this bill had been enacted into law earlier, and the proposed joint committee had been in operation, this breakdown would not have occurred. I say this because I believe that the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget will be conducive to a better cooperation and a spirit of working in harmony between the two Appropriations Committees of the Congress. If we can have members of these committees working together, each receiving the same information, each using the same tools, and each relying on the technical advice and information furnished by a joint staff, they will be able to obtain more complete information and to evaluate more intelligently the budget requests made by the various agencies of Government. This, in turn, should go a long way toward removing

the frictions and disagreements which have cropped up between the two bodies, from time to time, in connection with the appropriation process.

Mr. President, although the Senate has been endeavoring, for more than 14 years, to effect the necessary improvements in the fiscal operations of the legislative process, the House of Representatives has so far failed to act favorably on this proposal. I am convinced that a majority of the Members of that body are as much interested in correcting serious deficiencies in the appropriation procedures of the Congress as are Members of the Senate. This is evidenced by the fact that to my knowledge 26 Members of the House had introduced identical or similar bills when the staff of the Committee on Government Operations made a count of such bills early in the first session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. President, in closing, may I say that it is my sincere and fervent hope that this or a similar measure will be enacted into law at this session of the Congress. The American taxpayer has a very real and vital stake in this legislation. We should not fail him.

Mr. President, among the sponsors of the bill which I am introducing today are included all members of the Committee on Government Operations, which has reported this measure to the Senate in preceding Congresses. In view of the interest numerous other Senators have manifested in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 10 days, so that other Members of the Senate who may desire to do so may include their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested; and will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC WORKS AND OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide public works and other economic development programs for the rehabilitation of the economy of the Appalachian region. I ask unanimous consent that the measure be held at the desk until the close of business on next Thursday, January 14, that other Senators may have the opportunity to join in sponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members will recall that the Senate, on September 25, 1964, passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 by a vote of 45 to 13. Unfortunately, during the closing days of the 88th Congress, the other body was unable to bring the legislation to a vote.

Since the adjournment of the 88th Congress President Johnson has repeatedly expressed his desire for early action on the Appalachian program by the 89th Congress, and has ranked this bill among the highest priority measures of his legislative program.

I am gratified that our esteemed majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] concurred in this judgment on a "Meet the Press" telecast last Sunday evening, and expressed the conviction that this would be the first major legislation passed by the Senate in the 89th Congress.

Mr. President, during the adjournment I had occasion to visit a number of communities in the Appalachian region, in other States as well as the State of West Virginia. I found a deep-seated and continuing interest in this legislation which has already stimulated much thought and planning at the local and State levels. The people of Appalachia are anxious for the enactment of this program so that their region also may begin to move toward the Great Society which the President eloquently depicted in his state of the Union message.

Mr. President, in this connection, I invite attention to the fact that there are 35 Senators whose names are on the bill which I have presented to the Senate. I wish to make special reference to the cosponsorship of the eminent Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who was most active in the development of this measure in the 88th Congress. I do this in a sense because sponsors of the measure come from all sections of the country and from both parties.

The measure is substantially the same bill passed by this body last year by a majority of more than three to one. I, therefore, endorse the view expressed by the majority leader that the bill should not require extensive hearings. It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will conduct brief but adequate hearings, then complete committee action on the measure, and report it to the Senate before the end of January.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 5 days so that others who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], in introducing the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—S. 3—which is similar to the bill we worked to develop in the last Congress, and which the Senate passed by a vote of 45 to 13 before adjournment.

The programs proposed in this bill represent the work of the Appalachian Governors, the work which we in the Senate began over 6 years ago, and the great interest which both President Kennedy and President Johnson have given to this region.

I have spoken often on this subject, for I know well the conditions in eastern Kentucky and throughout Appalachia. For some 175 years, my family has lived in this great region. The people are of pioneer stock and through many generations have been ever faithful to the needs of their country. The spirit of its people is high despite the unhappy and continuing problem of unemployment. But the development program proposed in this bill is required if our communities are to build the facilities to encourage industry to use the great resources that exist in the region. Increased flood protection, new highways and airports, more health and education facilities, and increased efforts at land improvement are vital.

This bill, S. 3, which we introduced today, authorizes the same expenditure of $1,077 million over a period of 5 years, stated in the bill which I was pleased to comanage with Senator RANDOLPH in the Senate last year. We are, though, proposing to increase the total authorized road system mileage from 2,850 to 3,350 miles across the region, including 1,000 miles of access roads instead of the figure of 500 miles in the bill last year. The $840 million for highway construction, providing up to 70 percent as the Federal share, is a basic program in this legislation, for roads will open isolated areas in Kentucky and in other Appalachian States to industry, to tourism, and to a fuller life for the people of the area.

In addition to the increase in authorized road mileage, this bill would place greater responsibilities and authority on the States, and I am sure that this will be welcomed by the States. This emphasis on the approval of programs at the local and State level, along with the incentives for private investment, will do much both to close the economic gap between this section and other regions of the United States, and to raise the standards of living.

The Appalachian development program is the result of much study. It is directed to a great and evident need. If the Congress approves this program providing support for transportation and flood protection, as well as for education and community development, then the 15 million people living in the hills and valleys in the Appalachian regions of 11 States—including eastern Kentucky—can work to achieve the same levels of abundance that are found in most of America.

I am grateful to my friend from West Virginia for his work and for his kind words. I will join him in the Public Works Committee to secure the earliest possible hearings and to bring this bill before the Senate. I hope others will again join with us in support of this bill. It will benefit Appalachian States, but it will also benefit the Nation.

THE WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill (S.

4) amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

This legislation is, with two exceptions, identical to that which passed the Senate on October 16, 1963, and in which 21 Members of this body joined me as cosponsors. I would add that the legislation was approved by the Senate by a vote of 69 yeas and 11 nays, and of the 20 Members not voting, 15 announced themselves as favoring its passage. The House Public Works Committee reported an amended version during the closing days of the 88th Congress. However, no further action was taken by the other body.

The bill which I am introducing is cosponsored by 25 of my colleagues, including all members of our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. It is a bipartisan measure directed toward improving the quality of our water resources and making more effective our programs for the control and abatement of water pollution.

This proposal is consistent with and supports the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, in which he called for an expanded conservation program as part of our effort to achieve the Great Society:

> For over 3 centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone.
>
> We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens. We will step up our effort to control harmful wastes, giving just priority to the cleanup of our most contaminated rivers. We will increase research to learn much more about the control of pollution.

These objectives and approaches are reflected in S. 4.

As I mentioned previously, this legislation is, with two exceptions, identical to S. 649, as approved by this body October 16, 1963. The sections deleted were those relating to the control and abatement of pollution from Federal installations and the problem of nondegradable detergents.

The Federal installations section was eliminated from this bill because similar problems with respect to Federal installations are present in the field of air pollution, as well as water pollution. In addition, there were other matters relating to Federal activities in both fields which require separate and more complete consideration. Because of these factors it was decided to cover these matters in separate legislation which will be introduced within a week.

The detergents section was deleted because the members of the coal and detergent industry have reported changes in their schedules for supplying the market with detergents which will degrade more readily than those presently on the market. In view of this change in schedule, it is considered advisable to conduct additional hearings on the detergent problem to determine the type or need of corrective legislation.

S. 4 includes the following proposals which were contained in S. 649 as it passed the Senate in October 1963:

First. To establish an additional position of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to help the Secretary to administer the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Second. To create a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to administer sections 3, comprehensive programs; 4, interstate cooperation and uniform laws; 10, enforcement measures; and 11, to control pollution from Federal installations.

Third. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for 3 succeeding fiscal years in the amount of $20 million annually for grants for research and development to demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling discharge of sewage from combined sewers.

Fourth. To increase grants to individual sewage treatment projects from $600,000 to $1 million and to allow multimunicipal combinations to be allowed grant increases from $2,400,000 to $4 million.

There is also a provision which allows for an increase of 10 percent in construction grants for treatment plants where comprehensive metropolitan planning has been carried out and where the treatment plants are part of such comprehensive plans.

Fifth. To provide procedures for the establishment of standards of quality applicable to interstate waters.

Sixth. To authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate abatement where he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution of interstate or navigable waters and action of Federal, State, or local authorities.

Seventh. To provide for audits where Federal funds are utilized and the normal requirements for technical amendments.

The need for the acceleration of sewage treatment plant construction and for the correction of the problem of combined sewers is no less urgent than when I introduced S. 649 in January of 1963, or when it passed the Senate in October of that year. As a matter of fact, the delay in enactment of legislation has created a greater backlog of needs in correcting the Nation's water pollution problems.

Today our older cities are faced with the necessity of separating their combined storm and sanitary sewers or devising means whereby the discharge of runoff from city streets are gradually fed through treatment plants to prevent overloading of treatment systems and the discharge of untreated sewage into public waterways. The correction of the problem of combined sewers requires huge expenditures on the part of the communities. In order to encourage and assist these hard-pressed cities it is essential that Federal encouragement be provided. The $20 million authorization could not correct the problem, but would furnish an incentive to attack it.

The importance of establishing water quality standards in our interstate water system is gaining more recognition and support. While this would be a new provision in Federal legislation, it is by no means a new or novel approach to aiding in the improvement of water quality and in the proper management of our water resources. We all recognize that the availability of water of good quality is a necessity for our economic and industrial growth. It is essential to the achievement of the Great Society.

The development and application of water quality standards would enable us to establish objectives and guidelines on the use of our waters and to prevent the misuse and abuse of this vital resource.

Water quality standards would provide techniques which could, in many instances, help us to avoid the necessity for enforcement action. Under present law and procedures nothing is done until pollution has reached the point where it endangers the health or welfare of many people. Then abatement action is taken and efforts are made to correct a situation which could have been prevented if standards of water quality had been established; municipalities and industries could develop realistic plans for new plants or expanded facilities, without uncertainties about waste disposal limitations which may be imposed.

In my own State, as in others, our previously abundant shellfish-producing waters have been immeasureably harmed through disposal of deleterious wastes. The economic losses to shellfishermen have been catastropic. S. 4 could provide them with effective protection for the first time.

For the program of sewage treatment facilities to be of greater benefit to our larger communities the limitation on individual and multimunicipal grants needs to be raised. The present ceilings are unrealistic when applied to the considerably greater expenditures which a larger city must bear in installing necessary treatment works. In application, the grants approximate as little or less than 10 percent of the costs involved, and thus they fail to achieve what is at once a primary and necessary objective of the grant program—the incentive to develop local projects for the control and abatement of water pollution.

S. 4 would authorize the establishment of an additional Assistant Secretary to help in the responsibility of the Department to oversee this important sphere of activities. There would also be authorized a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to carry out certain functions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, thus accomplishing two purposes.

First, the new administration would elevate the status of our water pollution control and abatement programs to a more appropriate and effective level in the Department. Second, it would free the Public Health Service to concentrate in its primary concern with health in the water pollution field as it is in other areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analyses will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended,

to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words "section 1." a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c) respectively.

(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignating by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called 'Secretary') shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 and the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe."

(b) Section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953, as made affective April 1, 1953, by Public Law 83–13, is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three"; and paragraph (17) of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)".

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 2 through 4 and references thereto, as sections 3 through 5, respectively, sections 5 through 14, as sections 7 through 16 respectively, by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

"FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Administration'). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary, and shall, through the Administration, administer sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of this Act and such other provisions of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from personnel of the Department, obtain, from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions."

SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section as follows:

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year."

SEC. 4. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 is amended by striking out "$600,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,".

(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out "$2,400,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,".

(c) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z 15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276(c))."

(d) Such redesignated section 8 is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under this section by 10 per centum for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'metropolitan area' means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President or by the Bureau of the Budget as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President or the Bureau of the Budget lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof."

SEC. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j).

(b) Such redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c)(1) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(2) The Secretary shall also call such a public hearing on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards set pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards.

"(3) Such standards of quality shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing standards designed to enhance the quality of such waters, the Secretary shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

"(4) The Secretary shall promulgate the standards pursuant to this subsection with respect to any waters only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(5) The discharge of matter into such interstate waters, which reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection or established by the appropriate State or interstate agencies consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection (whether the matter causing or contributing to such reduction is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into tributaries of such waters), is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (a) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (b) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act."

(c) Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "; or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution re-

ferred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities."

(d) Redesignated subsection (h) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the word "practicability" in the second sentence thereof, the words "of complying with such standards as may be applicable."

SEC. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

SEC. 7 (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 6(b)(4)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8(b)(4)."

(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 5" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7".

(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (g)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (h)".

(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (e)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)".

(e) Section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 8(c)(3)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(d)(3)" and by striking out "section 8(e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(f)".

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Water Quality Act of 1965".

The section-by-section analyses, presented by Mr. MUSKIE are as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSES OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED

Section 1. National water pollution control policy: Adds new subsection (a) to section 1 of act stating the act's purpose to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the preservation, control, and abatement of water pollution.

Section 1 of the act would be further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) and (c) and amending subsection (b) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary in administering the act by supervising and directing the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 of the bill and administering all other functions of the Department related to water pollution. Other duties could be assigned as desired by the Secretary.

Section 2. Federal Water Pollution Control Administration: Redesignates sections and includes new section 2 in act creating the Federal Water Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer redesignated sections 3 (comprehensive programs), 4 (interstate cooperation and uniform laws), 10 (enforcement measures), and 11 (to control pollution from Federal installations) of act. Responsibility for other provisions of the act could be assigned as the Secretary may prescribe.

Section 3. Grants for research and development: New section 6 provides authority for grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from combined sewers.

Grants would require approval of appropriate State authorities and projects must demonstrate new or improved methods of controlling discharges from combined sewers. Also grants would be limited to 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost.

There would be authorized for appropriation $20 million annually for 4 fiscal years starting with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Grants to any project would be limited to 5 percent of total appropriations.

Section 4. Grants for construction: Redesignated section 8 is amended by increasing the dollar ceiling limitation on any grant for a single waste treatment plant construction project from $600,000 to $1 million. This section is also amended by increasing the dollar ceiling limitation on a grant for a project which will serve more than one municipality from $2,400,000 to $4 million.

Subsection (f) is redesignated as subsection (g) and additionally makes applicable the Secretary of Labor's labor standards enforcement authority to the present provisions making prevailing wage provisions of Davis-Bacon Act applicable to workers employed on grant-assisted projects.

New subsection (f) authorizes the Secretary to increase the amount of a grant by 10 percent for a project in a standard metropolitan area which is certified by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency as being in conformity with a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area.

Section 5. Enforcement measures against pollution of interstate or navigable waters: Redesignates subsections of redesignated section 10, (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j) and inserts new subsection (c) authorizing the Secretary, after notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and other Federal agencies, State, and interstate water pollution control agencies, and municipalities and industries involved, to prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

Directs the Secretary to also call a public hearing on his own motion or at a Governor's request to consider a revision in such standards. The standards of quality are to be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of the act. In establishing standards for enhancing water quality, the Secretary is to take into consideration their use and value for all legitimate water uses.

Directs the Secretary to promulgate the standards only if, following his request, State, and interstate agencies have not developed satisfactory standards.

Makes the discharge of matter, which reduces quality of interstate waters below the promulgated standards, subject to abatement under existing enforcement procedures.

Provides that this subsection does not prevent the application of enforcement measures to applicable cases and does not extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by the act.

Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of redesignated section 10 directs the Secretary to call an enforcement conference whenever he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution of interstate or navigable waters and action of Federal, State, and local health authorities.

Redesignated subsection (b) of redesignated section 10 provides that in addition to requiring that the court, in enforcement cases, give not only due consideration of the practicability and the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved but consider also the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable.

Section 6. Administration: Adds new subsection (d) to provide that recipients of assistance under the act shall keep such records as prescribed by the Secretary for audit purposes.

Section 7. Provides for technical amendments.

COLLEGE STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the greatest natural resource of this Nation today is no longer its mineral reserves, its oilfields, or its traditional riches whose past exploitation have built our economy. Rather, today's greatest natural resource is the potential of a well-educated, competent populace fitted to lead the Nation into the space-age era with all its material and human complexities.

This realization, with the new demands it makes upon us for assuring the sound educational development of all our youth without regard to their economic status, or that of their families, has been growing. The magnitude of the need, and the vast potential reward to the Nation in providing training for all qualified youth to the limit of their abilities, has become even more apparent than it was last February when I first introduced the Hartke college student assistance bill, then S. 2490.

That bill received hearings last year before the Education Subcommittee and was favorably reported, with amendments, as S. 3140, which remained on the calendar at adjournment. Today I am offering a new version of the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. Since one portion of my earlier bill was absorbed in the amendments to the National Defense Education Act last year, S. 5 is comprised of three rather than four portions: First, a program of student grants doubled in size over the previous proposal; second, a work-study program identical to the proposal of last year, which on a small scale is now a part of the antipoverty program; and third, a most substantially increased student loan insurance venture, containing a number of changes from the 1964 bill.

All three portions of this comprehensive student assistance act would run for an authorized 4-year period. The undergraduate student grants would aid 100,000 students in the first year, with an additional 100,000 in each of the following 3 years at a cost of $75 million

per year, with a peak of $300 million in the fourth year of the program. These student grants are intended to aid a student who has exhausted other possibilities—such as National Defense Education Act loans, parental assistance, or work-study grants. They are not intended to be scholarships in the usual sense that only the top-ranking academically qualified would receive them. They are intended, rather, to be the necessary lift to put over the final financial barriers students accepted by the institution as capable of keeping up with the academic requirements, presumably including B and C as well as A students. Further, administration of the grants would be under the control of the institution rather than through the State commission structure outlined in the 1964 bill.

As I have already mentioned, the work-study provisions remain the same as in S. 2490. The cost would be $250 million per year, which would aid 330,000 students annually.

Fully as important as these two portions, and in some ways the most vital as well as the least costly, is the guaranteed student loan provision toward which I have directed not only S. 2490 but other bills in the past.

Members of the Senate, I am sure, are familiar with the basic idea—a Federal insurance guarantee for loans arranged directly by the student with a lending institution. S. 5 calls for the insurance of loans up to a total of $700 million in fiscal 1966, with an increase of $100 million annually to a peak of $1 billion in the fourth year. These figures, of course, are for gross amounts of insured loans, not by any means of cost to the Government, which will be quite minimal as to operation and reserves.

Other changes include, rather than insurance of 90 percent of the loan and interest, insurance of 100 percent of the loan but no insurance of the interest; eliminating involvement of the colleges except for certifying eligibility of the student as in good standing; extension of the borrowing privilege to all students who are carrying at least half of a full-time academic load; inclusion of vocational type institutions as well as academic; and an interest grant of 2 percent from the time the loan is made until the end of repayment.

We must give vigorous aid to all qualified to benefit by education and training for the new age that is upon us. To do so effectively, we need the kind of program provided by my bill. It provides help directly to the student, the very person we are seeking to benefit, rather than aiding him through his parents at second hand. It gives access to resources needed at whatever level is necessary—grants to maintain the hard-pressed student who has exhausted the resources of loans, work opportunities, and meager family backing or none at all; extension of the work-study principle to the benefit of both students and their institutions; and above all, the opportunity for low-cost loans, made from private sources, for which the student himself becomes responsible.

Such a package approach has secured the enthusiastic support and endorsement of the entire spectrum of educational experts, as last year's hearings showed. These include the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and many more.

There is also a strong support from Members of this body. I am pleased to announce that the following Members have requested to be included at this time as cosponsors of the bill: Senators MUSKIE, MCGEE, RANDOLPH, GRUENING, CLARK, MCINTYRE, BURDICK, YARBOROUGH, INOUYE, CANNON, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, PELL, and BAYH.

Mr. President, in order that others may consider the bill and join in its sponsorship, I ask that the complete text of S. 5 may appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on January 15.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Indiana, and be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 5) to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for student grants, loan insurance, and work-study introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Student Assistance Act of 1965".

TITLE I—UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GRANTS

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for grants to persons who have not previously received grants under this title and who are selected for such grants by the institution of higher education in which they are enrolled or have been accepted for enrollment. In addition, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the six succeeding fiscal years such sums as are necessary for making grants to individuals who have received grants under this title for previous years.

Amount and duration of student grants

SEC. 102. Any person who is determined by the institution of higher education in which he is enrolled or has been accepted for enrollment, in accordance with the provisions of the institution's plan approved under section 104, to need financial assistance to begin or continue his education as an undergraduate at such institution may be given a student grant under this title. Such a grant shall be based on the student's financial need for assistance during the academic year, but shall not exceed $1,000 for such year or its equivalent.

Allotments to States and institutions

SEC. 103. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 101 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall set aside an allotment for each State which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of full-time undergraduate students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of such students enrolled in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of such students enrolled in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 101 for any fiscal year, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines as to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such amounts are appropriated.

(c) From each State's allotment under subsection (a) there shall be allotted to each institution of higher education in the State an amount which bears the same ratio to the State's allotment as the number of full-time undergraduate students enrolled in such institution bears to the number of such students enrolled in all institutions of higher education in the State. Sums allotted to institutions of higher education which do not have plans approved under section 104 shall be reallotted among the other institutions of higher education in the State pro rata on the basis of their original allotments under this subsection. Subject to the provisions of the next sentence, the Commissioner shall pay from each State's allotment for each fiscal year to each institution which has a plan approved under section 104 the amount requested by the institution. Where the total requested by all institutions in a State is less than the State's allotment, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, among institutions which requested more than the amount allotted to them. Such reallotment shall be made in proportion to the original allotment, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to insure that no payment will be made in excess of the amount requested by the institution. Any amounts remaining after the Commissioner has carried out such reallotment may be reallotted within other States in the discretion of the Commissioner.

Plans for participating institutions

SEC. 105. (a) Any institution of higher education desiring to participate in the student grant program under this title may do so by submitting to the Commissioner a plan for such institution for carrying out the purposes of this title which the Commissioner approves under this section. No divinity school or seminary or similar institution shall be eligible to submit a plan under this title. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that funds received pursuant to this title will be used only for making student grants in accordance with the plan;

(2) provides for the selection of undergraduate students to receive grants, for determination of the amounts of such grants, and for determining the extent of financial need, in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria which provide reasonable assurance—

(A) that the individuals selected to receive grants under this title will have the ability to pursue sucessfully, at the institution of higher education, the course of study he has selected, determined in accordance with the institution's regularly employed measures of aptitude and ability, and that the amount of each such grant for each year will be based solely on his need for financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, and

(B) that such individuals are exceptionally needy and but for the receipt of a student grant pursuant to this title would not pursue a course of study at an institution of higher education;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be neces-

sary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the institution under this title;

(4) provides that such a grant shall be paid in such installments as provided in the institution's plan, and that no payments shall be made for any period when the student is not maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution which he is attending, or is not devoting essentially full time to educational work, except that failure to be in attendance for a short period of time where there is good cause in the judgment of the institution for nonattendance shall not disqualify a student from receiving further payments, or failure to be in attendance at an institution during vacation periods, periods of military service, or during other extended periods of time during which there is good cause in the judgment of the institution for nonattendance (during which periods he is receiving no payments) shall not terminate the grant; and

(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the institution of higher education submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) In the case of any plan which has been approved by the Commissioner, if the Commissioner finds—

(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) that in the admistration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provisions,

the Commissioner shall notify such institution that the institution will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Cost of education allowances

SEC. 106. In order partially to compensate institutions of higher education for expenses in excess of student tuition and other fees, incurred by such institutions in providing education to persons awarded student grants and receiving payments with respect thereto under this title, the Commissioner shall, in accordance with regulations, pay each institution which such a person attends during the major portion of each academic year for which such person receives student grant payments, the amount of $350. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make such payments.

Payments

SEC. 107. The Commissioner may arrange for the payment of the amounts due recipients of student grants and institutions under this title in accordance with section 405.

TITLE II—LOAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Scope and duration of loan assistance program

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of facilitating loans to students in eligible institutions, eligible lenders may be insured by the Commissioner, on behalf of the United States, against losses on loans made by them to such students, on or after July 1, 1965, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this title. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this title in any fiscal year ending before July 1, 1969, shall not exceed $700,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $800,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $900,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Thereafter, insurance pursuant to this Act may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit as defined in section 203) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this title, to continue or complete their educational program; but no insurance may be granted or any such loan made or installment paid after June 30, 1972.

(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this title, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of such quotas. For purposes of this title, the term "eligible lender" means an eligible institution, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

Authorization of Commissioner to make certain interest payments

SEC. 202. (a) The Commissioner shall pay such part of the interest on any loan insured under this title as equals 2 per centum on the amount borrowed. The remainder of such interest up to the maximum prescribed by the Commissioner shall be paid by the student borrower in accordance with section 205. Payments by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purpose of this section. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 205 with respect to the payment of interest, the Commissioner may enter into such special arrangements with lenders with respect to interest payments to be made by him as he deems necessary for the proper administration of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall prescribe and define from time to time the maximum rate of interest for loans insured under the provisions of this Act. In doing so he shall give consideration to the going commercial rate for loans with similar security.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Limitations on individual loans and on insurance

SEC. 203. (a) No loan or loans by one or more eligible lenders in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any student in any academic year or its equivalent shall be covered by insurance under this title, and the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all loans made to any student shall not exceed $10,000 at any time. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of such annual limit. As used in this section and hereinafter in this title, the term "line of credit" means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured under this title shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid balance of the principal due on such loan, but shall not include any part of the interest on such loan.

Sources of funds

SEC. 204. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this title shall be insurable whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

Eligibility of student borrowers and terms of student loans

SEC. 205. A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable under the provisions of this title only if—

(a) made to a student who has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such an institution, is in good standing, and in either case will be carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution,

(b) such student is in need of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, as determined by the lender, and

(c) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which (1) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required, (2) provides for repayment of the principal amount of such loan in installments over a 10-year period (or such other period as may be authorized by regulation of the Commissioner) beginning (except in the event of default in payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower) not earlier than 1 year following the date on which the student completes or ceases to pursue the study program in which he was enrolled or had been accepted for enrollment, (3) provides for interest on the unpaid balance of such loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate as prescribed and defined by the Commissioner by or pursuant to regulation, which shall be payable, by the Commissioner and the borrower as provided in section 202, in installments over the period of the loan, (4) entitles the student borrower to accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan, and (5) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this title and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this title, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

Certificates of insurance—Effective date of insurance—Premiums

SEC. 206. (a)(1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this title, he may, upon tender by the applicant to the first year's insurance premium payable pursuant to subsection (c), issue to such applicant a certificate of insurance covering such loan and setting forth the amount and terms of such insurance.

(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of such certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit (as defined in section 203), submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance, was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon thirty days' default by the lender in

the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall contain (A) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (B) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

(b)(1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by such lender, on or after the date of such certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this title, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provision for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit (as defined in section 203) extending beyond the cutoff date specified in such certificate, loans or payments thereon made by such holder after such date pursuant to such line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of such certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 201, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection (b) for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this title a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per year of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest of such loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest, or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 207(a).

(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with such subsection upon such consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

Procedure on default, death, or disability of student

SEC. 207. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this title, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon any security for such loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by such beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary, within the limits of liability specified in section 203(b), the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon such loan as soon as such amount has been determined. The "amount of the loss" on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the loan, not including interest, on the date of payment by the United States on its insurance obligation, except that where the Commissioner has decided to make payment on his own motion the amount of the loss as so determined shall be deemed tentative and shall be increased by the excess, if any, over such tentative amount of any net recovery made by the Commissioner on such loan after deduction of the cost of such recovery (including reasonable administrative cost).

(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the insured portion of the loss, or tentative amount of loss, pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan with respect to amounts of principal.

(c) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on such insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

(d) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to excuse the holder of a loan from exercising, in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this title, the same care and diligence which would reasonably be used in making and collecting loans not insured. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence, or to make the reports and statements required under section 206(a)(3), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify such lender for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this title until he is satisfied that such failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

(e) As used in this section, the term "insurance beneficiary" means the insured or its authorized assignee, if the certificate of insurance is held by such assignee.

Revolving insurance fund

SEC. 208. (a) There is hereby established a Student Loan Insurance Fund (hereafter in this section called the "Fund") which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for carrying out the provisions of this title, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to transfer to the Fund from time to time from the appropriations provided under subsection (b) of this section such sums as he deems necessary to provide capital for the Fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this title, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the Fund. All expenses under this title other than payments under section 202 shall be paid from the Fund, including (within the limits authorized from year to year in appropriation Acts to be paid for such purpose from the Fund) all administrative expenses which the Commissioner determines are reasonably attributable to his operations under this title. Moneys in the Fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. If at any time the Commissioner determines that capital surplus and reserves of the Fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the Fund, such excess may be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b)(1) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated for transfer to the Fund, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section—

(A) the sum of $1,000,000; and

(B) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the Fund. Any sums appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(2) Interest shall accrue to the Treasury on outstanding capital resulting from transfers to the Fund from appropriations under paragraph (1) of this subsection. The rate of such interest with respect to each such transfer shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield, during the month preceding such transfer, on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to those of loans insured under this title. From time to time and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, all accrued interest.

(3) If at any time the moneys in the Fund (including any appropriation available for transfer to the Fund pursuant to this section) are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured under this title, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the

Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for such purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this paragraph. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this paragraph shall be deposited in the Fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such Fund.

Legal powers and responsibilities

SEC. 209. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Commissioner may—

(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this title without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this title from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) include in any contract for insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provision of this title may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines such modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

(4) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision, of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured under this title;

(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired including any equity or any right of redemption.

(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this title—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act;

(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act with respect to insurance under this title, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

TITLE III—WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and promote work-study programs for students who are in need of the earnings from employment to pursue courses of study at institutions of higher education, and to assist such institutions to develop and expand courses of study requiring periods of full-time on-the-job training, there are authorized to be appropriated $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title and with agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment by the Commissioner of the compensation of students employed under work-study programs covered by such agreements for such fiscal year.

Apportionment of funds

SEC. 302. For the purpose of determining the maximum amount that may be paid by the Commissioner under this title as compensation to students at each participating institution of higher education, the Commissioner shall apportion the amount appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year as follows:

(a) The Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for the purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) In order to allocate the amount so allocated to any State among institutions of higher education in such State with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in his regulations under this title, the Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which such institutions must file application for such allocations. In the event that the total requested in such applications from such institutions in a State exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the allocation from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications from such institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, and may allocate such reallotted amounts among participating institutions in such other States.

Conditions of agreements

SEC. 303. An agreement with any institution of higher education under this title shall—

(1) provide for the operation by the institution of a work-study program for the employment of its students by such institution, or by a public agency or institution pursuant to a contract or other arrangement with such institution, in work of an educational character or having a substantial educational or public service content;

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) is in need of the earnings from employment to pursue a course of study at such institution or to undertake a period of full-time on-the-job training required by his course of study at such institution, (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study while employed under the program covered by the agreement, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at the institution, or in the case of a student already enrolled in and attending the institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance at such institution;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session;

(4) provide that, in each fiscal year during which the agreement remains in effect, the institution shall expend (from sources other than payments by the Commissioner under this title) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this title) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for such employment during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which the agreement is entered into;

(5) provide for payment by the Commissioner, within the limits of the applicable allocation with respect to such institution under section 302(b), of the Commissioner's share of the compensation of each student employed in the work-study program in accordance with the agreement, which share shall be 100 per centum of such compensation for employment prior to July 1, 1967, and 75 per centum of such compensation for employment on that date and thereafter; and, subject to section 304, provide that the institution undertakes to act, if so requested by the Commissioner, as his agent for the payment of the Commissioner's share of the student's compensation;

(6) provide that the Commissioner's share of the compensation of any student employed in the work-study program in accordance with the agreement shall not exceed for any calendar year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, (A) in the case of a student who is participating in a course of study at such institution, or who is participating in a program of full-time on-the-job training required by his course of study, during essentially all of such calendar year or its equivalent, $2,500 if he is a graduate or professional student or $1,250 if he is any other type of student, or (B) in the case of a student who is so participating during substantially less than such calendar year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, $2,000 if he is a graduate or professional student or $1,000 if he is any other type of student;

(7) provide for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for the keeping of such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verifications of such reports;

(8) include such other provisions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution; and

(9) include provisions designed to make work financed under the program covered by the agreement, or equivalent work offered by the institution, reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof.

Payments to students

SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner's share of a student's compensation for work performed in employment covered by an agreement under this title may be paid directly by him to the student; or it may be paid through the institution making such agreement as paying agent for the Commissioner. If the institution is utilized as paying agent, the Commissioner's share may be paid to the institution in advance or by way of reimbursement, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, and the Commissioner may authorize the institution to combine the Commissioner's share and the remainder, if any, of the student's compensation in a single payment to the student.

(b) Regardless of the method of payment under this section, students employed in a work-study program covered by an agreement under this title shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed as restricting the source (other than this title) from which the institution may pay its share of the compensation of a student employed in accordance with an agreement under this title.

(d) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 401. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 402. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(c) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(d) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary schools;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, if the Commissioner determines there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions to participate under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards.

(e) The term "eligible institution" means (1) an institution of higher education or (2) a business or trade school, or technical institution, or other technical or vocational schools, in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons who have completed or left secondary school, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education, (C) provides a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education designed to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations, and (D) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this clause, except that if the Commissioner determines there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools of a particular category, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools of that category, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met by such schools in order for loans to students attending such schools to be insurable under this title and shall also determine whether particular schools meet such standards; and for the purpose of this clause the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(f) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or institution means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(g) The term "public" as applied to any school or institution includes a school or institution of any agency of the United States, except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act.

Delegation of authority

SEC. 403. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the promulgation of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

Administration

SEC. 404. In administering this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof, and to pay therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be provided in the agreement.

Method of payment

SEC. 405. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement.

BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CLASSROOMS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide $500 million a year in Federal assistance—for the next 2 years—for construction of classrooms in public elementary and secondary schools.

This is similar to legislation I have proposed many times in the past, and I am hopeful that the year 1965 will see Congress enact, for the first time, a comprehensive program of Federal assistance to the public elementary and secondary schools of this country.

The 88th Congress, as we all know, made a remarkable record of achievement in the field of education. So much so, in fact, that it has rightly earned the nickname "the Education Congress."

There was the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act; the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963; the Vocational Education Act of 1963; including extension of the federally impacted areas program and an expanded and extended National Defense Education Act program.

We also approved the Library Services and Construction Act, and revised and broadened the Manpower Development and Training Act program. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is an education-oriented program to train both young people and adults. Then there is the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

It would be hard to find any Congress in history that had done as much for education.

But we have one major piece of unfinished business that must receive top-priority attention and that is our elementary and secondary schools.

Through many years of neglect, we have inherited a chronic shortage of qualified teachers and suitable classrooms that is really a national scandal.

The bill I propose would make only a modest start on this enormous problem.

The Federal funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of an allocation formula which measures the relative income per schoolchild of the several States.

The range of the formula would be limited to a ratio of 2 to 1—wherein the least wealthy States would receive approximately $16 per school age child, while those with the highest per capita incomes would receive approximately $7 per school age child.

Each State, in order to qualify for its full allotment, would have to maintain a school expenditure effort equal to both its past effort and the average national increase.

Using an estimated figure of $35,000 as the average national cost of classroom construction, this bill, in 2 years, would provide the funds for construction of some 38,000 classrooms.

At some later time, I intend to discuss this legislation in more detail. But for now, I shall content myself with the observation that the need for congressional action in this area, has increased each of the 10 years I have been in the Senate.

It is greater now than it has ever been. And we must begin now to meet this urgent national need.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 8) to provide for a program of Federal assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce again, for appropriate reference, the cold war GI bill, to make educational assistance and home loan guarantees available to the 5 million veterans of the cold war similar to that made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.

The provisions of this bill are almost identical with those of similar cold war GI bills which I have introduced during the last three Congresses. In the 86th Congress, the cold war GI bill (S. 1138) passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 31, but was not acted upon by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The bill of the 87th Congress (S. 349), as well as the cold war GI bill of the 88th Congress (S. 5), was favorably reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The latter bill was left on the Senate Calendar for almost a year and a half, and the Senate was unable to bring it to a vote.

The proposed legislation has always enjoyed broad public support, and its popularity today is greater than it has ever been before. Even though this bill has been pending for some time in the Nation's Congress, the people of this country refuse to allow their hopes to lapse. Instead of remaining dormant while they wait for this body to consider this needed legislation, our citizens have maintained a consistent tide of support for the cold war GI bill.

Each year a large number of our vigorous American youth enter military service to give from 2 to 4, or more, years of their lives to the defense of their country. They do so, and this country needs them to do so, because foreign powers continue to threaten the security of this Nation and of the free world. This military requirement will continue until the last vestige of danger to this Nation has been removed from the frontiers of freedom. So long as there is a violent Vietnam, a Berlin crisis, or an island threat from Cuba, our American youth will be required to serve their Nation.

The bill I have introduced provides an opportunity to demonstrate that we, as a nation, do recognize the extreme unique personal sacrifices exacted from our cold war veterans by their military service. Before a misconception develops, let me point out now, Mr. President, that this bill is not conceived as a reward or as an inducement for our young men to serve their country. For those who would reduce the purpose of this bill to these concepts, I can only retort that I conceive the level of patriotism in our country to be of a higher quality. I do not believe that we need reduce our defense effort to gimmicks or rewards to induce our young men to defend our country. Service to one's country should be, and presently is, based on a moral obligation to defend the principles by which we live.

For this reason, Mr. President, I do not wish this bill to be confused with the thoughts of those who would hold this educational opportunity out as a reward to those who undergo specially hazardous duty for their country. I mention this because I do not believe that there is any room in our American philosophy for the thoughts of those who demand that our youth earn educational opportunities by risking their lives. We often speak of the United States as the Nation of opportunity, a place where anyone is offered an opportunity in life to aspire to his highest ambitions. There is no place in our heritage for the idea that educational opportunity must be earned by placing one's life at stake.

In apposition to this manner of thinking, the basis of the philosophy behind this bill is that everyone in this country should have the opportunity of pursuit of happiness without being penalized unfairly. This is the idea that in the name of justice, one will not be discriminated against unfairly in seeking fulfillment of life. Yet, this is just what is happening at the present time.

We find that only 44 percent of our draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform. While these men are sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives just at the crucial age of peak development, the 56 percent of their counterparts are utilizing this time to further their careers and develop their futures. An even more unfortunate fact is that it is just these admirable young men who are serving their country who are the least able to afford the time which is sacrificed from their future development. These are the men who are least able to afford an education, who are least prepared for a civilian occupation, and who have to struggle the hardest to survive the competition for the future. Hence, the injustice is magnified, as we take the very men who must struggle the hardest to get ahead in life and set them 2 to 4 years behind in their competitive position, just because they are the 44 percent who do the admirable thing in serving their country.

The real problem occurs when our cold war veterans return to civilian life. After being removed for 2 to 4 years from the mainstream of competition, they return to civilian life just as they left—unskilled, uneducated, and largely unemployable. Last year unemployment compensation for veterans increased $2 million—to over $96 million—money which could have reaped benefits if used for the training of these veterans. Here is the place where the cold war veteran needs help. He does not need a reward—what he needs is a chance. Whatever his military experience, hazardous or not, there is a need for readjustment assistance to help the cold war veteran get his ship of success back into the mainstream of opportunity.

It is not for the veteran alone that this assistance is needed, for our Nation can ill afford to lose the talents and ability of over 5 million cold war veterans by 1970. Our Nation needs them, and they need the interest of our Nation in their future. This is the purpose of this bill: to do everything we can to rectify the injustice dealt these veterans, and to afford opportunity to every American indiscriminately.

The cold war GI bill provides these young people with 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of service, not to exceed 36 months of schooling. This aid would be in the form of a monthly cash allowance to the veteran, who selects his own school and pays his tuition and maintenance expense from the allowance. A single veteran would receive $110 monthly. A married veteran with two children would receive a maximum of $165 a month. The bill also provides home and farm loan assistance of a type which calls for a loan fee that will be set aside to pay for any losses under the program. Only those persons who perform 180 days or more of military service, and who are discharged honorably, would be eligible for these benefits.

This is not a bonus or a pension plan; it is a readjustment plan to train a veteran to become self-sufficient and thus avoid the necessity of a bonus or a pension. It is a way to give these young veterans an opportunity to return to civilian life, get a job, and to realize their educational objectives at the most formative time in their lives.

By far the most farsighted veterans' program in our history was the original World War II GI bill of 1944 which accomplished just these objectives. Through this bill and the later Korean conflict GI bill, almost 11 million veterans received training which elevated

them into productive employment and additional income. Their increase in taxes paid on this additional earning power was more than sufficient to pay back the Government the cost of the programs, and Uncle Sam is now accruing a profit to the tune of over a billion dollars a year. The cold war GI bill will also be self-liquidating.

Aside from the monetary advantages of this investment, the GI bills have injected thousands of trained scientists, doctors, engineers, teachers, and other professional personnel into our economy. Through these bills, veterans were able to escape the problems of readjustment now plaguing cold war veterans, and this is just what this bill will provide for the cold war veteran.

But the cold war GI bill does more than redress inequities and provide opportunities. In addition, it will help build an educational fortress which, in the long run, will be of more value in defending our freedom than all the armaments in existence. The contributions which can be made by these educationally readjusted veterans is incalculable, especially in light of our still desperate need for more teachers, more engineers, and more scientists. Last year, this body, earned the distinction of being labeled the "Education Congress" because of its efforts to raise the standard of education. Let us not view this as a landmark to be seen in passing, but let us convert it into a stepping stone leading to a complete educational system which provides an opportunity for every citizen to develop his abilities to his utmost potential.

Mr. President, the documentation of need for and values accruing from this bill could go on ad infinitum. However, the most important basis for this bill is the need to provide our young veterans with an opportunity to readjust to civilian life so that military service will not have the effect of creating a lifetime burden for the 44 percent of our eligible men who defend their country.

This is not a halfway proposal to reward only those who see hazardous duty, or some other select group of servicemen—for educational opportunity cannot be used to salve our conscience for sending men to war. Rather this is the recognition that there is a segment of our population that suffers from lack of opportunity, and that is the entire cold war veteran population. Their need is not based on the type of military duty they performed, but on the lack of opportunity to readjust back to civilian life after having been removed for 2 to 4 years.

The proposed legislation would also enjoy broad public support. Its popularity today is greater than it has ever been before.

Mr. President, on this subject I have received a great volume of mail from people all over the country and from servicemen overseas. During this fall, while on speaking tours, more people came to me and expressed an interest in that bill than in any other bill that has been before the Congress in the past year. I include in that statement the civil rights bill and the tax bill. The people of our country recognize that the bill is a measure of the utmost and pressing importance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to remain at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors and that an explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation of the bill will be printed in the RECORD and the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanation is as follows:

DIGEST EXPLANATION OF THE COLD WAR GI BILL, ENTITLED THE "COLD WAR VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965"

This bill provides readjustment assistance for cold war veterans; i.e., persons who perform active duty in the Armed Forces during the "induction period." As defined by the bill, the "induction period" extends from January 31, 1955 (the termination of Korean conflict readjustment aid) and ends on the date of termination of the compulsory draft law. The present draft law termination date is July 1, 1965. Applicable throughout the bill is a requirement of discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Readjustment assistance authorized by the cold war bill is similar to that previously afforded to veterans of the Korean conflict.

Educational and vocational training assistance: Eligibility is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty or discharge for service-connected disability. Period of education or training (not to exceed 36 months) is calculated by multiplying 1½ times each day of active duty. During educational period veteran receives monthly allowance, as follows: For full-time college training the monthly allowance would be—no dependents, $110; one dependent, $135; more than one dependent, $160. Veteran must begin education or training within 3 years after discharge or enactment of bill, whichever is later; and must complete education within 8 years after discharge or enactment of bill, as case may be. No allowance shall be paid for any period prior to September 1, 1965. Persons enrolled in courses of education on September 1, 1965, would be entitled to allowance from that date, although they could not receive payment until after bill's enactment. All education and training end not more than 10 years after the end of the induction period, except that certain career enlistees have a later termination date determined by the date of their final discharge.

Guaranty and direct loan assistance: Eligibility for guaranty and direct loans is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty, or discharge for service-connected disability. Widow of veteran who died of service-connected disability also eligible. Loans are for purpose of purchasing (a) homes, including farm homes, and (b) farm lands, livestock, etc., to be used by veteran in farming operations. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Loans are subject to guaranty fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of loan amount, to be used to cover losses on loans. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guaranty loans. Interest rates and maturities of loans controlled by laws applicable to World War II and Korean veterans, now and in the future. (Under Public Law 86–73, maximum interest rate is 5¼ percent per annum.) Termination date of guaranty and direct loan program is 10 years after end of induction period, except for loans on which VA commitments have been issued before such date.

TAX CREDIT FOR EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education.

This bill is identical to the proposal I offered last year as an amendment to the 1964 tax cut bill. The amendment was narrowly defeated by a 45-to-48 vote. It provides an income tax credit on the first $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies to anyone who pays these expenses for a student at an institution of higher education. It is cosponsored by Senators DOMINICK, ALLOTT, BENNETT, BOGGS, BREWSTER, CANNON, CASE, DODD, EASTLAND, ERVIN, FANNIN, FONG, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, HICKENLOOPER, JACKSON, JORDAN of Idaho, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCGOVERN, MILLER, MONTOYA, MORTON, MUNDT, PASTORE, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, SCOTT, SIMPSON, THURMOND, and TOWER.

The concept of tax relief to ease the burden of the high costs of higher education has been advanced many times in the past. In the past decade over 400 bills have been introduced in this and the other body. In the last Congress alone, 19 bills of this nature were introduced in the Senate and over 100 in the House.

I first proposed tax relief for college expenses 2 years ago in a speech on this floor.

This year we must squarely face the issue of providing tax relief to ease the heavy burden of college costs. It has been discussed for a decade. Now we must decide if, as a nation, we are to treat education costs as we do the interest on a home mortgage, or flood damage, or health expenses.

This proposal is for the average family in America. Their income is made up almost entirely of salary. They work hard to earn that salary, and it is all taxable.

If they pay a $1,000 medical bill, they get some tax relief. If a tornado or a flood causes them $1,000 of damage, they get some tax relief. But when they pay $1,000 a year for 4 years to send their sons and daughters to college, they bear that burden without adequate help from our tax laws.

I believe the time has come to recognize that these average Americans are entitled to a break. When they pay large sums to provide their children or themselves with a college education, they are spending money in the national interest, and it is entirely appropriate for the Nation to ease their burden through the tax laws.

Our tax laws recognize also the importance of investment. Both in 1962 and again last year tax laws were enacted making substantial provision for tax relief when investment was made in new plant and equipment. Investment in our future as a nation—in the education of college students—is just as entitled to a tax credit as investment in a new plant and equipment.

So however we approach it—relief from the burden of a heavy, extraordinary expense or inducement to invest—tax credit for higher education costs is a must.

The bill introduced today was jointly developed last year by the original cosponsors who included Senators BREWSTER, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, DODD, DOMINICK, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, Keating, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, and SCOTT. It was designed to provide the necessary tax relief to those who need it most. The principal features of the proposal are as follows:

First. The bill provides an income tax credit on $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. The credit is subtracted from the amount of taxes which are due, at the bottom of the income tax form, after all deductions and exemptions have been taken into account and after the appropriate tax rate has been applied. Thus, each dollar of tax credit is a dollar actually saved by the taxpayer.

Second. The credit is computed as follows: 75 percent of the first $200 of expenses, 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the next $1,000. For example, expenses of $300 would result in a credit of $175, while expenses of $1,500 would result in a credit of $325.

The sliding scale formula has been adopted to equalize the benefit of the credit with respect to students at private and public colleges. Tuition charges average a much smaller amount at public colleges than at private colleges. On the other hand, the nontuition expenses such as room and board are a much larger percentage of the total college costs at a public college than they are at a private college. The credit does not apply to room and board expenses. Therefore, the fairest way to equalize the benefit between public and private college students is to provide a larger percentage of credit on the first few hundred dollars of tuition expenses.

While the dollar amount of relief would be higher at private colleges, the percentage of relief would be actually greater at State and land-grant institutions. For instance, the median charge for tuition and fees in all public institutions of higher education for 1962–63 was $170. Books and supplies cost an additional $90. A taxpayer sending his son or daughter to such a college would be entitled to a tax credit of $165 or almost 100 percent of the total tuition cost. He would be entitled to a credit of $253 if the student attended a private institution of median cost—or roughly only 40 percent of the total tuition cost at such an institution.

Third. The credit is available to anyone who pays for the tuition expenses—parents, students, or any other person who pays for a student's higher education.

Fourth. There is a limitation on the credit so that it gives less dollar benefit to upper middle income groups and no benefit to high income groups. The credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000. In other words, for every $5,000 of adjusted gross income above $25,000, the credit is reduced by $50. As a result, the taxpayer earning $40,000 gets less benefit than the taxpayer at the $10,000 or $20,000 level, and the taxpayer at the $57,500 level gets no benefit at all.

The primary purpose of this bill is to ease the heavy financial burden of college costs and thus to help reach the goal of enabling every deserving young man and woman in this country to obtain a college education. It is primarily a tax measure but it aids education too. The financial burdens of high college costs are just as entitled to be eased through tax relief as medical expenses and casualty losses. These college costs hit middle income and lower middle income families with an impact that hurts. The man earning $8,000, $10,000 or $15,000 faces a heavy burden in paying $2,000, $1,000 or even $500 for college costs. And this man is generally not eligible for scholarship or loan funds to aid his son or daughter. For example, under the National Defense Education Act loan program, 71 percent of the families receiving loan funds have incomes below $6,000.

But this bill is not offered as a substitute for any other form of aid to higher education. We need funds for buildings, for scholarships, for loans, for teacher training institutes, for graduate fellowships, and for research. All will help higher education, and I support these programs. But the need for these programs do not in any way lessen the need to ease financial burden of high college costs.

This proposal was criticized last year on a number of counts, often by critics who did not know what it provided. Let us deal with those objections one by one now so that future discussion and debate can be based on fact, not fancy.

First. It is claimed the bill helps the wealthy. The fact is, the $5,000 man gets more benefit than the $30,000 man, and the $60,000 man gets no benefit at all.

Sixty-two percent of the dollar benefit goes to families with incomes between $3,000 and $10,000 who happen to comprise 62 percent of our population; 91 percent of the benefit goes to families below $20,000 of income. This is not a millionaire's bill for one simple reason: the millionaire gets no benefit whatsoever. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a chart showing the dollar benefit distribution under this bill.

Second. It is claimed the bill discriminates against the poor. The fact is the credit operates exactly like all other tax relief provisions of the Internal Revenue Code: It is available only to those who pay a tax. The medical deduction is not used by nontaxpayers, yet who would oppose it on that ground? And who would argue that it discriminates against the very poor? All credits and deductions provide no relief to those who pay no tax. Why then should this one credit be attacked for such a reason? Those in the very low income groups who pay no taxes need a sound program of student aid including scholarships. I am for such a program. It is needed in addition to tax relief for middle-income families. These are not alternatives. They are both necessities.

Third. It is claimed the bill favors the high-tuition colleges; most of which are private colleges. The fact is the bill favors the low-tuition colleges, most of which are public colleges. For instance, the credit on a $200 expense is $150. That is 75 percent. The credit on a $1,000 expense is $275. That is only 27 percent. Even where a college charges no tuition, the expense of fees, books, and supplies invariably totals $200 or more.

Those who claim this proposal favors high-tuition colleges are looking just at the dollar amounts of the credit. It is true that the credit on $1,000 of tuition is more dollars than the credit on $200 of tuition. But that cannot possibly be the test of discrimination or else every credit and deduction in the Internal Revenue Code would be similarly attacked. The investment credit gives far more dollar benefit to the man who buys a $100,000 machine than to the man who buys a $10,000 machine, but who would call that discrimination?

While most credits in the Internal Revenue Code work on a flat percentage basis the credit provided for in this bill has been weighted in favor of the low tuition colleges. This is done by using the sliding scale formula, whereby the greatest percentage of credit is computed on the lowest amount of tuition.

The only sensible way to measure the fairness of a tax relief measure is to see what share of the burden is eased. This credit saves 75 percent of the $200 burden and only 27 percent of the $1,000 burden. So the man with a $200 expense has $50 left to pay, and the man with a $1,000 expense has $730 left to pay. How that result can be said to work against the $200 man is more than I can understand.

This argument about the low tuition colleges has been put forth most vigorously on behalf of the land-grant colleges and the State universities. I strongly suspect that many presidents of these colleges who attacked the bill last year did not realize that it actually favors the low tuition colleges. Even then, I am sure that the parents and students at these colleges and universities favor this bill. And I am sure that many other critics of the proposal have no idea what the costs really are of attending these colleges.

I have prepared a table showing what the dollar benefit of the credit would be on tuition, fees, books, and supplies at most of the State universities and land-grant colleges of America. The tuition and fee figures were supplied by the Office of Education. To these has been added the Office's $90 estimate for books and supplies. I ask unanimous consent

to insert this table in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Fourth. It is claimed the tax credit will produce tuition increases. The fact is that tuitions go up whether tax relief is granted or not. Colleges set their charges by the expenses they face, not by what the traffic will bear. But if there are colleges that raise their tuition whenever they find that parents have some extra money, then they will do so whether or not this bill is enacted. For these colleges will know that parents already have extra money because of the rate reductions in last year's tax bill. Finally, the bill provides only a 10-percent credit on expenses over $500, so every added $100 of tuition over $500 results in only a $10 saving to the parent—scarcely an incentive to the college.

Mr. President, in submitting this bill, I want to emphasize that I will once again push for its early consideration and enactment. Tax legislation is sure to be considered this year. Tax credits for the expense of higher education will also be voted on—one way or another. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk an additional 5 days in order that others who wish to join as cosponsors might do so.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and tables will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 12) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 12

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as 40, and by inserting after section 38 the following new section:

"SEC. 39. EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the expenses of higher education paid by him during the taxable year to one or more institutions of higher education in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT PER INDIVIDUAL.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed $200,

"(B) 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500, and

"(C) 10 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) PRORATION OF CREDIT WHERE MORE THAN ONE TAXPAYER PAYS EXPENSES.—If expenses of higher education of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(3) REDUCTION OF CREDIT.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year, as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year exceeds $25,000.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'expenses of higher education' means—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(B) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(B) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The amounts otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as expenses of higher education of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"(B) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(2) NONCREDIT AND RECREATIONAL, ETC., COURSES.—Amounts paid for expenses of higher education of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(e) DISALLOWANCE OF EXPENSES AS DEDUCTION.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any expense of higher education which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of higher education of any taxpayer who, under regulation prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Expenses of higher education.

"Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

Dollar benefit under Ribicoff bill providing tax credit on 1st $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies at an institution of higher education

	Adjusted gross income up to—							
	$25,000	$30,000	$35,000	$40,000	$45,000	$50,000	$55,000	$60,000
Tuition per student:								
$100	$75	$25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	150	100	$50	0	0	0	0	0
$300	175	125	75	$25	0	0	0	0
$400	200	150	100	50	0	0	0	0
$500	225	175	125	75	$25	0	0	0
$600	235	185	135	85	35	0	0	0
$700	245	195	145	95	45	0	0	0
$800	255	205	155	105	55	$5	0	0
$900	265	215	165	115	65	15	0	0
$1,000	275	225	175	125	75	25	0	0
$1,100	285	235	185	135	85	35	0	0
$1,200	295	245	195	145	95	45	0	0
$1,300	305	255	205	155	105	55	$5	0
$1,400	315	265	215	165	115	65	15	0
$1,500	325	275	225	175	125	75	25	0

Dollar benefit of Ribicoff tax credit bill on tuition, fees, and books at State universities and land-grant colleges

	Resident		Nonresident	
	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit
Alabama A. & M. College	$274	$169	$394	$199
Auburn University	315	179	615	237
University of Alabama	350	188	700	245
University of Alaska	328	182	628	238
Arizona State University	320	180	920	267
University of Arizona	297	174	897	265
Arkansas A. & M.	270	168	470	218
University of Arkansas	290	173	560	231
University of California	263–314	166–179	863–914	261–274
Colorado State University	330	183	750	266
University of Colorado	370	193	994	250
University of Connecticut	250	163	650	240
Delaware State College	245	161	495	224
Florida A. & M.	270	168	620	237
University of Florida	316	179	666	242
Florida State University	316	179	666	242
Fort Valley State College	315	179	615	237
Georgia Institute of Technology	399	200	789	254
University of Georgia	350	188	695	245
University of Hawaii	338	185	338	185
University of Idaho	254	164	564	231
Southern Illinois University	275	169	425	206
University of Illinois	360	190	710	246
Indiana University	390	198	795	255
Purdue University	390	198	940	269
Iowa State	387	197	690	244
University of Iowa	380	195	710	246
Kansas State University	334	184	664	241
University of Kansas	314	179	664	241
Kentucky State College	264	166	414	204
University of Kentucky	310	178	610	236
Louisiana State University	260	165	560	231
University of Maine	490	223	890	264
University of Maryland	396	199	746	250
Maryland State College	271	168	421	205
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1,790	325	1,790	325
University of Massachusetts	514	226	914	266
Michigan State University	414	204	960	271
University of Michigan	370	193	990	274
Rutgers (New Jersey)	596	235	696	245
New Mexico State University	340	185	590	234
University of New Mexico	390	198	660	241
Cornell University	1,790	325	1,790	325
State University of New York	515–865	227–226	515–1,085	227–284
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical	410	203	660	241
University of North Carolina	375	194	800	255
North Carolina State College	409	202	834	258
North Dakota State University	390	198	660	241
University of North Dakota	390	198	660	241
Kent State (Ohio)	486	222	816	257
Miami University (Ohio)	490	223	890	264
Ohio State University	465	216	960	271
Wayne State University	402	201	840	259
University of Minnesota	405	201	870	262
Alcorn A. & M. (Mississippi)	276	169	476	219
Mississippi State University	361	190	761	251
University of Mississippi	371	193	770	252
Lincoln University (Missouri)	223	156	323	181
University of Missouri	305	176	605	236
Montana State College	420	205	758	251
Montana State University	400	200	738	249
University of Nebraska	354	189	594	234
University of Nevada	351	188	951	270
University of New Hampshire	492	223	1,037	279
Ohio University	540	229	940	269
Langston University (Oklahoma)	274	169	537	229
Oklahoma State University	314	179	666	242
University of Oklahoma	300	175	630	238
Oregon State University	465	216	1,035	279
University of Oregon	420	205	990	274
Pennsylvania State University	615	237	1,140	279
University of Puerto Rico	247	162	1,057	281
University of Rhode Island	415	204	915	267
Clemson College (South Carolina)	546	230	796	255
South Carolina State College	380	195	610	236
South Dakota State College	388	197	526	228
State University of South Dakota	378	195	546	230
University of Tennessee	315	179	615	237
Prairie View A. & M. (Texas)	239	160	539	229
Texas A. & M. University	257	164	557	231
Texas Technical College	242	163	542	229
University of Texas	234	159	534	228
Utah State University	309	177	474	219
University of Utah	390	198	585	234
University of Vermont	581	233	1,365	312
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	420	205	750	250
Virginia State College	430	208	600	235
University of Virginia	467	217	967	273
University of Washington	390	198	690	244
Washington State University	390	198	690	244
West Virginia University	320	180	850	260
University of Wisconsin	390	198	1,090	284
University of Wyoming	386	197	686	244

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, FONG, MORSE, THURMOND, LAUSCHE, and MCGOVERN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be left at the desk for 5 days so that other Senators who wish to do so will have an opportunity to join as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This bill, S. 14, if enacted into law, would curtail the shipment in interstate commerce and delivery by common carrier of mail-order firearms to juveniles under the age of 18 years and to persons with felony convictions.

It would accomplish this by providing that the potential purchaser of a mail-order gun enclose a notarized affidavit with his purchase order to establish his bona fide age, name, address, felony convictions, and whether he has complied with local State firearms laws.

The affidavit must contain the name and address of the principal local law-enforcement authority in his community. The seller is then required to forward, by registered letter, a copy of the affidavit and a description of the gun to the law-enforcement officer named in the affidavit with return receipt requested.

Mr. President, I believe this bill would bring a reasonable measure of regulation to the vast interstate commerce in firearms now being conducted via the mail-order, common carrier route.

S. 14 is identical to S. 1975, which died in the last Congress without a vote ever being taken on it.

I feel strongly about this legislation, as I know many of my colleagues do. But our concern over the mail-order gun problem and our efforts to do something about it were not enough to get my or any other bill through the Senate during the 88th Congress.

In short, I think the gun interests prevailed in this matter last year. My proposal was killed, as has been every other serious attempt to amend the Federal firearms laws since their enactment.

I want to make it clear now that my amendment was shouted down by an unreasonably and unjustly opposed small, vocal, and well-organized hard-core minority.

This din of opposition began on August 2, 1963, when the bill was first introduced by myself along with Senators ERVIN, BAYH, Kefauver, and FONG. And this opposition was a novel situation considering that the amendment had the prior approval of those concerned with the problem, including the Treasury Department which enforces the law, the National Rifle Association, which represents the Nation's sportsmen, the manufacturers of firearms, the importers of firearms, and others involved in the sale of weapons.

This legislation was neither hastily conceived nor hastily introduced, nor poorly thought out as the public has been led to believe. For almost 3 calendar years, during which time the bill was drawn, those who would be most affected by its adoption were consulted on each provision, at each step on the way, as it were. The result was almost unanimous approval of the amendment when it was introduced on August 2, 1963, almost 4 months prior to the assassination of President Kennedy with a mail-order gun and the subsequent murder of Officer Tippit with a mail-order gun.

The gun interests knew the history of this legislation; but, following President Kennedy's assassination, the gun lobby exploited a cry of "hysteria." There was much flag waving, highly emotional appeals about disarming the law-abiding citizen, constant misinterpretation of the Supreme Court's decisions in this area, and repeated attempts to confuse the issue in the minds of the public. These devices were used in speeches, national and local advertising, public appearances by prominent persons, weasel-worded statements before congressional committees, and personal contacts.

Altogether the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has intensively investigated this problem for more than 4 years.

During the extensive hearings we held prior to the introduction of the original bill, we documented, conclusively, I believe, the existence of a mail-order firearms problem in the United States and the need for remedial legislation.

I would like to cite only a few of the many startling facts that we uncovered.

We found that mail-order firearms were being consigned to juveniles and criminals in the city of Pittsburgh in contravention of the Uniform Firearms Act provisions of the laws of the State of Pennsylvania.

We found that hardened felons had ordered and received mail-order firearms in Los Angeles which were subsequently used in the commission of armed robberies.

We found that the Sullivan law of the State of New York was being circumvented by the shipment into that State of mail order firearms consigned to felons.

We found that 25 percent of the mail order firearms which were shipped into the District of Columbia were consigned to persons with criminal records.

We found that virtually no effective control over the interstate traffic in firearms exists today.

And we found that responsible Federal, State, and local officials recommend and strongly support Federal legislation which would place the necessary controls over this traffic in firearms.

It was evident to me and a majority of this subcommittee that remedial legislation was not only prudent, but vital if the flow of firearms interstate were to be curtailed.

To insure that legislation would be developed which would not unduly restrict the rights of the law-abiding citizen to own and possess firearms, I sought and received the counsel of the domestic firearms industry and the sporting fraternity.

A series of conferences were held in the Senate Office Building attended by representatives of the firearms industry, gun clubs, the appropriate Federal executive agencies, and the subcommittee staff, to draft a bill which in the opinion of those concerned would effect positive results but which would not infringe the liberties of responsible citizens.

This, I believe, was accomplished and the bill was introduced.

S. 1975 was referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. However, no action was scheduled until the tragic assassination of President Kennedy with a mail order rifle in Dallas.

An outraged citizenry was stunned by the ease with which the assassin purchased and received his firearm. My mail overwhelmingly reflected this.

With public attention thus focused on the problem, public hearings were scheduled by the Commerce Committee and were held in December of 1963, and January and March of 1964.

I testified to the need for Federal legislation before the Commerce Committee on December 13, and appeared again in March 1964 to clarify misconceptions and distortions which were published concerning the provisions of my bill.

On August 11, 1964, the bill died when the Senate Commerce Committee adjourned without voting on it.

Mr. President, I continue to believe in this bill. Independent polls have shown that more than 70 percent of the American public favors more control over mail order firearms and the great majority of the editorials and articles that have been written on the mail order gun problem support my proposal.

And I mean to see to it that this time S. 14 does not fall victim of the same forces that brought about the demise of the bill in the last Congress.

The FBI uniform crime statistics, released in July 1964 for the year 1963, are perhaps the best attestation to the seriousness of the continuing and growing misuse of firearms in this country.

There were 8,500 willful killings during 1963. Firearms were used in 56 percent of all murders.

The FBI report concludes:

> The easy accessibility of firearms and the lethal nature of the gun are clearly apparent in these murder figures. When assaults by type of weapon are examined, a gun proves to be seven times more deadly than all other weapons combined.

The most recent FBI figures indicates that for the first 9 months of 1964, there was a 10 percent increase in murders committed in this country compared to the same period in 1963.

When we consider the fact that mail order sales account for one-half of the total guns sold; that criminals in cities with tight gun laws avail themselves of mail order guns; and that juvenile delinquents are prime users of mail order guns, we can appreciate the important effects these sales have on these FBI statistics.

The subcommittee's continuing investigation reveals there is still a serious mail order firearm problem throughout the Nation. For example, we found that over a recent 3-year period, just two Los Angeles firms sent 4,069 firearms to consignees in Chicago. Subcommittee investigators with the help of the Chicago

police found that 25 percent of these consignees had criminal records in that city.

A person must have a permit to purchase a gun in Chicago, yet 95 percent of these people did not have permits. And that is the point of this bill in a nutshell.

It would guarantee that a person did not buy a gun through the mails in contravention of local laws. Without this bill, the police of Chicago and other cities across the land are virtually powerless to stop the flow of guns across State and city borders.

There is no doubt that the mail order firearm problem will not be resolved until the Federal Government enacts the necessary remedial legislation.

I hope that this bill will receive prompt consideration in the Senate Commerce Committee and on the floor of the Senate. Each day of added delay is costing human lives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 14) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1250) is amended to read as follows:

"That as used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, or corporation.

"(2) The term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between any State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any possession or the District of Columbia. The term 'State' shall be held to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'firearm' means any weapon, by whatsoever name known, which will, or is designed to, or which may be readily converted to, expel a projectile or projectiles by the action of an explosive, the frame or receiver of any such weapon, or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer.

"(4) The term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the manufacture or importation of firearms for purposes of sale or distribution; and the term 'licensed manufacturer' means any such person licensed under the provisions of this Act.

"(5) The term 'dealer' means (a) any person engaged in the business of selling firearms at wholesale or retail; (b) any person engaged in the business of repairing such firearms or of manufacturing or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms, or (c) any person who is a pawnbroker. The term 'licensed dealer' means any dealer who is licensed under the provisions of this Act.

"(6) The term 'fugitive from justice' means any person who has fled from any State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States, (a) to avoid prosecution for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year; or (b) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding.

"(7) The term 'pawnbroker' means any person whose business or occupation includes the taking or receiving, by way of pledge or pawn, of any firearm as security for the repayment of money loaned thereon.

"(8) The term 'Secretary' or 'Secretary of the Treasury' means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(9) The term 'indictment' includes an indictment or an information in any court of the United States, the several States, possessions, or the District of Columbia under which a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year may be prosecuted.

"(10) The term 'crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year' shall not include any Federal or State offenses pertaining to antitrust violations, unfair trade practices, restraints of trade, or other similar offenses relating to the regulation of business practices as the Secretary may by regulation designate."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsections (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 2 of the Federal Firearms Act are amended by striking out the words "or ammunition" wherever they appear.

(b) Subsection (d) of section 2 of said Act is amended by striking out the word "Territories".

(c) Subsection (f) of section 2 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) It shall be unlawful for any person who is under indictment or who has been convicted by any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or who is a fugitive from justice, to receive any firearm which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce."

(d) Subsection (i) of section 2 of said Act is amended by striking out the words, "and the possession of any such firearm shall be presumptive evidence that such firearm was transported, shipped, or received, as the case may be, by the possessor in violation of this Act."

(e) Section 2 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer knowingly to deliver, or cause to be delivered, to any common or contract carrier for transportation or shipment in interstate or foreign commerce, to persons other than licensed dealers or manufacturers, any package or other container in which there is any firearm without written notice to the carrier that a firearm is being transported or shipped.

"(k) It shall be unlawful for any common or contract carrier to deliver, or cause to be delivered, in interstate or foreign commerce any firearm to any person with knowledge or with reasonable cause to believe that such person is under eighteen years of age.

"(l) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship, or cause to be shipped, any firearm in interstate or foreign commerce to any person (other than to a licensed manufacturer or to a licensed dealer, or to a person exhibiting a State license as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, or for exportation to a foreign country) unless the person to whom such firearm is to be shipped has submitted to such manufacturer or dealer a sworn statement, in duplicate, in such form and manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe, attested to by a notary public, to the effect that (1) such person is eighteen years or more of age, (2) he is not a person prohibited by this Act from receiving a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce, (3) there are no provisions of law, regulations, or ordinances applicable to the locality to which the firearm will be shipped which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession of the firearm, and (4) that (Title ------ ------, Name ------, and Official Address ------) (blanks to be filled in with the title, true name, and address) are the true name and address of the principal law enforcement officer of the locality to which the firearm will be shipped. It shall be unlawful unless such manufacturer or dealer has, prior to the shipment of such firearm, forwarded by United States registered mail (return receipt requested) to the local law enforcement officer named in the sworn statement, the description (including (1) manufacturer thereof, (2) the caliber or gauge, (3) the model and type of firearm but not including serial number identification) of the firearm to be shipped, and one copy of the sworn statement, and has received a return receipt evidencing delivery of the registered letter or such registered letter has been returned to the manufacturer or dealer due to the refusal of the named law enforcement officer to accept such letter as evidenced in accordance with U.S. Post Office Department regulations. It shall be unlawful for any person to cause to be transmitted by United States mail, or to cause to be transmitted in interstate commerce, such a sworn statement which contains any false statement as to any material fact for the purpose of obtaining a firearm from a licensed manufacturer or a licensed dealer.

"This subsection shall not apply in the case of any firearm shipped to a licensed manufacturer or dealer for authorized service and which is being returned to the sender by the manufacturer or dealer and the records of the manufacturer or dealer shall properly show such information."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Any manufacturer or dealer desiring a license to transport, ship, or receive firearms in interstate or foreign commerce shall file an application for such license with the Secretary, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. Each such applicant shall be required to pay a fee for obtaining such license as follows:

"(1) If a manufacturer of firearms, a fee of $50 per annum;

"(2) If a dealer (other than a pawnbroker) in firearms, a fee of $10 per annum; or

"(3) If a pawnbroker, a fee of $50 per annum.

"(b) Upon filing by a qualified applicant of a proper application and the payment of the prescribed fee, the Secretary shall issue to such applicant the license applied for, which shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, entitle the licensee to transport, ship, and receive firearms in interstate or foreign commerce during the period stated in the license. Except that, no license shall be issued pursuant to this Act (1) to any applicant who is under twenty-one years of age; or (2) to any applicant, if the applicant (including, in the case of a corporation, partnership, or association, any individual possessing directly or indirectly, the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of the corporation, partnership, or association) is prohibited by the provisions of this Act from transporting, shipping, or receiving firearms in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(c) The provisions of section 2 (d), (e), and (f) of this Act shall not apply in the case of a licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer who is under indictment for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, provided that such manufacturer or dealer gives notice to the Secretary by registered or certified mail of his indictment within thirty days of the date of the indictment. A licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer who has given notice of his indictment to the Secretary, as provided in this subsection, may continue operations pursuant to his existing license during the term

of such indictment, and until any conviction pursuant to the indictment becomes final, whereupon he shall be fully subject to all provisions of this Act and operations pursuant to such license shall be discontinued.

"(d) Each licensed manufacturer and licensed dealer shall maintain such permanent records of production, importation, shipment, and other disposal of firearms as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to the transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation of any firearms sold or shipped to, or issued for the use of (1) the United States or any department, independent establishment, or agency thereof; (2) any State, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any department, independent establishment, agency, or any political subdivision thereof; (3) any duly commissioned officer or agent of the United States, a State, or possession or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision thereof; (4) to any bank, public carrier, express, or armored-truck company organized and operating in good faith for the transportation of money and valuables, which is granted an exemption by the Secretary; (5) to any research laboratory designated as such by the Secretary; or (6) to the transportation, shipment, or receipt of antique or unserviceable firearms (other than a 'firearm' as defined in section 5848(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) possessed and held as a curio or museum piece.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prevent shipments of firearms to institutions, organizations, or persons to whom firearms may be lawfully delivered by the Secretary of Defense or his delegate, nor to prevent the receipt or transportation of such firearms by their lawful possessors while they are engaged in military training or in competitions."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended by striking out the words "or ammunition."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 5 of said Act is further amended by striking out the words "title 26" where they first appear and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Internal Revenue Code of 1954", and by striking out the words "section 2733 of title 26" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 5848 of said Code."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. The Federal Firearms Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying or affecting the requirements of section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, with respect to the manufacture, exportation, and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

INCREASE TO $2,400 OUTSIDE EARNINGS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today that would increase the amount of money social security beneficiaries can earn before suffering deductions.

Under the present law persons receiving benefits do not suffer deductions for the first $1,200 which they earn. But they then lose $1 for every $2 earned up to $1,700 and $1 for every dollar earned thereafter.

I have long felt this system of deductions to be both unfair and inadequate. It robs many of our citizens of the initiative to better their own circumstances, as well as working a hardship on those who must because of illness or other reasons augment their social security benefits. That is why I am introducing legislation to strengthen our social security system by helping those who have paid money into it and who are now dependent upon it.

My bill would amend the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits.

This legislation conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I am urging its early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 15) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TYDINGS a bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia. This is to be a joint Federal-State venture.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the development of Assateague Island and certain adjacent waters and small marsh islands for public outdoor recreation. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, waters, and other property, and to administer these for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation and conservation. The natural features of the island would be retained for the benefit of the public.

Assateague Island is a low, narrow, undeveloped barrier reef approximately 32 miles in length, lying parallel to the coasts of Maryland and Virginia, separated from the mainland of these States by Sinepuxent and Chincoteague Bays.

But Assateague Island is more than this—it is the largest remaining undeveloped seashore between Cape Cod and Cape Hatteras. It is one of the very few remaining such areas in this country. Within a 250 mile radius of Assateague is to be found one-fifth of the population of the United States—about 33½ million people. Almost one-fourth of this number live within a 3-hour drive of the island.

Thus, Assateague Island represents one of our last opportunities to acquire a sizable seashore for public benefit.

Mr. President, these are the simple geographic facts which motivate my introduction of this legislation. There are, however, additional factors which have influenced my decision on this matter, and which deserve to be made a part of the public record at this time.

For almost three decades, the oustanding recreational values of Assateague Island have been recognized. A 1935 survey of the National Park Service included Assateague as one of the 12 areas along the Atlantic coast to be preserved for public use and enjoyment. In 1943, the Virginia portion of the island was acquired by the Federal Government, and established as the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

In 1955, the National Park Service made a restudy of the Atlantic coast, but made no recommendations with respect to Assateague Island because, at that time, the 14 miles of the island immediately north of the Virginia line were being extensively subdivided by private developers, and it appeared that the opportunity to preserve the natural and untapped recreational resources of the island for the public had been lost.

In 1961, the Maryland General Assembly authorized the State roads commission to construct a bridge connecting Assateague Island with the mainland of Worcester County. The State subsequently acquired 640 acres with 2 miles of ocean frontage for development as a State park, and declared its intention to acquire the remaining 7 miles of the island to the north for similar development.

Tidal storms of 1962–63 focused increased attention on Assateague Island, and pointed up the urgent need for beach-front stabilization and other protective work if the barrier reef was to be preserved in any form for development purposes.

In June of 1962, Maryland Governor Tawes and Interior Secretary Udall agreed to a joint study for purposes of determining the most feasible future utilization of the superb recreational opportunities offered by Assateague Island.

The following spring, the newly created Bureau of Outdoor Recreation published its report recommending the acquisition of Assateague Island for public recreational use. At the same time, contracts were let and construction began on the bridge. The cost of the bridge was to be borne jointly by Worcester County and the State of Maryland.

Since the filing of the report by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, intensive study of the proposals embodied in this report, and endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior, has been carried on by the appropriate agencies of the State government. In addition to these studies, public hearings have been held to permit all interested parties to be heard. Innumerable meetings have taken place between representatives of private property owners on Assateague Island, officials of Worcester County, State officials, and representatives of the Department of the Interior. These meetings have included several inspection tours of the island itself.

In 1963, the Maryland Department of Forests and Parks, under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. S. L. Hammerman, recommended public development

of the island. Similar recommendations have been made by the Maryland Economic Development Commission and the Maryland State Department of Planning. Yesterday, the Maryland Board of Public Works, the State's highest authority in this field, unanimously approved the concept of public development of Assateague Island.

That the various State boards, agencies, and officials have concurred in their approval of a plan for Assateague Island which embodies public development jointly by the State and the Federal Governments is a tribute to their foresight in these matters.

The studies which I have made of the reports issued by the Department of the Interior, the agencies of the State of Maryland, and the Worcester County Commissioners, including the pertinent engineering analysis, have convinced me that the future of this island demands exclusive public development.

Wise conservation and development of our natural resources today will return vast dividends tomorrow. Each failure to act now is an opportunity lost forever. The task of preserving our natural resources becomes more acute each day. To conserve and preserve what is left, and to reclaim some of what has been lost, is an obligation which we owe to ourselves and to future generations. We must continually bear in mind that we are only trustees of a rich and bounteous heritage found in the natural resources of our land.

The rapid rate of our population expansion makes it imperative that we act now to preserve for the residents of our cities, our suburbs, and our towns the recreation areas which will enrich the lives of their inhabitants.

Many of the challenges in the development of adequate recreational facilities are best met at the State and local level. Maryland officials are to be congratulated for their continuing efforts in this regard—efforts which, in the case of Assateague Island, have already brought about the acquisition of parts of that island for State park purposes, and the letter of contracts for bridge construction.

Only through further public development can we hope to preserve what is a precious possession not only of Worcester County but of the Nation. Only through public development will the necessary Federal funds and techniques be available for beach stabilization and protection. Only through public development can we hope to provide the large metropolitan area between Philadelphia and Washington with an unparalleled recreational opportunity. Only through public development can Maryland take advantage of the unrivaled publicity and promotional facilities of the Department of the Interior—facilities which have increased the number of visitors to the Hatteras National Seashore, with no nearby metropolitan area, by 500 percent in a period of 10 years; facilities which can be expected to bring 3 million visitors a year to the Assateague National Seashore by 1975. Only through public development can we expect to provide for the greatest economic benefit to Worcester County and to Maryland from this, one of its most valuable assets.

A national seashore at Assateague will serve as a magnet for visitors which will increase each year. In view of the plans of the Department of the Interior for only minimum facilities on the island itself, the areas adjacent to the island will acquire an enormous potential for private development and growth. With this in mind, it is not too early for the citizens and officials of Worcester County, with the assistance of the State, to begin the preparation of a master plan for the development of facilities along the bay side of the county to service the island.

Mr. President, convinced of the importance of conserving for all time and for all people the unique natural features of Assateague Island, and for the many other reasons cited above, I lay before the Senate today a proposal which would place the entire 32 miles of the island in public ownership, and would make possible the comprehensive planning and development of this magnificent beach through joint State and Federal action.

Under this proposal, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire land, water, and other property within the boundaries of the seashore by donation, purchase, or exchange, or in such other manner as he shall find to be in the public interest, except that any property or interest owned by the States of Maryland or Virginia shall be acquired only with the concurrence of these States.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to assure all Assateague Island property owners that every effort will be made to bring about negotiated settlements of land transfers, and that every property owner will be justly compensated.

Owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary may reserve a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial purposes for a term of 25 years.

The Secretary is authorized and directed to compensate the State of Maryland in the amount of two-thirds of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, presently uncompleted, between Sandy Point and Assateague, and to pay a reasonable share of the cost of operation and maintenance of this bridge and its approaches. The State has agreed to reimburse Worcester County for the full share of its investment in the bridge construction and I have been advised by the Governor that the funds for this reimbursement will be included as part of the program he will present to the Maryland General Assembly later this month.

Since my introduction of the original legislation in September 1963, conferences with other members of the Maryland delegation, with representatives of Worcester County, and with the Department of the Interior have resulted in an amendment to the original bill. This amendment, which is included in the new bill as section 7, provides for selection of 600 acres of suitably elevated land for the construction by private interests of suitable overnight and other public accommodations for visitors to the seashore. These facilities will be subject to taxation by the State and by Worcester County. These facilities, those which are certain to be constructed on the adjacent mainland near the bridge terminus, and the anticipated influx of visitors from across the Nation, will surely mean an unprecedented increase in economic activity and tax revenues for Worcester County.

The State of Maryland shall continue to own the area presently designated as a State park, and shall have the right to acquire from the Department of the Interior any additional area of the island northward from the State park as the State may from time to time determine to be needed for State park purposes.

The Secretary of the Interior will administer the Assateague Island National Seashore for general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. The seashore will furnish unlimited opportunities for hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating, and the park will be open to the public at all times.

Mr. President, I introduced this bill in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. In spite of a crowded committee calendar, and the marathon debates which characterized the 88th, I received the utmost cooperation from my colleague, Senator BIBLE. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, the distinguished Senator from Nevada has performed a magnificent service to future generations of Americans through his careful protection of the great natural beauty of our country.

Through the cooperation of the chairman, the Assateague Island National Seashore proposal received a preliminary hearing on August 11, 1964. At that time, an early resumption of hearings was promised. Recent events have made immediate committee action essential if this great national resource is to be preserved for public enjoyment.

Private commercial developers have been pressing the State very hard for construction permits. The State, which is firmly behind Federal acquisition, has refused to grant the permits based on its ownership of State park land and the failure of developers to provide adequate sanitation plans. In an initial court test, the failure to grant permits has been reversed, and the State has appealed to Maryland's supreme judicial body. Permits will not be granted pending the outcome of this appeal.

The Maryland Court of Appeals is expected to rule early in 1965, perhaps as early as February or March. If the opinion of the lower court is sustained, there is little likelihood that private development can be forestalled. The millions of people living in Baltimore, Washington, Wilmington, and Philadelphia, and those additional millions who will visit the seashore annually, will have been deprived of an unprecedented recreational opportunity.

I hope the Congress can act in time.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be allowed to lie on the table until the close

of business on January 13 so as to give other Senators an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 20) to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO WATER RESOURCES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing four bills in regard to water resources for myself and a number of cosponsors which constitute a rather broad research and planning program in that field. Three of the bills might be described as unfinished business from the 88th Congress, for they were before us last year. Two of the three have been passed by the Senate.

The four bills are the river basin planning bill; a measure to enact title II of the Water Resources Research Act as it was adopted in the last Congress by the Senate but modified in conference; a measure to speed our program of weather modification research, experimentation and testing; and an amendment to the Saline Water Act.

I request that all these bills lie on the desk the remainder of this week to permit Senators who wish to join as cosponsors to do so.

The river basin planning bill, Mr. President, is S. 1111 of the 88th Congress as it was reported favorably to the House of Representatives by the House Interior Committee. It was slightly modified from the Senate version by the House committee to insure the orderly functioning of the river basin planning commissions. The amendments are acceptable. I understand the House committee chairman expects to take the measure up soon and hopes to report it to the House again at an early date. Inasmuch as it has once been approved by the Senate, I hope it will also be handled here without delay.

The planning bill accomplishes three things. It provides for a Federal Water Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. This Council has been functioning on an ad hoc basis for 4 years. The bill also authorizes the establishment of Federal-State river basin planning commissions where and when half the States involved and the Council agree that a commission is desirable. Finally, it authorizes the appropriation of $5 million annually for 10 years to assist State governments in planning for both intrastate and interstate waters.

The planning bill has the vigorous support of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, and many other groups.

The second bill I have introduced, to amend the Water Resources Research Act, restores the language of title II as we passed it in 1963 in this body.

Title II originally authorized the appropriation of $5 million increasing $1 million each year for 5 years to $10 million annually, for the Secretary of the Interior to use to make matching agreements, contracts, grants, or other arrangements with any colleges, universities, private institutes, foundations, or firms or individuals with competence to undertake needed research on water problems.

The House of Representatives eliminated title II entirely from the bill. It agreed in conference to restore an authorization of $1 million each year for 10 years, subject to a preappropriation submission to Congress of research projects proposed to be undertaken with the funds. The President has objected to the proviso. Response to the act has indicated that the sums originally authorized can be fruitfully invested in research in this important area. Many of us feel that we should adopt the program as it was originally proposed.

Resolutions calling for amendment of the bill as I am now proposing have been passed by the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, by a group of colleges and universities in the New England area which conferred on water problems at Cornell University in New York in September, and by a group of foundations and research institutes, including Stanford Research Institute of California and the Illinois Institute of Technology—formerly the Armour Foundation—which met in December at the Brookings Institution here.

The response to the Water Resources Research Act has been very great. The bill as enacted authorized a basic grant to one college or university in each State to help finance a water resources research institute or center, plus matching funds for specific research projects. I am advised that 43 States have already filed applications for their basic grants and that the other 7 have advised the Office of Water Research that they will do so shortly.

The bill was patterned very closely after the Hatch Act of 1887 which established the Agriculture Experiment Stations. That act provided basic grants to each State, then matching funds. In the first year of the Hatch Act, nine States qualified. It was 6 years before all had qualified. We may very well have all 50 of our States qualified for water research work in the first year of operation under S. 2 of the 88th Congress.

In addition to the title I response, I am told that more than 30 research projects have been submitted for assistance under title II. This has been done in spite of the administration's reluctance to implement the title II program until it has been amended.

This response to the act, Mr. President, is proof of nationwide concern with water problems, of a recognition of their importance by our institutions of higher education, and of their willingness to assign some of their most competent personnel to research in the field and to the training of more hydroscientists, who are urgently needed.

The Senate can take a good deal of pride in this Senate-originated measure, and in other water legislation recently enacted and in the process of enactment. These bills stem from the work of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, which was proposed by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD in 1959, and chaired by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma. The select committee did an outstanding job, giving this body, and the Nation, a much needed understanding of the critical nature of our water problems, and the broad outlines of steps necessary for their solution.

The third bill which I am submitting is intended to speed up work on weather modification, and to provide for increased experimentation and field testing of weather modification procedures.

The Senate select committee, in making the Nation's first assessment or inventory of supply and requirements for water by regions, found that five major river basins in the Southwest and the upper Missouri basin would be making full use of all water available to them by 1980. By the year 2000, three additional areas, including the western Great Lakes region, will be at the end of their supply.

The problem of these areas is an additional quantity of water for all uses, to support economic growth.

Throughout the East, and especially in the great industrial area from New England south to Norfolk and then stretching in a band west to Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Kansas City, quantity is not so great a problem as quality. There is a growing stringency for unpolluted, usable water supplies. A great deal of storage is going to have to be built in the East to store municipal water and to augment minimum flows for waste dilution.

Increased precipitation, either as rainfall or snowfall, will prove as helpful to the East in meeting dilution flow requirements within the next few years as to the arid Western States. Acceleration of weather modification studies, as proposed in the bill I am offering, is consequently of national interest. I hope it will not be regarded as a sectional matter.

We have two situations in the West which make weather modification experimentation there appropriate, in addition to our urgent need for water. There are large, sparsely settled or unsettled areas where experiments can be run with minimum danger of damage. We also have some fully developed river systems where reservoirs can catch and store all runoff waters regardless of when and where the precipitation occurs within the basins.

It is no longer necessary to make water fall on a specific farm or ranch at a specific time to give value to weather modification. With basinwide reservoir systems, clouds can be "milked" anytime they occur and the water stored. It is now obvious that within a generation or two we are going to have full development and control of most of the major

river systems in the Nation. What we can develop now in the weather modification field will be of value throughout the Nation, and even the world, in a very few years.

Under the circumstances, the relatively small authorization proposed in this accelerated weather modification proposal is both timely and modest.

The last of the four measures I am offering is an amendment to the Saline Water Act.

For centuries men have tried to find a cheap way to make fresh water from the ocean. Shortage of pure water in arid areas, and periodic droughts have resulted in as serious disasters to the human race as has too much water in other instances.

With our increasing population, the seasons of drought, and the pollution of many of our water sources becoming a more serious problem as the years passed, President Truman in 1949 recognized that we had been doing too little to develop ways and means of desalting sea and brackish water. He recommended to the Congress that legislation be passed to provide a program of research and demonstration of practical means for producing from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use. The President had in mind a broad program, and visualized such a program as the only means by which early results could be obtained.

On the basis of President Truman's recommendation a bill was introduced in the House by Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of San Diego, Calif., and one by the late Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming early in the 81st Congress. Hearings were conducted and a great deal of work was done on this legislation but the legislation died at the end of the 81st Congress.

Similar legislation was reintroduced in the 82d Congress by Senator O'Mahoney and the late Senator Engle, then Congressman from California. I conducted hearings in the Senate beginning March 15, 1951. The legislation was supported by the Department of the Interior. The Senate bill 5 was reported to the Senate and the Engle bill was passed by the House. When the House bill came to the Senate the language of S. 5 was substituted and the House bill approved and became Public Law 448 on July 3, 1952.

The President had recommended $25 million for the program; however, the Congress chose to proceed more cautiously and approved only $2 million for a 6-year program; $175,000 of this was authorized for the fiscal year 1953.

Although this legislation was not what we hoped for, it was a beginning and in 1955 the Congress increased the authorization to $10 million and extended the program from 6 to 14 years.

Three years elapsed during which it became obvious that private industry had perfected techniques and equipment for converting saline and brackish water which gave promise of meeting, at an early date, the goals of the saline water program.

The Department of the Interior, now under a different management, seemed reluctant to move promptly to demonstrate processes that it had not generated from its own research, and there was no evidence of an energetic demonstration program being carried out by the Department of Interior.

Therefore, in 1958, after nearly a year of preparation, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 135, "To provide for a full-scale demonstration plant for production from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses." This resolution authorized $10 million for the construction of a full-scale plant. I stated at the introduction of this bill that we hoped to do in the saline water program what we had done in the atomic energy program, and that is to demonstrate in an actual production test knowledge and equipment which had resulted to date from research, both public and private, into techniques of desalting water.

The task of getting this legislation finally approved was long and arduous. There was opposition from the Department of Interior. Those connected with the program wanted to hold the program to the former type of research program and limit the size of plants to the degree that they would not be able to demonstrate on a large scale. After hearings and considerable work, the opposition of the Department of Interior to the demonstration idea was overcome. After being amended to provide for five demonstration plants, the bill was finally signed on September 2, 1958 and became Public Law 85–883.

This legislation did not end the research program but in effect it divided the overall saline water program into two parts: First, a research and development program, authorized by the act of July 3, 1952, and broadened by Public Law 84–111 in 1955; and second a demonstration plant program designed to produce the concrete results designed from the beginning.

Interest in the saline water program continued to spread throughout the United States and several foreign nations. In the 87th Congress, I sponsored a bill to provide for additional research and development in the saline water field. This included economic studies, studies of methods and uses of byproducts, development of plant processes and designs and annual reports with recommendations for location and operation of new demonstration plants. The law, as finally passed provided $75 million for this program during the years 1962 through 1967. This was sponsored in the House by Congressman ASPINALL. The Senate proposed $100 million for this program and the House $50 million and the final act was a compromise between the House and Senate.

Some fine progress has been made with this program, but now we are ready to go on to bigger plants. The President has expressed a keen interest and strong support for this program and I understand that there will be some budget increase for the work. The Department of Interior has signed contracts for studies of conceptual designs for combination water desalting and power generating plants which would turn out 50 million gallons of fresh water per day. Even though we have made some fine progress there remain a great many problems and especially when we begin to move to plants that will produce 50 to 100 million gallons of fresh water per day. We are not sure what we will run into in these large plants in connection with such problems as heat exchanges, cost of pumping, pressures, and heavy scaling. These are mostly engineering problems but they must be solved and it will take additional money and time to build larger plants and work on these problems. I do not believe that we have any time to lose because the water shortages exist today.

The bill that I am introducing today will amend the Saline Water Act of September 22, 1961, in order to permit the acceleration of the saline water conversion program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 21. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HART, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 22. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

S. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 24. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to set aside part of Antelope Island—the largest island in Great Salt Lake—as a national monument. The National Park Service is wholly in accord with this proposal, and has already given a favorable report to an identical bill I introduced in the 88th Congress (S. 25).

Great Salt Lake is unique among American bodies of water. It possesses

singular scientific and recreational attractions. Yet neither can be fully appreciated or enjoyed because they are not accessible.

Ever since our celebrated lakeshore resort, Saltair, was closed some years ago, facilities for bathing in the lake have been very limited. And nothing has been done to preserve and make accessible to all the tremendous geological story the lake has to tell, or to give to outdoor lovers the satisfaction that comes from viewing the vast panorama of the lake's windswept beaches and surrounding mountains from one of the islands.

A national monument on Antelope would restore and develop these striking values of Great Salt Lake. I propose that the monument embrace only the western side of the island, where the waters are deepest, and that the eastern side of the island, where an operating ranch is now located, be excluded, for the present at least. This would establish a national monument about 14 miles long and 4 miles wide, enclosing approximately 16,300 acres of land and 4,500 acres of water.

Within these boundaries would be enough of the rugged mountain range which runs down the center of the island to provide for an entertaining and educational display of the geologic history of the Great Basin area from the present time back to the ice age. The monument would also embrace enough of the shoreline to allow for the establishment of suitable facilities for public bathing in the briney water which is unlike any this side of the Dead Sea, and for the construction of ramps so that boats could be launched into the dense blue water nearly one-third salt in content.

While Great Salt Lake is remarkable in itself, it is the key to a much broader geological study, as I have indicated. Schoolchildren are taught throughout our land that the lake is the remnant of vastly larger ancient lakes that were formed in the Great Basin during the ice age of the Pleistocene epoch, beginning roughly 1 million years ago and ending only about 10,000 years ago.

At different levels above the present surface of Great Salt Lake, the shorelines of the larger ancestral lakes occupying the area are easily recognized. These lake levels extend up across the beaches of Antelope Island and on up its rugged mountain range. Each lake level bears a different name—Bonneville, Provo, Stansberry, and Gilbert. The ancient lake which eroded the highest level has been named in honor of Capt. B. L. E. Bonneville who explored much of the area between 1832 and 1836. At its maximum size, Lake Bonneville occupied much of western Utah, and extended more than 300 miles from the extreme southern part of Idaho nearly as far as the Arizona boundary. The waters lapped against the Wasatch Mountains on the east and spread 180 miles to the west into Nevada. Its total area was approximately 20,000 square miles—more than twice the area of Massachusetts.

Geologists estimate that Lake Stansberry, corresponding to the shoreline 300 feet above the present lake, existed some 23,000 years, while Lake Gilbert existed a short time and shrunk to a level only about 400 feet above the present lake. This whole story is etched on Antelope Island.

For those who want scenery with their geology, the ravines between the peaks are filled with gray-green sage, service berries, and willows, and, in season, with starchroot, sunflowers, and wild roses. Mountain climbing and hiking are a challenge with a spectacular view in every direction. To the west is the burnt umber of the Oquirrh Mountains—to the east the smoky brown of the Wasatch Range, with towering snow-covered peaks of the Wasatch Front, a great geologic fault of ancient days.

The fascination of Great Salt Lake is well described in a magnificent book on it written by Dale L. Morgan. I quote him:

> Visitors have called its waters bright emerald, grayish green, and leaden gray; they have called them sapphire and turquoise and cobalt—and they have all been right. Its colors vary with the time of day, the state of the weather, the season of the year, the vantage point from which it is seen. It can lie immobile in its mountain setting like a vast, green light-filled mirror or, lashed by a sudden storm, rise wrathful in its bed to assault boats and its shoreline with smashing 4-foot waves. The wind is its only master.

Thousands of Americans have seen the lake from the windows of a pullman car, as they crossed the Lucin Cutoff. This, Mr. Morgan holds, is to miss the real lure of the lake. He sums it up this way:

> The feel of the sun and the salt on your skin, the wide sweep of the open sapphire sky, the strangely scented wind raucous with the screaming of the gulls, the intermingled beauty and striped ugliness of the lake and the shore * * * in all these things is something of the experience of great Salt Lake.

During the three centuries of written history, the lake has been a magnet for all types of men. Spaniards, mountain explorers, and other adventurers sought it out. For years this strange body of water beckoned the intrepid and the fearless. Many expeditions charted and studied it. Later the Mormons found it and in the Great Salt Lake Valley their promised land.

During the years of the westward migrations, the lake and the blazing salt deserts to the west of it formed a barrier to the march to California, lengthening the trail by many miles. Those who tried to cross the salt desert directly lost their wagons, their animals, and sometimes their lives, and wrote tragic chapters in pioneer history.

Years later—in your time and mine—these salt flats came into their own as an internationally famous track for the great auto racing meets beginning in the thirties. Speed records were broken then by Utah's own Ab Jenkins, and England's Sir Malcolm Campbell. Again this past fall the salt flats were the scene of new recordbreaking speed tests, with Art Arfons driving a car at an average speed of 536.71 miles an hour to break all previous world land speed records.

I began almost as soon as I came to the Senate 6 years ago to seek ways to develop the potential of Great Salt Lake. In both the 86th and 87th Congresses I introduced bills to establish a Great Salt Lake National Park, which would have included all of both Antelope and Fremont Islands, and a substantial portion of the lake itself. Hearings were held on this bill in Utah, and the support for it was overwhelming. I also requested that the National Park Service make an official survey of the area encompassed by the bill. Highly skilled people with years of experience in evaluating and developing park projects found the area of great interest. The National Park Service report made three special points:

First. Great Salt Lake illustrates outstandingly significant scientific values worthy of preservation and interpretation either by the Federal or State governments.

Second. No existing area in the national park system duplicates the values of Great Salt Lake.

Third. The north end of Antelope Island was the most impressive site for development.

When this report came out, I decided that a bill establishing a national monument on Antelope Island would make the most of the lake's potential, and eliminate any objection which might arise from trying to incorporate sections of the lake precluded from recreation use because of industrial and municipal pollution. I introduced the first monument bill last session.

Construction of an improved access highway across the lake would bring Antelope Island within less than a 30-minute drive from Salt Lake City. My bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior may construct a causeway or causeways to the island. Because of the shallow water to the east and south, shoreline area roads could be built easily.

My bill would also permit the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain boating and bathing facilities on the Antelope Island beaches. It likewise contains a section protecting all present rights of the State of Utah, its political subdivisions, and persons, to water flowing into the lake, to minerals there—including oil and gas—and to chemicals outside the monument boundaries. No effort will be made to control the lake level, and no requirements so to do may be laid on the National Park Service. The monument will not limit or impair private recreation facilities, nor mining of salt or other minerals elsewhere in the lake.

This Great Salt Lake Monument bill already has the support of the vast majority of the citizens of my State of Utah, and I am hopeful it will receive the support of the remainder of the country. It would preserve an area unduplicated in any of our other national parks or monuments for the wonderment and enjoyment of generations to come.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 25) to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GOLDEN SPIKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a Golden Spike National Monument at Promontory, 30 miles west of Brigham City in Box Elder County, Utah.

It was at Promontory, as every schoolboy knows, that the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869. President Leland Stanford of the Central Pacific and Vice President Durant of the Union Pacific drove a golden spike to climax the road building race—1,800 hand-built miles of track in 6½ years.

The event fulfilled the dream of Columbus for a shorter route to the Orient, insured possession of the entire West for the United States and began a new era of development for the Nation.

The spot where this historic event took place is now commemorated as the Golden Spike National Historical Site. A small monument has been erected by the National Park Service, and each year the driving of the spike is reenacted by the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County.

I have long felt that the importance of this event in the history and economic development of our Nation deserved greater recognition than the small monument now erected there. I have been trying to obtain either an expanded historical site, or a national monument, which would include some of the old historic roadbed, and a railroad museum.

Last March a significant step was taken toward this goal when the Southern Pacific Railroad deeded to the Federal Government some 730 acres including 15 miles of the old roadbed. The Department of Justice, however, has now raised some questions concerning the title to this land, and without a clear title the Federal Government cannot spend funds for the development of an expanded Golden Spike area.

I feel that this whole problem should come before the Congress, and I am introducing the bill for this purpose. The National Park Service is anxious to move ahead with development of the Golden Spike area. I have conferred many times with National Park Director George Hartzog about it.

The driving of the golden spike at Promontory, Utah, was more than just an event. It symbolized the linking of a continent, and the opening up of the West. It is not now properly commemorated, and I seek to remedy this at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 26) authorizing the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. Moss was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GLEN CANYON RECREATION AREA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to create a Glen Canyon Recreation Area. Authority to create this area was contained in the Colorado River storage project—Public Law 84-485—but I have found that this authority does not provide an adequate basis for administering the Glen Canyon Recreation Area, and I seek to establish the area by enactment of a new law which spells out in detail its purposes and how they shall be realized.

I think it important that this be done. Glen Canyon Recreation Area has been called "America's Newest Playground." It is without doubt one of the most overpoweringly beautiful sections of the country. For countless centuries it has been remote and lonely. A few lucky people saw parts of it by horseback; others glimpsed far horizons and meager parts of it in adventuresome boat trips down the Colorado River. But, now the waters of the Colorado have backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam to form Lake Powell, and miles and miles of this magnificent towering, red rock country have become accessible to all by modern motor launch. Whole canyons, never before entered are now easily entered and explored. The accessibility and beauty of Glen Canyon have been multiplied a thousandfold.

It is quite appropriate, I think, that the waters confined by Glen Canyon have been named for the first man to run the Colorado River—John Wesley Powell. For the waters themselves are as venturesome as was this early intrepid explorer. They have gone places water has never gone before, and quite literally a new world is opening up. It is a world of steep walls and rolling slick rock, of cliff faces and sheer drops, of narrow canyons in deep shadows and immense amphitheaters in bright sunlight, of buttes and minarettes, and spires and ridges of wide expanses of flickering water and the splash of ephemeral waterfalls. The colors of the rocks are as magnificent as they are unpredictable—striped in graduated tones of brown, gray, black and white, of red, purple, and pink, softened by weathering and by the vivid green of ferns, monkey flowers, moss, or lichens. The glow of the rocks and their fantastic shapes, contrasted with the deep blue of the waters of Lake Powell make the Glen Canyon recreation area a paradise for the outdoors lover, and a photographer's dream. For the latter it can be the most exciting experience of his life.

In addition to broadening the legislative authority for dealing with this remarkable area, my bill will do two other things:

First. It would provide by law for a review of the area to determine those portions necessary to preserve and provide public access to the shores of the lake, and provide public recreation within the present boundaries of the area established administratively by the Interior Department. The area now encompasses some 1,430,000 acres in both Arizona and Utah. Studies are underway to adjust these boundaries. More than likely the area can be reduced. Presently it appears to be too large. I anticipate that by the time my bill is called up for hearings we will have the recommendations of the Department of the Interior for boundaries, and that the congressional committees can make the final determination as to where those boundaries should be located.

Second. The bill would make present mineral leasing laws apply to the entire recreation withdrawal, subject only to a general regulation by the Secretary to protect scenic and recreation values.

Mineral leasing policies in this area have had a rather checkered history. In an order dated September 10, 1953, the Bureau of Reclamation, with the concurrence of the Bureau of Land Management, withdrew about 1¾ million acres for reclamation purposes in the Glen Canyon area. This closed them completely to mineral entry. At that time, however, there was considerable interest in connection with the search for uranium ore, and since construction of the Glen Canyon Dam would not be started for some years, the lands were reopened in 1954 to mineral location, entry, and patent, subject to the stipulation that each locator would remove all improvements without cost to the United States if and when it was determined that the lands would be needed for reclamation purposes.

The mineral order was revoked in 1957, on all of the lands in Arizona and about 160,000 acres in Utah, since most of them would be inundated as soon as the dam was completed. In July of 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation asked that the mineral reopening order be revoked in its entirety, which means that the adjacent lands as well as the inundated lands would be included. The Department embarked on a program of collecting facts on which the Secretary can base a decision. Multiple use in the area is now under study, I understand, along with boundary adjustments.

I am, of course, concerned that an order which would close the Glen Canyon Recreation Area to mineral location and mineral leasing would even be suggested. One of the reasons I want to establish the Glen Canyon Recreation Area by law is to clarify and emphasize the principle of multiple use within a recreation area. Few of our Western States can afford to have such large areas locked up for recreation use only—we must assure that we will be getting the most we can from multiple use of our national recreation area for the benefit of our entire economy. Subject to general regulation by the Secretary to protect scenic and recreational values, multiple use should, in general, be our watchword.

In this respect, my bill provides that grazing should be continued, and that hunting and fishing should be permitted and continue under applicable laws of the respective States. There should be

exceptions only in zones and areas where hunting or fishing would jeopardize public safety or enjoyment, fish and wildlife management, or administration of the recreation area. The bill provides that fishing and hunting limitations shall be put into effect by the Secretary of the Interior only after consultation with the Arizona Game and Fish Department or the Utah Department of Fish and Game.

The bill I am introducing today is patterned after the measure introduced last session by my distinguished colleague from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] to establish the Lake Mead Recreation Area above Davis and Hoover Dams on the Colorado. There are several differences, however. There is a slight change in my bill relating to the acquisition authority, because there is no question about establishing the area—it is already subject to reclamation withdrawal. There is also some adjustment in language made necessary because the Department of the Interior now recognizes recreation as one of the primary objects in multiple-purpose projects, while when Lake Mead was established, reclamation was a primary objective but recreation had not been given this new recognition. There is now underway in the Department of the Interior a pilot study of outdoor recreation values on the public domain land in Utah, and I anticipate that the results of this study, also, will be available when my bill is given committee consideration.

There are also a few other minor variations between this bill and the bill to establish the Lake Mead Recreation Area made necessary because of changed conditions, but, in general, the bills follow the same pattern.

The 88th Congress is to be commended for passing legislation to establish Canyonlands National Park in southern Utah. Already a superintendent has been appointed for Canyonlands—Mr. Bates Wilson—and several Park Service crews are at work. We are already at work to open up this spectacular area.

The Glen Canyon Recreation Area abuts on Canyonlands. It is within the magnificent golden circle concept of national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the Four Corners area where Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah come together. I am hopeful that the Congress will continue to develop this superb recreation complex, and that we can give specific legislative authority to the establishment of the Glen Canyon Recreation Area.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, my bill to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 27) to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1965

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to insure the availability of strategic and critical materials during a war, or national emergency, by providing for a stockpile of such materials, and for other purposes. This legislation, to be known as the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1965, would repeal and replace the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, of 1946.

This bill has its origins in the inquiry into the strategic and critical materials stockpiles of the United States conducted by the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee during previous sessions of the Congress. During the last session of Congress, this legislation was thoroughly studied and unanimously agreed upon, first by the National Stockpile Subcommittee and then by the full Armed Services Committee. All appropriate departments of the executive branch of the Government unanimously favored it and urged its early passage. All who have studied the current stockpile situation can only become convinced that new legislation is long overdue.

Under this bill all strategic and critical materials now kept in three stockpiles—the national stockpile, the supplemental stockpile, and Defense Production Act inventory—will be consolidated into two; namely: First, the national stockpile in which would be held those strategic and critical materials needed to meet established stockpile objectives; and second, the materials reserve inventory in which would be held all materials excess to stockpile objectives.

Uniform management and disposal procedures with more precise statutory guidelines are stipulated for the operation of these stockpiles. The bill also provides for disclosures to Congress and the public of all pertinent information on the management of the stockpiles which would not help a possible enemy; permits disposal of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each and every disposal, yet retains for Congress the power to disapprove of any proposed disposals; and makes all contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpiles subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 28) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MODIFICATION OF THE GREERS FERRY DAM AND RESERVOIR, WHITE RIVER BASIN, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], a bill to modify the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir project in Arkansas to include the construction of a water garden as a feature of the recreational facilities adjacent to the dam.

Greers Ferry Reservoir was dedicated in the fall of 1962 by our late President, John F. Kennedy, who at the time expressed interest in this unique project to capitalize on the attractive setting in which the dam is located. The concept of a water garden at Greers Ferry had its origin in the department of architecture of the University of Arkansas where it was assigned as a student project. The work done by the architecture students and members of the faculty was the basis for more detailed plans which have been prepared under Presidential directive by the Little Rock district office of the Corps of Engineers.

This bill was introduced in the last session of the Congress, but due to the substantial workload of the Senate and the fact that executive comments on it were not received in time it was not reported by the Public Works Committee. During the recess, I received a letter about the project from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget who said, in part:

> We believe the garden would be an interesting and worthwhile experiment.

The Greers Ferry area is one of the most beautiful in the country. The rugged terrain and the trees, rocks, shrubs, and flowers which cover it provide a perfect setting for the water garden development which would capitalize on the natural beauty of the area and be a prime attraction for visitors to the north central section of Arkansas. I might point out that most recreational facilities at such reservoirs are designed for fishermen and campers, and little is done to develop them for the enjoyment of others. The project is admittedly a unique innovation in America, although water gardens are well known in other parts of the world. The Trivoli Gardens of Italy and the Peterhof Gardens in Russia are world famous and attract countless visitors each year. It is proper, I think, that we in this country begin to recognize the potential beauty of many of our public structures as has long been the practice elsewhere in the world. This administration has been committed by President Johnson to a major effort to conserve and exploit the natural beauty of America and to lay stress on the artistic products of our society. I believe this project supports this commitment.

Greers Ferry Reservoir is centrally located and readily accessible to large population centers such as Memphis, St. Louis, Kansas City, Tulsa, and Little Rock.

The cost of the project is estimated at $325,000. This figure, while impressive in the abstract, is small when compared to the benefits to be derived from the project. Approximately $1,500,000 will be spent at Greers Ferry on the recreational facilities now provided as a matter of course at Federal reservoirs. These include campsites, ramps for boat launching, and access roads. Little is provided for those who are not fishermen, boat operators, or campers. This

beautiful development could be enjoyed by every visitor to the damsite.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible for me to insert the preliminary sketches of the water garden in the RECORD. They will, of course, be available to the Public Works Committee in its consideration of the bill, and I believe the members of the committee will be highly impressed with the proposal.

An abundant supply of water is available from the reservoir, which is approximately 2,000 feet from the site tentatively selected for the water garden. The preliminary sketches of the project show a walkway from the observation platform adjacent to the dam descending to the lower level of the river along which the garden would be constructed. A series of walkways and fountains at various levels would capitalize on the natural terrain. Lighting would be installed to give the fountain a dramatic quality at night.

Mr. President, we believe this project is a worthy experiment in the realization of the esthetic potential of our great Federal public works projects. It is in keeping with this administration's emphasis on artistic achievement and quality. I hope it will receive prompt attention from the Public Works Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 29) authorizing modification of the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir, White River Basin, Ark., in the interest of recreational development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION AND DIVERSIFICATION COMMISSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BAYH, BREWSTER, CLARK, GRUENING, HARTKE, LONG of Missouri, MONTOYA, MORSE, MCINTYRE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of Ohio, TYDINGS, and RIBICOFF, a bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission. The purpose of the Commission, as outlined in this legislation, is to assist the Nation's industries and communities in meeting defense cutbacks or shifts with a minimum of economic dislocation and a maximum productive use of all our national resources.

In October 1963, I first introduced a bill along these lines, to promote a greater awareness of the increasingly important issue of defense adjustments throughout our economy and to encourage planning in the industries which are most affected by shifts or reductions in defense procurement.

Since that time, the Congress approved for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, a military budget nearly $1½ billion less than the previous year. For fiscal year 1966, a further reduction is planned.

Furthermore, on December 12, 1963, the Secretary of Defense announced the closing of 26 military activities throughout the United States and the elimination of 16,300 jobs in the Military Establishment. Then again on November 19, 1964, the Secretary of Defense announced the closing of 95 additional military installations at home and overseas, with a personnel reduction of 63,401 employees.

These cutbacks are not the beginning of unilateral disarmament, nor are there any real grounds for expecting that the vast resources which have made our defenses second to none throughout the world can easily or immediately be transferred to other public and national needs. But these cutbacks are an indication that defense spending, which since 1950 has represented about 50 percent of the Federal budget and 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product, has probably ceased to grow and may well decline for the rest of this decade. These cutbacks are an indication that defense installations which have contributed jobs and money to the economies of some areas over long periods—in fact, as long as a century and a half in the case of some of the naval shipyards—will be adjusted to changing defense needs.

The overall result of the shifts and cutbacks should be a stronger America—a defense establishment more alert to the changing demands of a troubled world, defense equipment more suited to current needs and a national economy freed from the burden of supporting uneconomic and unnecessary activities. Millions—perhaps even billions—of dollars may ultimately be released for productive public purposes, such as new schools, better health facilities, finer recreation opportunities, better transportation, cleaner air and water, and the like.

But the immediate impact of contract cancellations and closing of facilities is very difficult for the employees and the communities directly affected. The long-term benefits may be hard to visualize. More aid to education is no immediate help to a shipyard worker with 18 years seniority and know-how in the construction of warships. A better urban mass transit system will not provide immediate new jobs for atomic technicians who are no longer needed in production of radioactive materials for stockpiling. The prospect of a cut in excise taxes does not help the community that has gone deeply into debt to provide schools, sewers, roads, and similar facilities for people who will be transferred out of the area.

The problems that these people, these firms, and these communities face are very real ones. The answers can be found only through careful planning, through coordination of local opportunities with Federal programs, of local resources with public needs, and through recognition that the conversion or diversification of military activities into useful civilian programs deserves high priority on the national agenda at this time.

The National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, to be established in this bill, would be a top level national forum with direct responsibility for this problem to work with business, labor, local government officials, and Federal agencies to ease the transition from military to civilian work wherever the shift can be made.

The Commission, as outlined in this bill, differs slightly from the original proposal. Its 12 members would include the Secretary of Commerce as Chairman, the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, the Treasury, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrators of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the General Services Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Directors of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The duties of the Commission will be varied and flexible enough to encourage large electronics firms to find new products and markets, to assist small rural communities in finding new jobs when military facilities are closed down, and to help individual unions and employees orient themselves toward new employment prospects. It will institute studies on the impact of conversion over the whole economy, using some of the capabilities including systems management techniques developed in defense programs, to develop new approaches to civilian problems and the allocation of resources in civilian programs.

It will submit reports on such studies to the President and Congress, together with proposals for executive or legislative action. It will encourage industries to explore new methods of meeting public needs, such as improved schools, health facilities, transportation, and pollution abatement.

The Commission is also charged with responsibility for calling a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth to encourage national planning efforts to meet the problems of defense adjustments. Similar conferences have been held in recent years on the problems of trade expansion, narcotics addiction, youth and physical fitness, and problems of the aging. It would be appropriate and useful to invite interested persons and groups from all over the country to consider the best approach in meeting defense shifts and making the most of opportunities for advancement in other directions with some of the resources released through a more efficient defense program.

The Commission is also charged with fostering the development of whatever regulations or procedures may be most useful in encouraging industry to seek direct answers to contract cutbacks. Among possible methods to encourage industry attention to the conversion problems are guidelines written into defense contracts, additional funds for future planning and diversification, tax incentives or bonuses and other Federal aids. These should be evaluated carefully by the Commission, in cooperation with the contracting agencies of the Federal Government and private industry. The bill is based on the assumption that public programs of all kinds should draw upon the talents and experience of our defense and nondefense industries within a competitive, free enterprise system.

The Commission is directed to work closely with local government authorities to help communities facing a particularly heavy adverse impact from the reduction of defense business. Regional planning—to assess and put to best use all the human and industrial resources of an area—is important to attract new jobs and, if feasible, to utilize facilities that may be excess to defense needs. Furthermore, areas which are heavily dependent on defense dollars, even though they may not be slated for immediate cutbacks, should be considering alternative sources of revenue to reduce their dependence on uncertain military spending.

In my own State the recent announcement that the Black Hills Ordnance Depot will be closed within 2 years has caused great anxiety to the people of the Edgemont, S. Dak., area. I am pleased that the citizens of this community are now working hard to attract alternative economic activities to their community.

The principal change in this bill as compared with the legislation which I introduced in 1963, is the elimination of the mandatory language requiring defense contractors to establish industrial conversion committees. Although I believe that such committees should be formed and can be useful, there are a number of different ways in which procurement regulations might be modified to encourage their formation. I believe it would be most helpful for the Commission to explore all of these possibilities in order to work out with the agencies and industry the most useful and acceptable procedures.

There is also additional emphasis on regional planning as an overall approach to shifting patterns of defense spending.

Regional planning can awaken communities to the needs for upgraded services in such fields as education, transportation, and health facilities. Although a direct transfer of manpower and equipment from building bombers to building roads may not be possible, a regional perspective on the problem could be very fruitful both in moving toward new jobs and in moving toward greater fulfillment of the needs of the citizens in any area.

The overall purpose of this bill then is to help industries and communities make the transition from fulfillment of defense needs to better fulfillment of the many pressing human needs of our society. A combined and cooperative effort by the Federal Government, the States and localities, and the industries involved will hasten the day when we can beat our swords into plowshares and turn our industrial talents even more directly to improving the quality of our society.

With such a design, we will begin to relieve the concern which many feel, lest conversion from war production be the occasion of unreasonable hardship for Americans. In turn, the development of competence for conversion will make possible more realistic appraisals of defense spending, for then decisions on the termination of contracts or the closing of installations to meet legitimate efficiency and security requirements need not be blunted by concern for economic dislocation. This is bound to improve both the short- and long-term design and administration of our security policies. It will also add new force to disarmament discussions by removing fear of the economic consequences.

These proposed steps can help give our people a solid basis for confidence in their own and our Nation's future. With other related efforts, they can demonstrate that the best path to American prosperity and economic growth lies not in a constantly expanding arms race but in carefully gaged steps toward peace.

Mr. President, I want to clarify my purpose in introducing legislation at this time.

This is not a newly recognized issue, arising out of the apparent thaw in East-West relationships. The problem was recognized in the report on the "Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament" made by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in March of 1962.

It was recognized by our very able colleague the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] in 1962, when he proposed a Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense to study procurement policies and take into consideration the effect that termination or modification of procurement contracts would have on the economy.

It was recognized by the New York Times financial and business editors in 1963 when they made a survey of conversion planning by our 25 major corporations which handle 50.8 percent of all defense work. They reported on August 16, 1963, that very little planning for conversion has been done by industry and that "many defense contractors simply refuse to consider a sizable cutback in arms production as any kind of a possibility in the foreseeable future."

It was recognized by the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower under the able leadership of Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania which held extensive hearings in 1964. The subcommittee estimated that, just to keep pace with population growth over the next two decades, public and private programs costing from $500 to $700 million will be needed in urban areas. Rural problems of conservation, water development, and recreational development on public lands would require an additional $12 billion a year for 10 years. All these efforts could profit from the reduction in defense spending, but only if a serious effort is made to plan for the switchover in resources and to make the most of funds no longer necessary for defense.

It was recognized by President Johnson in December 1963 when he established an interagency committee chaired by Gardner Ackley, of the Council of Economic Advisers. This Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament can undertake studies in the field, but it lacks the legislative mandate, the staff, and the direction to undertake the broad effort of education, coordination, and encouragement that is needed to give top national priority to the problems and opportunities of economic conversion and diversification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk until the close of business January 15 for additional cosponsors, and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks so that any other Senators who wish to join in support of this measure may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 30) to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Economic Conversion and Diversification Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that in the last decade the cold war has required the United States to make a heavy military and economic commitment for defense; that it is the policy of the United States to maintain a fully adequate national defense and to regulate expenditures for such defense in accordance with changing requirements of American security; that economic ability to adjust to changing security needs is in the interest of the general welfare of the United States; that careful preparation is necessary if such adjustments are to be achieved with a minimum of economic dislocation and individual hardship; that the problem-solving capabilities of American industry should be utilized to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of public programs in non-defense areas; and that the economic conversion and diversification required by changing defense needs presents a great challenge and opportunity to the American people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established, in the Executive Office of the President, the National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of:

(1) The Secretary of Commerce, who shall be chairman of the Commission;

(2) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers;

(3) The Secretary of Defense;

(4) The Secretary of Labor;

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury;

(6) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(7) The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission;

(8) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(9) The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity;

(10) The Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

(11) The Administrator of the General Services Administration;

(12) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall preside over meetings of the Commission; except that in his unavoidable absence he may designate a member of the Commission to preside in his place.

(c) The Commission shall have a staff to be headed by an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, his

compensation to be at the rate provided for Grade 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Commission to—

(a) institute studies that will help to determine appropriate policies and programs to be carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government in order to facilitate economic conversion and diversification, including studies of possible schedules of public and private investment patterns that could result from various degrees of economic conversion and the anticipated income and employment effects of such patterns, and studies of how the advanced scientific, technical, systems management and related capabilities of American industry might be employed in established nondefense public programs, the reports of such studies to be submitted to the President and to the Congress whenever appropriate, but at least annually, with the first report to be submitted within one year after the enactment of this Act;

(b) encourage industries to explore methods of better meeting public needs in such areas as school construction, health facilities, transportation, and pollution abatement;

(c) convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth, within one year after the enactment of this Act, to consider the problems arising from shifts or reductions in defense outlays including the termination of defense contracts or the closing of defense facilities, and to encourage appropriate planning and programing by State or local governments and by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion and diversification capability;

(d) consult with the Governors of the States to encourage appropriate studies and conferences at the State, local, and regional level, in support of a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion and diversification capability;

(e) develop programs, in cooperation with the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, that will bring their established authorities and programs to bear on the problem of planning for economic diversification in communities, States, and regions heavily impacted by defense expenditures; and

(f) make such recommendations to the President and to the Congress as will further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Commission, in cooperation with contracting agencies of the Federal Government, shall foster the development of regulations, procedures, and recommendations to encourage recipients of defense contracts, subcontracts, or grants to plan for conversion and diversification to civilian work in the event of curtailment or termination of such contracts or grants.

SEC. 6. The Commission, in cooperation with States and local government authorities, shall encourage areas heavily dependent on defense contracts, subcontracts, grants, or Federal installations, to form regional conversion and diversification committees to plan for alternative employment opportunities in the event of curtailment or termination of such facilities.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a).

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce, as Chairman of the Commission, is authorized to make contracts or grants for studies relevant to the purposes of the Commission.

SEC. 6. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is most gratifying to be able to join with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota today in introducing again a bill which recognizes one of the most serious economic problems that face our people. In my opinion, this bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission is one of the most important measures to be presented to the 89th Congress. The Senator from South Dakota is to be commended for his determination and vision.

Mr. President, the realities of today's world point out clearly the necessity for legislation of the kind proposed here.

With the continuing change in defense needs brought about by the advancement of science and technology, with the concentrated efforts to reduce unnecessary defense spending, and with the hope for additional steps toward responsible arms control and disarmament, it only seems commonsense for the Federal Government to participate in the planning of actions that will meet the economic effects of changes in defense spending.

In a free economy like ours, the major responsibility for such planning rests with the industries involved and the communities in which defense industry is concentrated. However, the Federal Government cannot disassociate itself from the consequences of substantial changes in defense outlays. It will require the cooperative efforts of industry, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government if such changes are to be met with a minimum of economic dislocation and individual hardship.

As indicated above, two types of planning are needed. First, there is the planning necessary to meet individual plant or military facility closing due to shifts in defense needs. The other is the broader planning required to prepare our Nation for widescale reductions in defense expenditures if responsible arms control agreements can be reached. The first type, however, demands our immediate attention as evidenced by the recent announcement of the closing of numerous military installations.

Many private firms which do substantial business with the Defense Department have taken tremendous strides in preparation for adjustments when Government contracts are no longer forthcoming. However, many firms have done little or nothing to prepare for changes. In some instances, this lack of action is due to lethargy but often it is due to lack of capability either financial or other.

The Federal Government has taken some steps to help individuals and firms affected by changes in defense spending, but they have not been sufficient to meet the need. State governments and local governments have also acted to assist in seeking adjustments. But, unfortunately, most of these efforts have been after the fact and thus somewhat haphazard. The economic health of our Nation and the welfare of the individuals affected demand a change in this situation. We must have thorough advance planning for future changes.

The Federal Government cannot prescribe by law how and what adjustments are to be made when plants or facilities are reduced or closed. However, it can help provide answers to many questions and provide leadership, impetus, and assistance to industry and community planning for conversion and diversification.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has made and is making efforts in the field of the economic impact of arms control and disarmament. A number of scholars have also undertaken studies with regard to the economic impact of changes in defense spending.

But there remains much to be learned—many questions to be answered. We need more knowledge as to the total economic effect of specific changes or reductions in defense spending. We need more knowledge as to the effect of increased Government spending in other sectors to offset defense cuts. We need more knowledge as to the effect of a tax cut to offset defense cuts. We need more study of other fiscal and monetary steps that could be taken. We need careful study of ways to divert or increase research and development efforts in the civilian sector. We need to look at the problems of firms which lack the capital to plan for adjustment. We need to look at the problems of firms so defense oriented they do not have a capability for civilian production.

A National Conversion and Diversification Commission could contribute substantially to filling these needs.

Shifts from defense production to civilian production offer a tremendous challenge and opportunity. Our task is to work for the best utilization of the manpower and resources released from defense production in meeting the economic and social needs of our Nation.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Congress will take immediate action on this bill so that we can move forward with a far greater degree of confidence that we are prepared to meet the human and economic problems which are a consequence of our ever-changing defense picture. Such action would add significantly to the overall security of our Nation.

SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator CANNON, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this project is vitally needed, to relieve a critical water supply situation in the area, to protect and conserve the dwindling ground water resources in Clark County, Nev., and to provide the firm additional supply of municipal and industrial water as required to serve a rapidly increasing population, as well as to provide for the optimum development of the natural resources of the southern Nevada area.

This section of Nevada has experienced a rapid increase in population since the early 1940's; and for most of the past decade this growth has been, and continues to be, phenomenal. A favorable climate, availability of large areas of undeveloped land, a strategic location in relation to the Lake Mead National Recretion Area, the Nevada atomic test site, plus activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, have all contributed to this development. The rapid growth of the area is best exemplified by the fact that the population has increased from an approximate 50,000 people in 1950 to 141,400 people in 1960. A projection of future growth indicates that over 300,000 people will be in need of water in this area by 1970; and that by the year 2000, over one-half million will call it home.

So great is the local interest in this project that the State of Nevada, at the last session of its legislature, designated the Colorado River Commission of Nevada as the State agency to contract with the United States for the repayment of project costs, and to operate and maintain the project when construction is completed. It has the active support of the Nevada congressional delegation; the State of Nevada, through its Governor, the Honorable Grant Sawyer; the department of conservation and natural resources; the Eldorado Valley Advisory Board; the Clark County Commissioners; the Southern Nevada Industrial Foundation; and all the municipalities and city groups located therein.

Previous activity on this proposal had been delayed, pending the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Arizona against California, to which Nevada was a party. This decision, among other things, allocated to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre-feet of the waters of the Colorado River. It is these waters that will be utilized through the distribution system provided for in this bill.

The major problems faced by the project area are those associated with the availability of water and the need to bolster the economic base as the foundation for continued economic health and future growth. An increased water supply must be made available for the expanding population, or industrial growth will not be able to continue, and the heavy investment of the Federal Government in the Nellis Air Force Base, the atomic energy test site, and the NASA project will be seriously hampered.

At present, the principal source of water in this area is the underground artesian basin, supplemented by a small amount of water pumped from Lake Mead. Withdrawals from the ground water basin have for several years exceeded the safe yield, with a resulting critical depletion of the underground waters. The Nellis Air Force Base, which relies entirely on water from wells drilled in the basin, is faced with an especially critical situation. The water supply for fire protection is inadequate during the summer months; and a constant patrol has been necessary in order to enforce water conservation measures.

The magnitude of the problem to service the entire area has been recognized by the State and local interests, and all are agreed that the proper solution requires the development of a single comprehensive master plan to supply additional water to meet the needs of the entire area. This project is the answer to that need.

In addition, I point out that the entire cost of the project will be repaid to the Government, together with interest over a 50-year period, normally used for this type of development.

The attention of the Senate should be also called to the fact that this project is a part of the southwest Pacific water plan, recently proposed by Secretary Udall as a solution to the overall problem facing the fastest growing section of the United States.

This project, like the central Arizona project, in Arizona, and the Dixie project, in Utah, authorized by the last Congress, need not await action on the complete plan. Although they are integral portions of the Secretary's proposal, they can be authorized and constructed individually, without in any way interfering with the complete plan slated for long-term action.

Because of the demonstrated need for the authorization without delay of the southern Nevada water project, I urge the committee to proceed immediately again to consider the matter favorably and the Senate thereafter to take affirmative action to authorize this project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 32) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be associated with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada, in the introduction of the southern Nevada water supply project bill.

Last year this bill received favorable action by the Interior Committee; but, unfortunately, there was insufficient time in which Congress could act.

The need for such legislation to make adequate provision for domestic and industrial water supply in southern Nevada is well known to anyone even passingly concerned with the great issues that confront the development of the Southwest.

This area is blessed with ideal climatic conditions and great tracts of undeveloped land which await only the application of water to reach its full potential.

Southern Nevada has undergone growth which has been so phenomenal as to catapult the entire State into a position of preeminence in increased population, which within the century will reach half a million. Congress has this opportunity to decide whether that growth will be orderly and welcome and a boon to the Southwest, or an insoluble problem and a curse.

Every responsible State and local organization in Nevada supports this plan to provide additional water to meet the growing needs of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Boulder City, Nellis Air Force Base, and the El Dorado Valley.

The consideration of this bill could not be more timely, for it comes at a point in our development when the underground artesian basin can no longer meet the existing requirements of the area. Indeed, the area has overdrawn on its underground supply.

Mr. President, in my view this project can stand alone, independent and financially feasible. Its cost is fully repayable over the normal 50-year period generally assigned to such projects. Yet the southern Navada water supply project will make a contribution to the overall, long-term water needs of the entire Pacific area.

I share fully the support expressed for this bill by my colleague, Senator BIBLE; and I believe that no single piece of legislation is more vital to the survival and development, as well as the prosperity, of our State.

TOCKS ISLAND NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators CASE, JAVITS, KENNEDY of New York, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and myself, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the establishment of the Tocks Island national recreation area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes.

This legislation would authorize the establishment of a national recreational area 70,000 acres in extent along the Delaware River between the Delaware Water Gap and Port Jervis, N.Y. The area would be established by the Federal Government under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior and would supplement the Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir authorized to impound the waters of the Delaware River in the area I have just described.

This proposed recreational area would serve more Americans than any other recreational facility ever created by the Federal Government. Located only 95 miles from downtown Philadelphia by express turnpike and only 75 miles from

downtown Manhattan, the proposed national recreation area will be within a 2-hour drive of more than 25 million Americans—a sixth of the Nation's population.

In his state of the Union message President Johnson has called for a new conservation program designed for an increasingly urban America. The Tocks Island national recreation area fills the bill exactly. It will utilize rapidly dwindling outdoor areas to provide recreation for millions of people before the land is lost forever to urban sprawl and honky-tonk development.

In August 1963, a few months before he was killed, our late President Kennedy pointed with pride to the new national seashores established under his administration and continued:

> I hope their ranks will soon include the Tocks Island national recreation area on the Delaware River. We need recreation areas where the people live and this can be closer to the largest amount of people in the country.
>
> Tocks Island will bring vitally important recreational opportunities to the heart of the Atlantic megalopolis—that giant urban strip reaching from Boston to Washington—which we desperately need if our huge metropolitan areas are to continue to be livable.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to be with President Kennedy when he made that historic address at Milford, Pa. in the Tocks Island area. At that time he dedicated the gift by the Pinchot family.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. The late President dedicated and accepted on behalf of the Federal Government the Gifford Pinchot estate and had it named as a Federal monument in honor of the late great Governor of Pennsylvania.

The national recreation area would be developed by the National Park Service around the mammoth Tocks Island Reservoir, already authorized and funded by Congress, providing a 32-mile-long manmade lake. The area is bordered on the west by Pennsylvania's Poconos on the east by New Jersey's Kittatiny Mountains, and on the extreme north by the foothills of New York's Catskills.

The area to be included in the proposed park includes many scenic gorges and waterfalls as well as large acreages of mountain forest. But the pressures of commercial development are already making inroads on the area, and the land grows more expensive with each passing day. There is a special urgency for Congress to approve establishment of the area this year before the cost skyrockets beyond our reach.

All forms of recreational development compatible with the out of doors and escape from the motorized and crowded cities would be proposed for inclusion in the development plans and that the facility would give a great boost to the vacation economy of the Poconos and the surrounding region.

It will be readily accessible to the 25 million people who live in the great megalopolis that stretches from Boston to Washington.

Interstate 80—the Keystone shortway—will link it with New York City, northern New Jersey, and Pennsylvania's anthracite cities; Interstate 84 will provide access from New England and the Catskill region as well as northern Pennsylvania; the northeastern extension of the Pennsylvania Turnpike will provide easy access to the area from Philadelphia, Allentown, Easton, and Bethlehem; and Interstate 78 will place the facility within easy reach of such Pennsylvania cities as Reading, Lancaster, York, and Harrisburg.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 36) to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "A BUILDING FOR A MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION"

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the requirements of section 4 of Public Law 106, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 189), I submit to the Senate, from the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, a report entitled, "A Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution," and request unanimous consent to have it printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I submit a report entitled "Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to Liberia; William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Rumania; Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to Chile; William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to Laos.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

PROPOSAL TO PROHIBIT THE FIXING OF TRAFFIC TICKETS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill prohibiting the fixing of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia. All Senators will be interested to know that since last April, when in the Senate I severely criticized the gross practice of fixing traffic tickets in the District of Columbia by the police, the number of such fixed tickets has been drastically curtailed.

At the time I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, it was argued that the adjustment of such tickets was in all likelihood justified by the facts of each situation.

The Metropolitan Police Department had furnished me with statistics showing the number of traffic tickets issued and the number of such tickets adjusted or fixed. At the time, I questioned whether the statistics showed the whole picture. I am glad that I questioned them.

I now learn that the statistics provided me, and contained in the annual report of the police department, included arrests only.

In regard to parking tickets, the word "arrest" means that it takes place only when the violator posts collateral or is booked at the police station.

It is interesting to note that many traffic tickets were never reported to the Central Violations Bureau, and thus did not appear in the statistics which the police department furnished me.

Last year, during a 1-month period, nearly 11,000 traffic tickets were transmitted by the Central Violations Bureau. I have had a study made of these tickets, and am informed that there were more than 400 traffic tickets which were not forwarded to the Central Violations Bureau at all to be included in the statistics.

Of these 400 traffic tickets, 261 were fixed or voided by the police, and 139 were missing.

I am also advised that a list of traffic tickets fixed or adjusted for moving violations was not compiled at all.

Since I made several speeches on the subject in the Senate last year, the District Commissioners have changed the ground rules for fixing or adjusting tickets. Their rules still leave room for abuse. However, the publicity attached to the practice of fixing tickets has reduced the number sharply.

According to information I have in my possession, the number of fixed or adjusted traffic tickets actually forwarded to the Central Violations Bureau shows that fewer than 200 parking tickets were adjusted in July of last year, as compared to more than 2,700 actually recorded during that month in the previous year.

As I pointed out a few minutes ago, these figures include those reported, and not necessarily the total number of tickets adjusted. It was argued that the number of tickets fixed in previous years was probably justified. If it was justified then, why is not the same number justified now?

The fact is, we almost stopped the racket of traffic-ticket fixing in the District of Columbia.

Though the recent action taken by the District Commissioners has tended to reduce the irregularities occurring in the adjustment of traffic tickets, it has not closed all the loopholes which exist. My bill would do so.

It is widely known that certain Members of Congress were not pleased with the original order of the District Commissioners, which would have taken traffic-ticket fixing completely out of the hands of the District of Columbia Police.

The Board of Commissioners, in an attempt to placate certain Members of Congress, modified their position so that police officials may file tickets during certain days and hours. In my judgment, this practice cannot be justified and leads to police abuse in the District of Columbia in regard to ticket fixing.

The bill I am introducing today would settle once and for all the problem of ticket fixing in the District of Columbia. I hope the bill will receive the enthusiastic support of the District of Columbia Commissioners, both Houses of Congress, and the public, so that this ticket-fixing racket in the District of Columbia can be stopped.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two memorandums from the District of Columbia Government, one of November 18, 1964, entitled "Traffic violation notices—Commissioners, District of Columbia"; and the other one, dated December 29, 1964, entitled "Traffic violation notices—to Commissioners, District of Columbia."

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

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,

November 18, 1964.

MEMORANDUM ORDER NO. 43, SERIES 1964

Subject: Traffic Violation Notices—Commissioners, District of Columbia.

To the Force:

The following order of the Commissioners, District of Columbia, relative to the subject matter, is published for your information and guidance: November 10, 1964, C.O. 64–1618.

Ordered:

1. Except as hereinafter provided, after copies of a traffic violation notice (hereinafter ticket) are received in the Central Violations Bureau of the District of Columbia court of general sessions (hereinafter court), neither "cancellation" nor "adjustment" of such tickets, whether for moving or nonmoving violations, may be made except by the Corporation Counsel or by Assistant Corporation Counsel designated by him and assigned to the Law Enforcement Division of the Office of the Corporation Counsel (hereinafter Law Enforcement Division).

2. Prior to the time that the copies of a ticket are received in the central violations bureau of the court, officials of the Metropolitan Police Department designated by the Chief of Police (hereinafter police) may cancel tickets for nonmoving violations found by them to have been erroneously issued (i.e., for parking at a broken or improperly working parking meter, for parking in a restricted area where the sign advising the public of the restriction is not in its proper place, or for other factual circumstances in which the motorist's reason for parking is not the basis for the cancellation).

3. Either before or after the copies of a ticket for nonmoving violation have been received in the Central Violations Bureau, adjustments of such tickets (as distinguished from cancellation for factual reasons as provided in par. 2 hereof) may be made only by the Corporation Counsel or his assistants designated by him in the Law Enforcement Division. As used herein, "adjustment" includes any decision not to prosecute based on the principles governing the entry of a nolle prosequi.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 hereof, tickets for nonmoving violations issued after 12 o'clock noon on Saturday, or on Sunday or a legal holiday, which the police certify were issued to a motor vehicle operator whom they find will not be available to appear on the next work day of the Law Enforcement Division, may be tentatively adjusted by the police, provided the police shall stamp on the ticket "subject to review by the Corporation Counsel" and shall send the ticket, accompanied by written reasons for such tentative adjustment, to the Assistant in Charge of the Law Enforcement Division. If the Corporation Counsel disapproves the action of the police, he shall notify the Commanding Officer of the issuing precinct to direct the offender to post collateral, and the case shall proceed in routine fashion.

5. The police shall not be under any obligation to forward to the Corporation Counsel a voided ticket; e.g., a ticket which has never been issued by being placed on an offending vehicle or delivered to an offending vehicle operator.

6. All police officers shall be instructed to be particularly cautious in the issuance of tickets to vehicles obviously being operated by tourists; i.e., vehicles from nonmetropolitan area jurisdictions, having therein suitcases, clothing, etc. However, it is expected that tickets will be issued to a vehicle of a nonresident, even if a tourist, in any case in which a violation occurs in a plainly marked area or for a violation which should have been quite obvious to the vehicle operator.

7. In the case of all requests for ticket adjustments, the person seeking the same shall submit reasons therefor in writing.

By order of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

F. E. ROPSHAW,
Secretary to the Board.
HOWARD V. COVELL,
Acting Chief of Police.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,

December 29, 1964.

MEMORANDUM ORDER NO. 43–A, SERIES 1964

Subject: Traffic violation notices—Commissioners, District of Columbia.

To the Force:

To implement the provisions of Commissioners' order No. 64–1618, dated November 10, 1964, as published in memorandum order No. 43, series 1964, the following procedures are hereby established:

1. Police officials may not cancel or otherwise adjust traffic violation notices, whether moving or nonmoving violations, after copies of the violation notices are received in the Central Violations Bureau of the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

2. Prior to the time copies of traffic violation notices are received in the Central Violations Bureau, officials of the Metropolitan Police Department designated by the Chief of Police may cancel nonmoving violation notices found by them to have been erroneously issued. Such action may only be taken for factual reasons based upon a written request for adjustment made by the recipient of the citation.

3. Traffic violation notices for nonmoving offenses issued after 12 noon on Saturday or on Sunday or a legal holiday, may be tentatively adjusted by the police when it is determined the recipient of the violation notice will not be able to appear in the Office of the Assistant Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia court of general sessions, on the next workday. In such cases the recipient of the violation notice shall be required to execute PD form No. 11 stating his reason for seeking the adjustment. The police official shall record on the violation notice "subject to review by the Corporation Counsel" and shall forward the written statement of the offender and the traffic violation notice to the Assistant Corporation Counsel on PD form No. 237. The recipient of the violation notice shall be informed that the final decision rests with the Assistant Corporation Counsel and if the decision is not to adjust the citation, it will be returned to the recipient with instructions to deposit collateral in the case.

4. Police officials shall maintain a detailed record of all traffic violation notices voided or canceled under the provisions of this order. This record shall reflect a detailed accounting for each traffic violation notice so processed. PD form No. 90 shall be forwarded to headquarters on Monday of each week and shall reflect all actions taken during the preceding week: Provided, however, it shall not be required that voided tickets, i.e., those which are spoiled, mutilated, or erroneously prepared and have not been issued by being placed on an offending vehicle or delivered to an offending vehicle operator, be reported on PD form No. 90. PD form No. 90 shall contain complete information with a detailed explanation of all tickets canceled under the provisions of section 2 of this order.

Police officials authorized to act on traffic violation notices under the provisions of this order shall be construed to mean commanding officers of any unit, supervisory officials of the rank of captain or above, and lieutenants who may be serving in the capacity of acting captains during the absence of unit commanders. It shall not include sergeants who may be temporarily serving as acting lieutenants. Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit unit commanders from delegating subordinate officials to interview recipients of traffic violation notices on other than the day tour of duty and making recommendations to the unit commander.

Commanding officers shall take appropriate steps to require extreme care in the preparation, issuance, and processing of all traffic violation notices. This shall include instructing officers in the proper preparation of traffic violation notices, care in the issuance of violation notices so as to avoid unnecessary voiding or cancelling of tickets, and the absolute necessity for all tickets being legible. Steps shall also be taken to insure that all traffic violation notices are properly accounted for and that they are reviewed by an official for accuracy and legibility at the time they are turned in by the

issuing officer. Erasures, alterations, or strikeovers shall not be permitted.

These procedures become effective immediately.

By direction of the Chief of Police.

HOWARD V. COVELL,
Deputy Chief of Police,
Executive Officer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the District of Columbia Commissioners that I do not intend to let them off the hook. I intend to continue to disclose to the public what I consider to be a source of corruption in law enforcement in the District of Columbia involving ticket fixing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Fix Is a Fix by Any Name," written by George Lardner, Jr., and published in the Washington Post on December 22, 1964.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 22, 1964]

A FIX IS A FIX BY ANY NAME

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

New excuses for old abuses have been sanctioned by the District Commissioners.

With straight faces painted by the House District Committee, they solemnly announced that parking tickets could no longer be "adjusted" by police.

Henceforth they can only be "canceled."

A fix is a fix.

Commissioners Charles M. Duke and John B. Duncan called for the new version. It requires simply a little more speed and perhaps a little more imagination.

All police officials have to do is catch the tickets before they go over to the Central Violations Bureau of General Sessions Court.

That leaves men of influence, their relatives, friends, and constituents only 12 to 36 hours—on the average—to catch police.

Walter F. Bramhall, clerk of General Sessions Court, says that copies of traffic tickets issued by police are supposed to be turned over to the Violations Bureau the morning after they're issued.

Most of them come in on time, Bramhall says, although some have come in 5 to 6 days late in the past.

Under the new rules of the game, police brass can squelch parking tickets until then for reasons such as "faulty meter," "sign prohibiting parking torn down," or any other "factual circumstances" except the motorist's personal reason for parking illegally.

Up to now, the excuses written on fixed tickets have been timeworn, homespun stuff such as "official business for a Congressman," "unaware of violation," and "stranger in town."

Much of this, of course, has been nonsense. There is little reason to expect that the new catchwords dreamed up will be any different.

So far there are no signs that the new game has caught on yet. But that doesn't mean it can't—or won't—be played.

Lack of imagination should be no real bar to giving it a whirl either. Under the old ticket-fixing rules, police were still supposed to write down the reason for the "adjustment," but many tickets were fixed without any reason at all noted. There's nothing in the new regulations to stop this.

Even the "stranger in town" tune may survive. The Commissioners ordered all police officers "to be particularly cautious in the issuance of tickets to vehicles obviously being operated by tourists." Drivers with out-of-town plates need only keep a suitcase in the back seat at all times.

From start to finish, the Commissioners have been dancing on a congressional string in this year's ticket-fixing episode.

Their unanimous vote in June to ban the practice was no declaration of independence to begin with.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, who had launched an investigation of the Police Department, charged that thousands of tickets had been fixed. Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, who oversees the Department, said MORSE was quite right.

The ban followed. The House District Committee cried foul.

The Congressmen liked the old practice of letting police precinct captains, their deputies and other higher-ups in the Department fix tickets.

Many police officials said they were glad to get the monkey off their backs, but the Congressmen weren't.

The Commissioners backed down to mull things over. It took them 5 months. The new version was a hollow attempt to save face by mixing the rules up a bit.

Tobriner voted against it, but Commissioner Duncan doesn't like to rock the congressional boat, and Commissioner Duke sorely wants to get a 1-cent increase in the gas tax out of the House District Committee.

What Congress wants, Congress gets. Now its Senator MORSE's turn again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 33) to prohibit the fixing of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no officer or employee of the District of Columbia shall administratively adjust or cancel any summons or other process issued by an officer or member of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police force in connection with a violation of any law or regulation of the District of Columbia relating to motor vehicles or the control of traffic. All records in connection with any such summons or other process so issued shall be preserved for a period of five years. Any officer or employee of the District of Columbia violating the provisions of this Act shall be imprisoned for not more than ninety days or fined not more than $300, or both.

GARRISON DIVERSION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, cosponsored by three of my colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], in connection with the construction of the Garrison Diversion, Missouri River Basin project by the Secretary of the Interior.

This proposed legislation would provide for the diversion of the Missouri River water in the States of North and South Dakota for irrigation purposes, for industrial and municipal use, and for lake restoration; also for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

This is essentially the same bill which was passed by the Senate in the previous Congress by a unanimous vote.

I hope that the bill will receive speedy approval in the 89th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 34) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. BURDICK (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of a development providing for the irrigation of two hundred and fifty thousand acres, municipal and industrial water, fish, and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control, and other project purposes shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with the plans set out in the Bureau of Reclamation report dated November 1962 (revised May 1963) supplemental report to said House Document Numbered 325.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of unit lands or facilities, or to dispose of unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The Secretary shall notify the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of any such proposed disposition to a State or local public body by transfer, conveyance, or exchange, or by lease for twenty-five years or more, and no such transfer, conveyance, or exchange shall be effectuated and no such lease shall be executed prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die) from the date of such notification. In connection with the foregoing undertakings and developments for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources on the Garrison diversion unit: (1) Federal costs incurred specifically for land

and basic facilities shall be nonreimbursable; (2) joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, other than those hereafter specified, shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable to the extent they do not exceed the sum of $13,000,000 plus 4 per centum of the cost of joint-use land and facilities of the unit in excess of $100,000,000; (3) joint costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement which are attributable to migratory waterfowl production habitat benefits shall be nonreimbursable; and (4) other Federal costs, including separable joint costs, allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable up to a limit of $2,500,000. Provision shall be made for the reimbursement, for the contribution by non-Federal interests, or for the reallocation of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the unit; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that provided in section 4(a) of this Act, pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated to the other unit purposes. For the purpose of this Act, "joint-use land and facilities" shall mean land and facilities serving two or more unit purposes, one of which is recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation, development of water resource projects, or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

SEC. 3. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

SEC. 4 (a) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due or callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

(b) From and after July 1, 1965, the interest rate on the unamortized balance of the investment allocated to commercial power in facilities constructed or under construction on June 30, 1965, by the Department of the Army in the Missouri River Basin, the commercial power from which is marketed by the Department of the Interior, and in the transmission and marketing facilities associated therewith, shall be 2½ per centum per annum.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act, the sum of $207,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the unit.

EXTENSION OF OUR FISHING AREA TO 12 MILES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of myself and Senators PASTORE and MUSKIE, a bill designed to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States to authorize the extension of the territorial waters of our Nation and its territories to 12 miles. The bill is identical to S. 1816, which I introduced in the 88th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie on the table for 10 days.

We must face up to the grim reality that our once great fishing industry is in trouble. The 88th Congress wisely took a long-overdue first step to help U.S. fishermen when it approved a bill introduced by my good friend and colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], which makes it possible to fine or imprison violators of our coastal waters who come inside our 3-mile limit. But the need persists to extend our territorial waters and give our fishermen a wider area in which to fish unmolested by foreign competition.

Today, 49 nations have extended their territorial waters to 12 miles or more and at the same time foreign vessels are fishinf off our shores in ever-increasing numbers.

In 1963 these sea farmers from other nations harvested fish off New England, off the Middle Atlantic States, in the Gulf of Mexico, in the Bering Sea, and in the North Pacific off Alaska.

Last year was the first time in our Nation's history that more than half of our fish supply—56 percent—of fishery products was imported. The percentage of fishery products imported in this country has doubled since 1950.

According to the Department of the Interior, nearly 300 Soviet vessels operated off New England in 1963; the total is one-third more than in 1962. Even as this occurred, even as foreign fishermen took more fish in our waters, our catch off the coasts of foreign countries declined. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries tells me that in 1954 our fishermen took 574 million pounds of fish on the high seas off Canada and Central and South American countries compared with only 429 million pounds in 1963. This is a decline of 145 million pounds in one decade.

Let us look at the fish import statistics.

In 1963, we imported a total of 6.5 billion pounds of fishery products. The previous high in 1962 was 1.5 billion pounds less—or 5 billion pounds.

Our imports of groundfish and ocean perch fillets, including blocks and slabs, went up to 232 million pounds from 221 million pounds in 1962.

Our imports of scallops went up to 13.3 million pounds from 11.6 million pounds in 1962.

Our imports of shrimp climbed to 151.5 million pounds from the previous 1962 high of 141.2 million pounds.

We ate more oysters. Our imports in 1963 totaled 8.3 million pounds of oysters, up from the previous 1962 high of 7.8 million pounds.

We imported more fish meal and scrap. The 1963 total of fish meal and scrap was 382,400 tons as opposed to the previous high in 1962 of 252,300 tons.

What did our fishermen do? Their catches of flounders, tuna, clams, blue crabs, king crabs, dungeness crabs and Oregon shrimp established new records. But our catches of Pacific halibut, Maine herring, Alaska herring, jack and Pacific mackerel, menhaden, salmon, Pacific sardines, tuna, and oysters did not increase. The oyster production in fact dropped to a new low.

How did Alaska participate in the national fishing picture?

First. Halibut landings in Ketchikan and Petersburg dropped and depressed the national catch;

Second. The herring catch, smallest since 1917, was about 31 million pounds or 8 percent less than in 1962;

Third. The salmon catch of red, chum, and pink salmon decreased by 60 million pounds;

Fourth. The dungeness crab catch totaled a record 11.8 million pounds or some 3 million pounds more than in the previous year;

Fifth. The Alaska king crab take of 77 million pounds was recordbreaking, exceeding by 24 million pounds the 1962 figure;

Sixth. The shrimp catch of plus-14 million pounds was 2.5 million pounds less than in 1962.

The lowered salmon catch in turn depressed the Alaska salmon pack by 708,000 cases.

Thus, in but two instances—the taking of king and dungeness crabs—has the Alaska fisherman been able to increase his catch. His halibut, herring, and shrimp catches dropped. Worse—the statistics of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries show that fishing in all parts of the Nation could be a great deal better.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed a table showing the world fish catch of the 10 leading nations for the years 1960, 1961, and 1962. The United States holds to fifth place but the four leading nations

catch increasingly larger amounts and statistics as to the actual take of mainland China simply do not exist.

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

World fish catch

Country	1960		1961		1962	
	Pounds (billion)	Percent	Pounds (billion)	Percent	Pounds (billion)	Percent
Japan	13.7	16.4	14.79	16.3	15.13	15.3
Peru	7.8	9.4	11.56	12.7	15.06	15.3
China (mainland)	11.1	13.3	11.07	[1] 12.2	11.07	[1] 11.2
Russia	6.7	8.1	7.16	7.9	7.98	8.1
United States	6.2	7.5	6.48	7.1	6.47	6.6
Norway	3.5	4.2	3.33	3.7	2.95	3.0
Canada	2.047	2.5	2.25	2.5	2.46	2.5
Spain	2.1	2.5	2.24	2.5	2.22	2.3
India	2.6	3.1	2.12	2.3	2.15	2.2
United Kingdom	2.037	2.4	1.98	2.2	2.08	2.1

[1] Based on 1959 data.

Source: Information supplied by the Department of the Interior, Mar. 4, 1964.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, upon first introducing this proposed legislation on June 28, 1963, I described the 3-mile limit as an albatross around the neck of U.S. fishermen. The albatross is still there and its victims—the fishermen—are weaker. It it disheartening to be told by the Department of the Interior that our fishing catch of both edible and nonedible items declined in 1963.

The catch of 4,750 million pounds in 1963 was 11 percent less than the record 5,534 million pounds taken in 1962. Fishermen also suffered a financial loss for they received $378 million for that catch or 5 percent less than the record $396 million received in 1962.

While we keep our wornout 3-mile limit, other nations catch our fish, thereby forcing U.S. consumers to buy part of the foreign catch to supplement our short supply. It makes no sense.

We keep our 3-mile limit which is an obsolete provision dating from days when 3 miles was the approximate distance a cannonball from a shore battery could hit a hostile vessel. In other words, the 3-mile limit was a development of a national defense measure which had nothing whatever to do with fishing.

Is it not silly and defensively unsound of us to keep that limitation and expose our shores to perhaps unfriendly eyes at this moment in world history when 49 nations have tossed aside the outdated concept

The following countries, as of December 1, 1964, according to information supplied by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, claim territorial limits or zones for special purposes, including fishing, which extend to at least 12 miles from the coasts: Albania, Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Communist China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Republic of Korea, Libya, Malagasy Republic, Morocco, Norway, Panama, Peru, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam (South).

It is expected that the following nations will shortly ratify the European Fishery Convention of 1964 which claims a 3-mile territorial sea plus 3 miles exclusive fishing zone plus 6 additional miles which is restricted to nations party to the convention: Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

So the total may climb to 58 countries claiming jurisdiction over at least 12 miles of territorial sea for fishing purposes.

On earlier occasions, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, I have discussed the need to extend our territorial waters for fishing purposes to 12 miles.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made before the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute held in Miami, Fla., November 11, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

OUR FISHERIES NEED GREATER AND FIRMER SUPPORT AND A 12-MILE LIMIT

(Speech by Senator GRUENING given at Miami, Fla., November 11, 1963)

Friends and members meeting at the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute, a little over 4 months ago, I introduced a bill in the Senate which sought to extend our fishing limits from the present and traditional 3 nautical miles from our coasts to 12 miles, and at the same time avoid some of the conflicting views and interests among our diverse American fishing groups.

The reason for this precaution was that we are not—and when I say "we" I mean our fishermen and those concerned with our fishermen—are not entirely united on the desirability of extending these limits an additional 9 miles, although I am convinced that a substantial majority of them are.

So, the bill provided that whenever the Governor of any State or territory alleged, by petition to the President, that the fishing by nationals of other nations in some or all of the coastal waters lying within the 12 miles of the shores of such State or territory was of such intensity or magnitude, or of a character to endanger the fishery resource within that area, the President should appoint a factfinding board which would investigate the allegations of the Governor and report within 90 days; that if the report sustained the contention of the Governor, as it probably would, the President could prohibit by decree the fishing of these nationals in the waters of that State up to 12 miles or he could provide other regulations which would limit the extent of their fishing, the type of their gear, and establish other restrictions that seemed necessary.

One purpose of introducing this legislation was to call attention to the need of action regarding the obsolete 3-mile limit.

In my remarks to the Senate I referred to that 3-mile limit as an "albatross hung around every fisherman's neck." For I am saying to you very frankly that I am in favor of the 12-mile limit for the entire United States. I think it is overdue. The 3-mile limit is an outmoded conception dating from the days of the cannon that shot round iron balls whose effective range was estimated to be approximately 3 miles. In other words, the 3-mile limit was a development of a national defense measure which had nothing whatever to do with fishing. For long the 3-mile limit was common to all nations with seacoasts.

While there has been a lot of discussion concerning these limits for years and the pros and cons of changing them, there has been no concerted action. International conferences to change these limits have never developed a sufficient agreement to make possible multilateral action or universal action. So what actually has happened recently is that individual nations have taken it upon themselves to extend these limits to whatever seemed to them to be best for their nationals, and varyingly to hope and assume that each could make its prescription prevail on others. But Uncle Sam, being generally good natured and perhaps in his maturity a little timid, has hesitated to take such action partly because of concern for international relations, but also because there were differences of opinion in our own fishing family.

These differences of opinion have become less and less valid because they were largely based on the desire of some of our fishermen to fish as close to the 3-mile limits of other nations as possible and did not wish to stimulate those nations into retaliatory measures if the United States proclaimed a 12-mile limit for itself. That situation has been rapidly disappearing as other nations have acted or claimed extensions of their fishing areas, and I suspect that before long we shall move closer to unanimity among American fishermen in supporting a 12-mile limit for our fisheries.

Let it be understood that this is for fisheries only and that is what our discussion is about, because there are some military or naval aspects, and extension of the limit to 12 miles for purposes other than fishing clash with some conceptions of our Defense Establishment.

Actually, the United States has in the past been a retarding agent in promoting change.

When the Hague Codification Conference met in 1930 under the auspices of the League of Nations, the United States favored continuation of the 3-mile limit which was then supported by the United Kingdom and by its former colonies or associates in the British Empire—Canada, India, Ireland, and South Africa, as well as by the Netherlands, Greece, Denmark, and China. Favoring 4 miles were Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Iceland. Six miles was sought by Italy, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Brazil, and Colombia. Portugal reached for 12 miles. No agreement was reached at this Conference.

Another conference, after long preparation in which 86 nations were represented, met in 1958, known as the Geneva Conference of the Law of the Sea. At that gathering 21 countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom, claimed 3 miles. In that category were also Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Japan, Jordan,

Liberia, Malaya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, South Africa, and Tunisia. Again Norway and Sweden, Finland, and Iceland favored 4 miles. Cambodia claimed 5 miles.

Twelve countries claimed 6 miles—Ceylon, Colombia, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia. Mexico claimed 9 miles and Albania 10. By this time, 11 countries were claiming 12 miles—Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Libya, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, and Venezuela. Chile, Costa Rica, Salvador, and Peru put in a claim for 200 miles, while Argentina, Korea, Nicaragua, and Panama sought to claim their continental shelves. At this Conference, Soviet Russia and the Arab bloc insisted on 12 miles, while the United States and the United Kingdom led the fight for the status quo—namely, 3 miles. Late in the Conference the U.S. delegation offered a compromise. It proposed a 6-mile limit with an additional 6-mile contiguous zone in which the coastal nation would have exclusive fishing rights, subject only to "historic rights" for countries whose nationals had fished in the area for the 5 previous years. This compromise failed to receive the two-thirds vote required for adoption as a Conference recommendation.

Two years later, in 1960, there was another conference—the Second Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea. This time the Conference began with the proposal that failed in the closing hours of the 1958 Conference, with the added qualification that after an initial 10 years the right of the states to fish within 12 miles would end unless bilateral treaties could meanwhile be negotiated. In this Conference the proposal fell short of one vote of the necessary two-thirds. With 82 nations voting and 5 abstentions, the proposal received 54 votes to 28 against. A shift of 1 vote would have made it 55 for to 27 against, the needed two-thirds majority. But let us remember that even after such a favorable vote there would be no compulsion for nations to carry out the findings of the Conference. A subsequent treaty with each nation, or a multilateral treaty of ratification, would have been needed and there was no guarantee or certainty that this would follow and that such treaties could be successfully negotiated.

This brief summary of recent history on the extent of territorial waters will give an idea of the difficulty of arriving at international agreement. The United States has been making efforts to secure such agreement. This is a praiseworthy objective—if attainable.

The United States has, in recent years, been suffering from what might be termed a power inferiority complex. Because we are powerful, we hesitate to assert that power. We demur at asserting it because of a well-intentioned and idealistic desire to show the world that we believe in negotiation, arbitration and decisions arrived at by mutual consent, if possible, of vexatious international problems. That is a fine ideal and a high purpose, which I applaud and which someday may prevail in the world. There is an old saying to the effect it is well to have a giant's strength but it is tyrannous to avail oneself of it. Well, neither is it desirable to have Lilliputians truss up and hamstring the giant through unwillingness on his part to use his giant's strength to protect his nationals' interest. For indeed events are outrunning the worthy high purposes but languid action of some aspects of our national policy. While the United States is striving for international agreements, other nations are going it alone.

On June 4 last, Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson, addressing the Canadian Parliament, declared that the time had come to "take firm and national action to protect Canada's fishing industry." Commenting on the growing number of foreign fishing operations which threatened to deplete his nation's offshore fishery resources, Canada's chief executive declared:

"The Canadian Government has decided to establish a 12-mile exclusive fisheries zone along the whole of Canada's coastline as of mid-May 1964, and to implement the straight baseline system at the same time as the basis from which Canada's territorial sea and exclusive fisheries zone shall be measured."

I can only applaud Canada's action as a vigorous move to protect its nationals' fishing interests.

Other nations, too, are moving—and moving unilaterally. Ecuador—little Ecuador—a country with no great political stability and seeking our financial aid under Uncle Sam's generous foreign assistance program and receiving it—to date to the extent of $152 million—seized two American fishing vessels and arrested their crews, although they were fishing more than 12 miles from shore, since Ecuador claimed exclusive fishing jurisdiction up to 200 miles. The crews were brought into the harbor and kept imprisoned on their vessels for 3 weeks, a plain, unmitigated outrage. Then the two ships were fined $12,086 and $14,186 respectively.

We may well contrast the absence of vigorous action by our State Department in this case with its action in Alaska, where it insisted that the crews of the Japanese vessels arrested by Governor Egan, when they were caught fishing within 3 miles of Alaska's coast, be released without trial, although in their case they could only have been fined for failure to have fishing licenses and for violation of the conservation practices prevailing in our waters.

There have been other cases in Ecuador and similar to these of harassment of American fishing boats off the shores of other Latin American countries, and it is high time that we had a clear-cut understanding as to what they may and may not do, and not be subject to the arbitrary, brutal, and ruthless maltreatment to which these American fishermen have been subjected. Submission to such maltreatment does not instill respect either for the country guilty thereof or for the United States which accepts it passively.

As you know, I was asked to present a written copy of this address, which required my writing it a week in advance; and when I wrote it, I said, at this point: "I expect that this issue will come up in the current debate on foreign aid and that legislation will be proposed to obviate such occurrences in the future."

Well, it has come up. It took place on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday and Thursday, November 6 and 7. At that time, an amendment to the foreign aid bill, sponsored by the two California Senators—Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, and Senator Clair Engle, Democrat—provided as follows:

"No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country which (1) has extended or hereafter extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement in which the United States is a party."

The amendement was vigorously supported both by my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, and by me. It was opposed by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, but it passed by a vote of 57 to 29.

An unusual parliamentary situation developed. It is customary, immediately after a vote has been taken, for the leader on the winning side to move for reconsideration of the bill and then have another Senator, similarly on the winning side, to move that the move for reconsideration be laid on the table. The purpose of this is to make the decision final and not to permit reconsideration at a future date.

Before the move for reconsideration could be offered by Senator KUCHEL in behalf of the Kuchel-Engle amendment, Senator LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor and spoke very emphatically against the amendment. He succeeded in swinging a few votes but not sufficient to prevent the motion for reconsideration to be laid on the table.

The amendment, of course, will still have to be approved in conference, since it is not in the House version of the bill, and I think you can be reasonably sure that strong efforts will be made by the opponents to secure its deletion in conference.

But there is more than that to prompt the United States to act. Foreign fishing vessels in increasing numbers are also appearing off our shores, in waters traditionally fished by American vessels. They have been off the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida and off our gulf coasts.

Soviet Russia is going after the fisheries all over the world with effectiveness, determination, and ruthlessness that threatens our fisheries and the livelihood of our fishermen. The Japanese likewise have become more and more aggressive. In 1956 the United States ranked second only to Japan as a fishing nation. By 1961, 5 years later, the United States had dropped to fifth place among nations in the size of its catch. We are now behind not only Japan, but behind Soviet Russia, Red China, and Peru. That is not a position of which we should be proud. Nor is it a trend that we can or should continue to tolerate.

While the world's annual fish catch has doubled in the last 15 years, the U.S. share of that increase has been negligible. But what has increased is our fisheries importation, which has, since 1940, grown approximately 400 percent. A determined national policy, geared to the national interest, could rectify that condition.

To be sure our dilemma is a complex one and I shall shortly touch on some of its problems and proposed remedies. But among the remedies which will be decidedly beneficial is the extension of our fishing preserves at least to the 12-mile limit with appropriate baselines between headlands.

The bill, S. 1816, of which I spoke earlier, cosponsored by Senator ED MUSKIE, of Maine—thus evidencing support from our easternmost and westernmost States—has not been acted upon. The reason for the delay is, in part, the desire of the State Department to complete negotiations with some of the nations which are already asserting, or preparing to assert, exclusive control of coastal waters beyond the 3-mile limit. Among these is Canada, whose announced purpose to extend its limits to 12 miles next May would—unless we reach an agreement—deprive some of our American fishermen of long-frequented fishing grounds.

Central and South American nations have made similar departures, and while our Government has "reserved all its rights," as the diplomatic phrase goes, it remains to be seen just what those reservations of our rights mean. In any event, I am convinced that we cannot wait much longer before taking action ourselves.

The urgency for action is brought home to us particularly in Alaska by not merely the invasion of our waters by Japanese and Russian fishing fleets, but their actual penetration inside the 3-mile limit and the taking of fish inside it. One may suspect that the Russians are there also for purposes of observation.

In the summer of 1962, Gov. William Egan, of Alaska, apprised of Japanese fishing vessels moving into the waters of Shelikof

Strait, a body of water lying between Kodiak Island and the mainland, long fished exclusively by Americans, wrote a vigorous protest to the State Department requesting effective action to prevent the Japanese incursion. Hearing nothing, he followed this up with a telegram. Still getting no response, he telephoned and got the Acting Secretary of State on the line. This was, the Acting Secretary said, the first he had heard of the difficulty. The best Governor Egan could exact from him was the promise to send an observer. Governor Egan was caustic over the phone. But, more important, defying precedent, he decided to act. He sent the Alaska National Guard to board two Japanese vessels clearly within these waters, arrested the captains and crews, and ordered them brought to court.

This forthright action was displeasing to the State Department, and produced an editorial in the Washington Post, the Capital's only morning daily, highly critical of Governor Egan. It pointed out that he had improperly taken upon himself a Federal function and chided him for not knowing the limits of a State Governor's authority.

However, his action received the virtually unanimous and enthusiastic support of the people of Alaska. In fact, there are many who believe this brought about his reelection in 1962. The pioneer spirit, still characteristic of "the last frontier" takes many forms. Governor Egan's pioneering received the hearty approval of Alaska's congressional delegation.

At the request of the State Department, the offending Japanese fishermen were released. Actually, there was at the time no penalty for the violation of our 3-mile limit. But the captain and crew could have been fined for not having an Alaska fishing license and for violation of conservation regulations related to the type of their ship's gear, for their nets were fine meshed and take everything, old and young, large and small.

Since that time, I am happy to report, legislation has been introduced in Congress to provide fines up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year for the violation of our coastal waters; that is, penetration by foreign vessels within the 3-mile limit. It, S. 1988, has passed the Senate, in large part due to the efforts of Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, chairman of the Commerce Committee, and of my Alaska colleague, BOB BARTLETT, and is awaiting action in the House, where I am confident it will also be approved. If the United States extends its fishing limits to 12 miles, these penalties will apply without need of any amendatory legislation.

The need for both the penalties and the extension is further demonstrated by actions of the Russian fishing fleet. Soviet vessels have repeatedly, under cover of morning fog, penetrated inside our 3-mile limit. Russian whaling vessels have taken whales well within it, and have been observed doing it. When detected by plane, they have often not moved, and only with the approach of our Coast Guard vessels have they moved out. Hitherto they have had nothing to fear. The Coast Guard vessel merely escorts them outside of the 3-mile limit. Actually, if S. 1988 becomes law, we shall need faster vessels because as of now they are not fast enough to catch the Russian ships. I have repeatedly requested the administration to station faster vessels—a destroyer or two—in Alaskan waters to overtake and apprehend such violators. Up to now, we are limited to escorting them outside our waters and then making a protest to the Russian Foreign Office.

So far, I have not secured compliance with these requests for destroyers or faster ships. I shall continue to make them. I have pointed out the uselessness of diplomatic protests made after such violations. Enactment of S. 1988, to impose fines up to $10,000 or a year's imprisonment, or both, will have a deterrent effect provided also we can catch the culprits. Otherwise, the Russian practice of fish-and-run will continue. I wonder, parenthetically, what would happen to American fishing vessels if they should similarly venture into Siberian waters. My guess is that our fishing vessels would never be heard from again.

Indeed, there is real danger that unless the Federal Government acts decisively, the State of Alaska may again feel impelled to act, as it did in the case of the Japanese fishing vessels in the summer of 1962.

Telegraphing the State Department on August 2, last, Governor Egan called attention to the presence of four Russian whalers within the 3-mile limit, giving their exact location. One whaler, he reported, had a freshly killed whale on a harpoon line, another whaler was preparing to fire. They were spotted by an experienced aircraft pilot and his passengers. Although the noise of the plane caused the whales to sound, the whalers made no effort to leave the area. This was but the latest of a number of confirmed observations of Russians fishing actively.

After urging the strongest possible representations to Russia and greatly augmented patrols, Governor Egan added that the State of Alaska had no desire again to take unilateral action and was aware of the delicate international situation but "cannot stand idly by in face of repeated violations of its territorial waters."

But there are still other problems with the Russians which will not be solved by the 12-mile limit and baselines alone and the penalties for their violations.

In Alaska we have, in recent years, developed an entirely new and desirable fishery product—the king crab. This is a large animal—its mature specimen measuring from 3 to 5 feet in diameter. The meat in each of its six claws is a meal. This new industry has been developed over the last decade largely through the enterprise and initiative of two Alaskans, brothers, Lowell and Howard Wakefield. Alaska king crab has become a nationally known delicacy and is increasingly marketed. It is caught by traps or pots which are lowered to the sea bottom from the crab fishing vessels and hauled to the surface and placed aboard.

For two succesive seasons Russian trawlers cruising outside the 3-mile limit have torn up these traps. Governor Egan met with the victims at Kodiak last month and their testimony was to the effect that the Russians were deliberately dragging through the crab fishermen's gear, each of whose pots were clearly marked by a buoy. The Russians went back and forth through this area. One fisherman lost three pots on one day, five on the next, and two subsequently. As these cost about $200 apiece, he felt he could no longer set out his crab pots. Others gave similar testimony. Our crab fishermen, in effect, have been driven off their fishing grounds and deprived of their livelihood.

Another fisherman, coming alongside a Russian trawler, observed large quantities of king crab on its decks. There were many female and immature crabs and none of these were thrown off, as our conservation practices require.

In a letter to the President last month, Governor Egan reported these facts to the President. He had counseled the fishermen fully to document and report their gear losses and encounters with the Russians and to avoid any incidents which would prejudice their cause. He was evidently apprehensive that some of them, inflamed by the deliberate and insolent invasion of their grounds and destruction of their property, might be tempted to take the law into their own hands. (Violence against Japanese seal poachers flared over half a century ago, when Alaskans did take the law into their hands.)

"I believe the evidence conclusive," Governor Egan wrote the President, "that the Russians are driving American fishermen from their traditional fishing grounds and ignoring the fundamental requirements of king crab conservation."

So even the 12-mile limit and the establishment of base lines will not be enough. The United States should reserve its continental shelf—subject only to such bilateral treaties as serve the interests of both our fishermen and of the Nation with which we treat. But even that will not be enough unless our Government takes a firm stand in behalf of our fishermen's rights and is prepared to back it up.

We have the largest defense budget in our history. We claim, and have, the most powerful military machine in the world—Army, Navy, and Air Force. We justify it and Congress votes it cheerfully in order to stop the advance of Communist imperialism all over the world. A large part of our defense effort, in dollars, material and manpower, is spent far from our shores, in distant parts of the world. Is it not inconsistent and inexplicable that we do not put out the same effort at home; that we do not stop the economic aggression on our very coasts?

It is high time we did so.

Such action, however imperative, will not solve all our fishery problems, for we must also meet the competition of other nations' subsidized fishing vessels and efficient floating factories. The Congress is moving in this direction with legislation to authorize the Government to pay a subsidy of 55 percent of the cost of new fishing vessels. This is proper and realistic, since our fishery interests are obligated to build in American shipyards. When we have modern ships and equipment, we will be able to compete on the high seas, though that will not solve the problem of foreign vessels disregarding conservation practices and taking immature fish.

Other legislation is giving us increased funds for research.

I sponsored a bill in the 87th Congress which would have turned over one-third of the proceeds from the Kennedy-Saltonstall Act to the States to be used by the State fishery authorities for whatever purpose they deem best. The funds were allocated to the States on the basis of fishery landings. The bill ran into some objections and did not pass.

In a modified form, sponsored by my Alaska colleague, BOB BARTLETT, along with 30 other Senators, of whom I was one, it has been introduced in this Congress and has already passed the Senate. It is S. 627, and I am confident it stands an excellent chance of passage in the House.

In addition to that, we now have an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which includes fish products and fish protein concentrate as part of the food for peace program. Senator BARTLETT of Alaska was one of the prime movers in securing this desirable amendment. When we overcome the stubborn resistance of the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, who objects to the domestic sale of fish protein concentrate on esthetic grounds, we will also increase our domestic market substantially for fishery products.

Indeed, it is high time that we began to give consideration to those who produce food from the sea comparable to that we give those who produce food from the land.

We are spending billions of dollars annually to help the farmer with price supports and storage of surpluses—but we have done next to nothing for the fisherman. We have never subsidized our fishermen for the fish they do not catch. We have no sea bank comparable to the soil bank. To quote President Kennedy's clarion call: "Let us begin." Well, we are just barely beginning in ship

construction and research. We must do much more to regain our lost position.

But we can, and I believe we must, protect our coastal waters and their fisheries. Although there are some differences between the views and interests of our own fishermen, I am convinced that the preponderant national interest will be served, as I have said, by extending our fishing waters to at least 12 miles and by including the Continental Shelf for crustacea and shellfish, and by being determined to enforce our rights within these areas. A vacillating, a weak-kneed, a soft policy will lead only to continuing and further encroachment. The United States has abundantly shown its generosity, its empathy, and its willingness to help other nations. Our foreign aid program has for years included projects to assist, to rehabilitate, to support the fisheries of a score of foreign nations.

It's high time we stood up for our own.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is time we stood up for our own.

We have given in grants the sum of $14,693,024 since 1955 to build up the fisheries of other nations.

That total includes $5,351,000 to help the fishermen of Korea; $1,355,670 to assist the fishermen of Pakistan, and $907,198 to assist the fishermen of Indonesia.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart appearing in the Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, 1962, volume 15, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United States, showing the world catch of fish, by countries, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

World catch of fish, crustaceans, mollusks, etc., by countries, 1962

[Live weight basis]

Country	Billion pounds	Percent
Japan	15.13	15.3
Peru	15.06	15.3
China (mainland)	[1] 11.07	11.2
U.S.S.R.	7.98	8.1
United States	[2] 6.56	6.7
Norway	2.95	3.0
Canada	2.46	2.5
Spain	2.22	2.3
India	2.15	2.2
United Kingdom	2.08	2.1
Indonesia	2.08	2.1
Iceland	1.84	1.9
Denmark	1.73	1.8
France	1.62	1.6
South Africa	1.44	1.5
Chile	1.41	1.4
Germany, Western	1.39	1.4
Portugal	1.14	1.2
Philippines	1.11	1.1
Korea, South	.99	1.0
South West Africa	.90	.9
Burma	.79	.8
Thailand	.75	.8
Pakistan	.73	.7
China (Taiwan)	.72	.7
Netherlands	.71	.7
Sweden	.64	.6
Brazil	[3] .62	.6
Angola	.59	.6
Vietnam, South	.56	.6
Mexico	.48	.5
Italy	.48	.5
Federation of Malaya	.44	.4
Poland	.40	.4
Morocco	.36	.4
Cambodia	.32	.3
Other	6.69	6.8
Total	98.59	100.0

[1] 1959 data.
[2] Revised.
[3] 1961 data.

Source: "Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, 1962," vol. XV, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, our fishing industry can be a principal weapon in our war against poverty. We can, if permitted, harvest our bountiful sea crops and make available to the hungry men, women, and children of our land the protein needed to grow strong and to keep strong.

Poverty can be cured here and in other lands. As a forward-looking society, verging on undreamed of greatness, we can end malnutrition if we utilize the untapped resources of our oceans.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 49) to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States and its territories, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas for some years the Congress of the United States has viewed with great concern the inadequacy of present arrangements for the protection, conservation, and rehabilitation of the fishery resources contiguous to the coasts of the United States of America and, in view of the potentially disturbing effect of this situation, has carefully studied the possibility of improving the jurisdictional basis for conservation and rehabilitation measures in this field; and

Whereas such fishery resources have a special importance to coastal communities as a source of livelihood and to the Nation as an important food and industrial resource; and

Whereas the progressive development of new methods and techniques contributes to intensified fishing over wide sea areas and, in certain cases, seriously threatens fisheries with depletion; and

Whereas there is urgent need to protect coastal fishery resources from destructive exploitation, having due regard to conditions peculiar to each region and situation and to the special rights and equities of the coastal States: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever the Governor of any State or territory alleges by a petition to the President of the United States that fishing by nationals of other nations in some or all of the coastal waters lying within twelve miles off the shores of such State or territory is of such intensity or magnitude that the fishery resources in such waters are in danger of depletion, the President shall appoint a Fact Finding Board (hereinafter called the "Board") consisting of three persons, one of whom shall be a resident of such State or territory.

SEC. 2. The Board shall, within ninety days, investigate the allegations made by the Governor and report its findings of fact and recommendations for action to the President.

SEC. 3. The President, on the basis of such report and recommendations and such other information as may be brought to his attention, may by Presidential proclamation, if he finds that the allegations are sustained by the facts—

(a) prohibit fishing in some or all of the coastal waters up to twelve miles off the coast of such State by any person not a national of the United States of America; or

(b) establish conservation zones in the coastal waters lying up to twelve miles off the coast of such State or territory, limit the amount and type of fishing which may be conducted in such conservation zones, and set forth when and by whom fishing may be conducted in such conservation zones.

SEC. 4. Members of the Board shall be appointed without regard to the civil service and classification laws and shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day when engaged in carrying out their duties and shall, in addition, receive reimbursement for actual expenses incurred in the performance of such duties.

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. JORDAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park, in the State of Idaho.

With only minor changes, this is identical with the bill—S. 2326—which I introduced during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, and upon which hearings were conducted both here and in Idaho late last year, at my request.

Mr. President, this measure is designed to preserve and interpret a series of invaluable historic sites in the Nez Perce Indian country of north-central Idaho—an area deeply interwoven in the fabric of our Nation's westward exploration and settlement. Dispatched by President Jefferson to find a Northwest Passage to the Pacific, the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1805 here met and mastered its greatest crisis, an accomplishment that gave us a major claim to the Oregon country. Here, too, was one of the first Christian missions established among the Northwest Indian tribes; the first printing press utilized in the Northwest; the gold discovery, in 1860, which populated the region; the first battles of the dramatic Nez Perce Indian War of 1877; and numerous other events which blazed the trail of our westward march.

Uniquely, these events transpired in a compact area of magnificently beautiful mountain country—an area with an average north-south distance of about 60 miles, and an east-west distance of approximately 110 miles, which is nearly the full width of northern Idaho. The new Lewis and Clark Highway follows the route of the explorers, from east to west, and crosses the Nez Perce Reservation, thus providing easy access for the thousands who will come to be reminded of a colorful and most important chapter of our national past.

The Secretary of Interior would be authorized to designate as the park a series of scattered sites throughout the area, thus requiring only the cooperation of other agencies, and the possible acquisition of a small amount of property in nonpublic ownership. The bill restricts such acquisition to not more than 1,500 acres of land and interests in land.

Mr. President, this proposal has impressive backing. It has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, and recommended by both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior. Federal agencies were unanimously in favor at hearings held here by the Sen-

ate Subcommittee on Public Lands. Those conducted at Lewiston, by the chairman and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], last October, brought forth overwhelming approval through direct and submitted testimony by more than 100 persons, including Gov. Robert E. Smylie. Printed hearings of this field inspection trip will soon be available, and I am hopeful that the bill will be high on the priority list of the Senate Interior Committee for this session.

Action is urgent. The opening of the new Lewis and Clark Highway has accelerated roadside commercial and residential development along the route, endangering the integrity and availability of potential sites.

A similar measure has been introduced in the House by the Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., of Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 60) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to facilitate protection and provide interpretation of sites in the Nez Perce country of Idaho that have exceptional value in commemorating the history of the Nation.

SEC. 2. To implement this purpose the Secretary of the Interior may designate as the Nez Perce National Historical Park various component sites in Federal and non-Federal ownership relating to the early Nez Perce culture, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area, the fur trade, missionaries, gold mining and logging, the Nez Perce War of 1877, and such other sites as he finds will depict the role of the Nez Perce country in the westward expansion of the Nation.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation or with donated funds such lands, or interests therein, and other property which in his judgment will further the purpose of this Act and he may purchase with appropriated funds land, or interests therein, required for the administration of the Nez Perce National Historical Park: *Provided,* That he may purchase no more than one thousand five hundred acres in fee, and no more than five thousand one hundred acres in scenic easements. The Nez Perce Tribe's governing body, if it so desires, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to sell, donate, or exchange tribal-owned lands held in trust needed to further the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) Indian trust lands and sites in Federal ownership under the administrative jurisdiction of other Government agencies, not to exceed one thousand and five hundred acres overall, may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the Nez Perce National Historical Park with the concurrence of the beneficial owner or agency having administrative responsibility therefor, but such designation shall effect no transfer of administrative control unless the administering agency consents thereto. The Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the administering agency in research into and interpretation of the significance of the site and in providing desirable interpretive services and facilities and other facilities required for public access to and use and enjoyment of the site, and in conservation of the scenic and other resources thereof.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of property which under the provisions of this Act may be designated for inclusion in Nez Perce National Historical Park as sites in non-Federal ownership, and he may assist in the preservation, renewal, and interpretation of the properties, provided the cooperative agreements shall contain, but not be limited to, provisions that: (1) the Secretary has right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property for the purpose of conducting visitors through the property and interpreting it to the public, and (2) no changes or alterations shall be made in the properties, including buildings and grounds, without the written consent of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior determines that he has acquired title to, or interest in, sufficient properties or determines that he has entered into appropriate cooperative agreements with owners of non-Federal properties, or any combination thereof including the designation of sites already in Federal ownership, he shall by publication in the Federal Register establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park and thereafter administer the Federal property under his administrative jurisdiction in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 6. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of the Interior may contract and make cooperative agreements with the State of Idaho, its political subdivisions or agencies, corporations, associations, the Nez Perce Tribe or individuals, to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any site, object, or property included within the Nez Perce National Historical Park, regardless as to whether title thereto is in the United States: *Provided,* That no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

(b) To facilitate the interpretation of the Nez Perce country the Secretary is authorized to erect and maintain tablets or markers in accordance with the provisions contained in the Act approved August 21, 1935, entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes" (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure for me to cosponsor the bill to authorize the designation of the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho. I not only have an interest in this as a Senator from Idaho, but I have lived most of my life in the Nez Perce country and I fully appreciate its national historical significance.

The purpose of the bill is to preserve, commemorate, and interpret the history and culture of the Nez Perce Indian country of this area in northern Idaho. This reaches from the Wallowa Mountains of northeast Oregon, some 200 miles across the State of Idaho to the crest of the Bitteroot Mountains in Montana. It encompasses a string of historic sites such as the ancestral homes of the proud Nez Perce Indian Tribe, campsites used by Lewis and Clark when they opened up the northwest empire in 1805, markers where battles were fought between Indians and Federal troops, the Spaulding area which includes the remains of the Henry Spaulding Mission of 1836, the St. Joseph's Mission and one of the first Indian Presbyterian churches at East Kamiah, the Craig donation land claim, the famous log drive sites on the Clearwater River, markers of those fur traders who first began to acquaint the Indians with our civilization, the town of Pierce where gold was first discovered in Idaho and the Weis Rock filter, a significant archeological site. These will be preserved and properly marked so these places where history was made will be available for the education and enjoyment of future generations.

Mr. President, this will be a unique park in many ways. All these sites will be linked together so that one administrative area will serve for all of them. Only the actual sites, where they are now in private ownership, will be acquired. There may be scenic and protective easements secured which will not adversely affect the local tax base or the productive capacity of the local communities. The actual sites may not exceed 1,500 acres and the scenic easements not exceed 5,100 acres under the terms of the bill. With about two-thirds of the State of Idaho now in Federal ownership this factor is of importance to us.

Under this program the historical and archeological sites will be preserved and made available for thousands of people interested in the Nez Perce Country each year, and yet the minimum of land will be purchased and scenic easements will protect these sites so they will not be unduly affected by the construction of buildings and structures not in keeping with the historical background.

A hearing on a bill for this same purpose which was introduced in the last session of Congress was held at Lewiston, Idaho, last October. Support for this legislation and the creation of such a historical park was widespread and enthusiastic.

This bill has the full support of Idaho's congressional delegation and we urge approval by the Congress for this unique national historical park.

PROGRAM OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I again introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of hospital insurance for the elderly, to be administered by the Social Security Administration.

The financing of adequate hospital and related care for older Americans is a persistent and pervasive national problem with which I have long been concerned.

Since 1959, I have sponsored bills to provide an equitable and meaningful program of hospital insurance that

would help our senior citizens retain their independence and dignity.

At no time since this issue first came before the Congress many years ago have chances of favorable action been so bright. As a result of the 1964 elections, a clear majority of both Houses of the Congress support this program.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, reemphasized his desire for early action. An overwhelming majority of the American people favor the program, and I truly believe that we will at last see it become law later this year.

The need for this program has been so clearly documented that there is no point in my repeating the obvious statistics.

The bill I submit today represents my personal efforts at development of a meaningful medicare program.

It differs in some respects from the King-Anderson bill, which has the support of the administration.

But the goal of both bills is the same, namely to establish a universal program of hospital insurance for older Americans on a national basis.

Accordingly, I intend to work with Senator ANDERSON and other supporters of this program to get the best possible medicare bill through the Congress.

At a later date, I shall discuss the details of my bill at greater length. In many ways, it coincides with the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which reported last week to the President.

Under my bill, a separate hospital insurance trust fund, financed by a separate payroll tax, would be established. The tax would amount to eight-tenths of 1 percent on salaries and wages up to $9,000 a year, with employer and employee each contributing four-tenths of 1 percent. Self-employed persons would pay six-tenths of 1 percent, up to the same maximum.

My bill would amend the Social Security Act, and the separate payroll tax would be collected on earnings as defined by social security, under existing procedures.

The bill would provide coverage to all persons 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits. All retired persons who are not covered by social security or railroad retirement, except for retired Federal employees who have their own programs, would receive the same benefits over the next 5 years, with the cost financed out of general revenues.

Benefits would be similar to bills I have introduced in the past and would include:

First. Forty-five days of hospital care per benefit period, without any deductible provision to be paid by the patient. The bill would provide as high as 90 days of hospitalization per calendar year.

Second. Ninety days' care in skilled nursing home per benefit period, following hospitalization, or up to 180 days per calendar year.

Third. Up to 120 home health service visits following hospital or skilled nursing home care in a supervised home health program, or in the outpatient department of a hospital, including radiation therapy and laboratory examinations.

Fourth. Payment for diagnostic outpatient services as recommended by a physician, without prior hospitalization or nursing home confinement, for such items as laboratory tests and X-rays, with the patient paying the first $10 of such charges in each 30-day period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 65) to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE'S speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure and privilege to yield now to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN]. In yielding to him, I welcome him to service in the Senate. This will be the first statement that the junior Senator from Arizona has made on the floor of the Senate. I want him to know how happy I am to have him with us.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I offer my sincere thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I am honored by his yielding to me.

My esteemed colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has today introduced a bill to authorize the construction and operation of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill.

Arizona is in dire need of immediate construction of the central Arizona unit contained in this bill. Her existing and ever-growing economy are fast exhausting her water resources in many areas of the State. Her very future is threatened by any delay.

The bill is more than a State project, as the benefits it provides will extend far beyond Arizona's borders. It is a program designed to initiate a regional plan to provide much needed water to the Pacific Southwest, with the cost repayable to the Federal Government under reclamation law.

Within the provisions of this project is included a program to assist alleviating the disastrous consequences of the floods now devastating California areas.

I hope the bill will receive the favorable consideration of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject appear in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the senior Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is of tremendous importance to the State of Wyoming and the other public land States. The purpose of my bill is to increase to 90 percent the amount of mineral royalties returned to the States from their respective mineral lands which are controlled by the Federal Government.

Unlike the great majority of the States of the Union, 70 percent of Wyoming's mineral interests has been reserved to the U.S. Government. Consequently, Wyoming, as is the case with the other Western States, is deprived of realizing the wealth of its natural resources.

Congress wisely provided that the State of Alaska would receive 90 percent of the royalties from all federally owned mineral lands within Alaska. This principle needs to be extended to the other Western States which experience unique and different problems as does the State of Alaska.

The Eastern States retained title to all their public lands and thus receive direct royalties from the same type of lands which our public land States gave to the Federal Government. My proposal is not a new one, but it is a just one and needs to be acted upon if we are to give equal treatment to all the States.

I do not mean to suggest that the Federal Government is getting rich off our mineral royalties. It only gets 10 percent of the royalties, as would be the case if my bill, which calls for a 90-percent return to the respective States, were adopted. Presently, 37½ percent goes to the States and 52½ percent goes to the reclamation fund. There seems to be little reason for this latter distribution since the reclamation expenditures have no relationship to the contributions made by the respective States or are they even capable of paying for a fraction of the costs of reclamation. Our reclamation program is now completely different than it was when this was originally set up. Now all our reclamation projects are self-liquidating, and the fund is not essential to our successful reclamation program.

It would be much simpler, more logical, and certainly more just to return this royalty money directly to the States of origin. The alternative to this is to force the States to come to Washington for financial assistance. Every effort must be made to enact legislation which will permit the States to do for themselves what they can do.

I am hopeful that this legislation will receive favorable consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 90) to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE FOURTH STEP—PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, nearly 100 years ago, this Nation—then smaller, more rural in character, but not less forward looking or lacking in imaginative

vision—established an independent Office of Education.

Nearly 100 years ago, the Congress of the United States, agreeing with Thomas Jefferson and other founders of this Republic that ignorance is the enemy of freedom, and knowing that the well-being of our children is synonymous with the security and integrity of our society, took the first step toward putting the resources of the Federal Government at the disposal of our children.

True, the Department, created by an act signed into law on March 2, 1867, by another President Johnson—President Andrew Johnson—was without Cabinet rank. And it was headed by a Commissioner, but so was the Department of Agriculture which was then 5 years old. The Commissioner was paid $4,000 a year, and his office, at home under the Interior Department umbrella, was at first known as a "Bureau." His staff was composed of three clerks, paid $2,000, $1,800, and $1,600 a year.

"It will throw a flood of light upon the dark places of the land. It will form a public sentiment which will arouse to increased activity the friends of education everywhere, and ignorance will fly before it," said Representative Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota, of the new office. So while the conception on which it was based was far from limited, the new Office itself was small.

But after all, so was our Nation. In 1870, the number of our elementary and secondary school students was 7.8 million; in 1963 it was 51.4 million, and while we as a nation spent $63.4 million on public elementary and secondary schooling in 1870, we spent $17.1 billion in the last school year.

As our Nation grew, we moved twice to raise the status of the Federal Government's commitment to education: After 72 years, the Office of Education became part of the Federal Security Agency. And in April 1953, the Office was transferred to the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At this point—if Senators will go back with me into rather ancient history—the Department was of rather modest size, and a single Cabinet officer might reasonably be expected to conduct its diverse affairs with some success. Still, the responsibilities of the Office of Education were limited. Basically, it remained an agency of pamphleteering, of statistical accumulation, and of technical advisement.

What I propose today, Mr. President, is that we take a fourth step to provide our children with fair and equitable educational opportunity—a step commensurate with the maturity of our society, the vision of its leadership, and the role expected of America by the free world and indeed by our own national conscience. What I propose is the creation of a Department of Education headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank. The new Department will bring together the scattered educational activities of the Federal Government and will coordinate its work. It will assure that education, a matter of paramount concern to our people, has a spokesman at the very summit of Government.

I propose today a bill which would restore education to full departmental status on the 100th anniversary of the founding of the first Department of Education within the executive branch—March 2, 1867. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. My bill is not a complicated one. It specifically prohibits Federal control of education. But it does establish a focal point within the Federal Government for education. It would create a Cabinet-level Department headed by a Secretary of Education, and the staff and programs of the present Office of Education would form the nucleus of the new Department.

In addition, the President would be given the responsibility of transferring to the new Department such education-related functions of other Government agencies as he believes are necessary to promote efficiency in Government and carry out the policy of the legislation. He would be directed to complete the transfers by March 2, 1967. To assist the President, the existing Federal Interagency Committee on Education, established by Executive order on October 16, 1964, would be given statutory authority not only to continue to aid in the coordination of Federal programs in education, but to recommend the appropriate transfers of authority to the President by July 1, 1965.

Within the new Department, the bill would create the positions of Secretary, Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries and a chief counsel—all appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would also create the position of Special Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Development, to be responsible for long-range planning, forecasting trends and problems in education, and assessing the results of existing Federal programs. He would be appointed by the Secretary from the civil service, with the approval of the President.

The purpose of this reorganization conforms with our traditions and aspirations as a democratic people. By strengthening the role of the Federal Government in its dealings with educational problems, we will give all our people a greater part in determining the ultimate form of the Great Society. A new Department of Education will give new dignity and import to the Federal—or general—concern with education. It will give greater visibility to the good work which the Federal Government is already performing in this field. It will help to focus public attention on educational problems—Federal, State, and local—North, South, East and West. And it will attract superior public servants to the cause of education, which is the cause of the future.

And in taking problems concerning our teachers' activities and our children's opportunities out of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we will help that Department achieve greater unity.

Under my bill, the Secretary of Education would be required to submit to the Congress a report dealing not only with the activities of his Department during the year, but with the facts and figures we must have if we are to legislate effectively. These would include objective data on enrollments, expenditures by States and communities, numbers of teachers, specific needs of critical areas in education and similar objective data.

The clear and firm commitment of our Nation to promote the cause of education was spelled out as long ago as the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which pledged that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In legislative act after act we have strengthened that commitment. We recognized long ago that the strength of education in our society presents a clear and essential Federal responsibility—it is long since time to give education in the executive branch a position equal to that responsibility.

Where is education in the executive branch today? It might be more appropriate to ask where it is not. From the green lawns of Bethesda's National Institutes of Health to Foggy Bottom—from the space age world of NASA to the heavily bureaued Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—42 separate Federal departments, agencies, and bureaus are involved in Federal education programs, and each of them makes educational policy—often indifferent or ignorant of the broad national objectives in the field of education. I do not say this in condemnation of any one of these departments. Each of them has a narrow responsibility which it seeks to discharge. None of them is concerned with the whole problem of education. Yet many of these peripheral approaches involve the expenditures of large sums of money—so large that they may unbalance and distort the whole picture.

The Department of Education I propose today would deal with the broad aspects of Federal education policy. It would seek answers to questions of urgent national concern—questions either long ignored or dealt with in haphazard fashion. What, for example, should be the role of Federal research support in higher education? Are we taking our most talented faculty away from their students and confining them to the laboratory? Are we building an elite within our universities—an elite of those who have received Federal research grants? Are we creating an elite of universities themselves?

What is the role of the small college—the junior college, the technical institute, the vocational school, the centers of excellence—not only separately, but considered together as a total national resource?

What are we doing to assure that our future leaders have the opportunity to gain the experience, knowledge, and training they will need? What of the average child? The child, who, like Winston Churchill or John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is a late bloomer, but who has the capacity to become a titan of his times? Our vocational programs are vastly improved and expanded—to be

sure, but are they equal to the awesome challenge of automation? Are we adequately preparing our students for 21st century demands and skills? Are our exceptional children—both the gifted and the slow—receiving the attention due their given gifts? Have we emphasized the sciences and mathematics in our schools so greatly that we are losing touch with our magnificent cultural inheritance?

Today, we are spending $5 billion a year in Federal funds for education. But less than a third of that amount, or $1.6 billion is channeled through the nominal agency for education—the Office of Education. Even within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there is an additional $800 million spent for education—through the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Welfare Administration.

The school lunch programs, State agricultural experiment stations and research and development programs of the Department of Agriculture add another half billion dollars a year to the Government's educational budget.

The National Science Foundation is directly and primarily concerned with education. It will channel $400 million into our schools and universities this year.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency's one-third of a billion dollars for college housing loans, the Labor Department's $362 million for vocational and technical training programs, the Veteran's Administration's $77 million for war orphans and veterans education programs are but a few more examples.

The Department of Defense, NASA, and the Atomic Energy Commission together contribute another $443 million to education—primarily in the area of research and science.

Let me conclude this list by naming the agencies and amounts that make up the remainder of the Federal education budget. The Department of Interior, $123 million; the State Department, $60 million; the District of Columbia government, $12.5 million; the Canal Zone, $12.4 million; the Department of Commerce, $7 million; the Treasury, $6.1 million; the Justice Department, $3 million; and the Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity, $190 million.

It is no wonder that the Office of Education, as now constituted, cannot begin to answer urgent questions of national education policy. It is but a part—and a small part—of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which I was once privileged to head.

When the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established in 1953, there were 35,408 employees. By 1960, the number had grown to more than 61,000. Today more than 83,000 men and women are needed to carry out the Department's programs.

The total HEW annual appropriations have soared from under $2 billion in 1953 to nearly $7 billion in fiscal 1965. The Office of Education spends $1.6 billion of that amount—a budget that has grown five times since 1953 and doubled in the past 2 years alone. Since the advent of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, education in America has made tremendous strides. We have passed more education bills in the past few years than in the entire previous history of the Office of Education. We have had two outstanding Commissioners of Education in Sterling McMurrin and Francis Keppel and it is a tribute to their imaginative talents—and those of their colleagues—that we have made as much progress as we have.

Now our great President has called for a new assault on ignorance and its evils, assigning a star role to education in the Great Society. He asked this week in his sweeping state of the Union message for an additional $1.5 billion for education. It only makes sense that we develop an administrative structure that can deal efficiently and effectively with programs of this magnitude and that can properly supervise and coordinate them.

We cannot expect to achieve success with an outmoded and antiquated administrative system. We cannot run 20th-century programs with 19th-century organizations.

I am not the first to propose a Department of Education. Educators and former Commissioners of Education have repeatedly urged that the Office of Education be elevated in strength and stature in the Federal Government. Since 1908, 53 bills have been introduced in Congress to accomplish this result.

The Education Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators in its study of "Educational Responsibilities of the Federal Government" recommended this past year:

> We believe that education deserves * * * status and that the most thorough and most durable way to assure it would be to establish a Department of Education with a Secretary who would sit in the Cabinet.

In November 1964, the Council of Chief State School Officers resolved:

> The council recommends that there be created in the Federal Government a Department of Education, headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank, for carrying out the Federal responsibility in education.

In 1963, the American Council on Education's program to develop higher education as a national resource recommended:

> That there should be an appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

Former Commissioner Earl J. McGrath proposed in October 1962 that the Commissioner of Education become an independent officer with Cabinet rank. Similar views were earlier expressed by past Commissioners Sterling M. McMurrin and Lee M. Thurston.

The President's Committee for the White House Conference on Education in April 1956 called for "a far stronger U.S. Office of Education." The Hoover Commission in 1947 declared that "the Office of Education has been kept so weak that it has neither the governmental status nor the facilities to be an effective force in developing or coordinating a Federal program of education."

President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1946 advised that "the status of education in the Federal Government must be raised before the Government will be able to play its important part in the speedy improvement in education."

As far back as 1929, the National Advisory Committee on Education reported to President Hoover that "the Committee recommends establishment of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet."

Mr. President, we have talked long enough. The consensus is overwhelming. The time has come to end the uncertain status of education in our Government. The time has come to end unnecessary duplication, waste, and administrative chaos. The time has come to create a Department of Education. For 100 years the forces of education in the United States have grown stronger and more effective. It is time to give them a leader—a leader who would speak for our children and their needs in the highest councils of Government.

Mr. President, the Hartford Courant this week editorialized about the two education measures which I have introduced today. Because of the constructive and interesting way in which the Courant presented its views in its editorial of January 4, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MR. RIBICOFF'S BILLS ON EDUCATION

Senator RIBICOFF is renewing his effort to get some income tax relief for those who are paying for a college education. His last attempt was foiled, largely by the Treasury Department, which foresaw a loss of many million dollars if the Ribicoff plan were adopted. Now Mr. RIBICOFF is planning a companion measure that would set up a Department of Education as a Cabinet post, divorcing it from the melange that now goes under the name of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is a commentary on our national thinking that while defense, commerce, and labor are accorded Cabinet status, we take the three most important activities that affect the lives of our citizens and lump them together in an administrative jumble. As Secretary of this Department Mr. RIBICOFF has had a firsthand view of the matter, and knows that one of the factors that militate against a strong Office of Education is the fact that it is buried in HEW.

The two proposed bills are correlated. Mr. RIBICOFF thinks Federal contributions to education, present and future, have risen to a point where a separate department should be set up to correlate the existing and new programs. The Federal Government is now spending $4.9 billion a year in a wide series of educational programs and there is little doubt that under the Johnson administration this program will be accentuated greatly, particularly the student loans. There is an increasing protest in Congress over the manner in which private loans are now being made by small loan companies to college students at high interest rates.

The Ribicoff plan for college tax credits would charge off part of income up to $325 yearly spent for the college education of a child. Individuals working their way through college would also be granted this modest relief.

Three factors may militate against the Ribicoff bills. There are some who are afraid of a strong Federal Education Department, although there has been no evidence as yet of a Federal desire to dominate. Then there is a national ambivalence toward higher education. We pay lipservice to it, and yet there are many, including Congressmen, who are mildly resentful of it, and object to anything making it easier for those who seek a higher education. Finally there will be the objections of Treasury officials who don't like any diminution in tax income.

Despite these factors there is a good chance that Mr. RIBICOFF will be more successful than he was last time. Change is in the wind.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 100

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established an executive department which shall be known as the Department of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

FUNCTION AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The function and purpose of the Department shall be to promote the cause and advancement of education throughout the Nation. To that end the Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, (1) advise the President with respect to the progress of education; (2) develop and recommend to the President appropriate policies and programs to foster the orderly growth and development of the Nation's educational facilities and resources; (3) exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting education; (4) conduct continuing comprehensive surveys, collect data, and make available findings, on the progress of education; (5) provide information and such other assistance as may be authorized by the Congress to aid in the maintenance of efficient school systems; and (6) encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and community educational activities at the local level.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe. The Under Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, and the Assistant Secretaries and General Counsel shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of such schedule. The Under Secretary (or during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

PROVISIONS OF LAW APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 4. Except to the extent inconsistent with this Act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Secretary may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 7. (a) The United States Office of Education, together with all of its functions, personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and other funds (available or to be made available), is hereby transferred to the Department, and all functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare being administered through such Office, and all functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to such Office, are transferred to the Secretary.

(b) All laws dealing with the relationship between Gallaudet College, Howard University, Freedmen's Hospital, and American Printing House for the Blind, respectively, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are hereby amended to substitute "Secretary of Education" for "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare," and to substitute "Department of Education" for "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(c) Section 394 (3) of the Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes (Public Law 87-447) is hereby amended to substitute "Secretary of Education" for "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare".

(d) Title II, part B, sections 231 and 232, and title III, sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 309 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415) are hereby amended by transferring from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Secretary of Education all duties and responsibilities contained therein.

(e) The President shall transfer to the Department from other departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government such additional functions relating to education as he determines necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency in Government and to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such transfers shall be completed by March 2, 1967.

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 8. All laws relating to any agency or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any agency or in connection with any functions transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, make a report to the President for the submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall also contain objective data on enrollments, expenditures, numbers of teachers, numbers of professionals who lack full qualifications, needs for classroom and other construction, special needs of critical areas such as urban areas, and similar data.

PROHIBITION AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 11. (a) Section 19 (d) (1) of the Act of June 25, 1958, is hereby amended by striking out the phrase "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" at the end thereof and inserting the following: "Secretary of Health and Welfare, Secretary of Education".

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 1) is amended by adding at the end thereof: "Eleventh. The Department of Education." and by amending the phrase "Health, Education, and Welfare" to read "Health and Welfare".

(c) Any reference to the Office of Education or the Commissioner of Education, in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, license, or other official paper in force on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department or the Secretary, as may be appropriate.

(d) Any reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, license, or other official paper in force on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department of Health and Welfare and the Secretary of Health and Welfare, respectively.

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a "Federal Interagency Committee on Education" (hereafter referred to as the "Committee").

(b) The Committee shall study and recommend such actions as may be necessary to assure effective coordination of Federal programs affecting education including: (1) development of Federal programs in accordance with the educational goals and policies of the Nation; (2) consistent administration of policies and practices among Federal agencies in the conduct of similar programs; (3) full and effective communication among Federal agencies to avoid unnecessary duplication of activities; (4) adequate procedures for the availability of information on

educational matters requested by the Secretary; and (5) full and effective cooperation with the Secretary on such studies and analyses as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee shall, not later than July 1, 1966, advise the President with respect to his responsibilities under subsection (e) of section 7 of this Act.

(d) The Committee shall be composed of the Secretary, who shall be the Chairman, and one appropriate representative of each of the following: the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Welfare, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(e) The chairman may invite Federal agencies in addition to those which are represented on the Committee under the provisions of subsection (d) of this section to designate representatives to participate in meetings of the Committee on matters of substantial interest to such agencies which are to be considered by the Committee.

(f) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology may each designate a member of his staff to attend meetings of the Committee as an observer.

(g) Each Federal agency which is represented on the Committee under the provisions of subsection (d), of this section, shall furnish necessary assistance to the Committee in accordance with section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691).

EXPENDITURES AUTHORIZED

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Department to carry out the provisions of this Act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. The provisions of this Act shall be effective on its date of enactment, except that section 7 shall be effective after ninety days following such date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 100) to establish a Department of Education, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EARTHQUAKE REPAIR OF EKLUTNA, ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna hydroelectric project near Anchorage, Alaska.

Shortly before the Congress adjourned last year, a similar bill was introduced by me in the hope that in the interim the Interior Department and any other agencies which might be concerned would have an opportunity to study the matter and be prepared to render early reports in this Congress because of the importance of the measure to Alaska.

The act of July 31, 1950, as amended by the act of August 13, 1953, authorized the construction of the Eklutna project, the only such facility in existence in Alaska. It is vitally important to the fast-increasing Anchorage area. Although the expanding needs through the years for power have been partially met by other means, the benefits of Eklutna are required and used by the city of Anchorage, the Matanuska Electric Association and the Chugach Electric Association.

The law authorizing the project at a cost not to exceed $33 million provided that the capital investment allocable to each unit of the Eklutna project would be amortized over a period of not to exceed 50 years from the time such unit was first put into service. The first 15,000-kilowatt unit went on the line in January of 1955 and the second 15,000-kilowatt unit was in place in March of that same year.

Actually, the project construction costs were considerably less than $33 million, reaching $30,521,183. The gross revenue through November 1964, was $14,148,-903 and the net revenue through the 1963 fiscal year was $3,534,668.

Project studies have indicated that the project investment would be paid off in 41 years, or by 1996, at the current rate.

There had been real hope that the success of the project would lead to favorable consideration for a rate reduction, extending the repayment period from 41 to 47 years, well within the 50-year amortization period established by Congress in the 1950 act.

However, the March 27, 1964, Alaska earthquake cast doubts on these prospects. Inspections following the spring thaw last year disclosed considerable earthquake damage to Eklutna. The thaw created an open area below the outlet structure; the earth below the dam subsided. Permanent repair estimates are placed at about $3.1 million, or $1,-390,000 for the dam and spillway and $1,700,000 for a new tunnel and inlet structure, the total cost to be budgeted over a 3-year period. In October the House and Senate Appropriations Committees approved $600,000 from existing Bureau of Reclamation funds for emergency transmission and intake structure repairs.

The temporary and permanent repairs will thus reach something in the neighborhood of $3.7 million. Under the terms of the original authorization law, these funds are reimbursable from project revenue unless otherwise provided by law. The bill I introduce today would, in effect, provide that the costs of repairing the earthquake-damaged Federal facility will be nonreimbursable and would, therefore, not be charged against Eklutna's revenues. The bill provides a means for bringing into reality the rate reductions anticipated for the Eklutna project prior to the devastating Good Friday earthquake.

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

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

The bill (S. 104) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, from damage caused by the earthquake of March 27, 1964, shall include measures determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be justified for protection of the project from possible future earthquake damage, and sums expended by the Secretary in effecting such rehabilitation shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, and not subject to the provisions of the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of July 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 382), as amended.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make Columbus Day a legal public holiday in the same manner as the eight other Federal holidays we now celebrate.

The intent of this bill is to perpetuate the memory of Christopher Columbus by making the date of his discovery of the New World, October 12, a legal public holiday.

It must be emphasized that this is not a new idea for most of the country—38 States now celebrate Columbus Day as a legal State holiday. Seven other States mark the day by gubernatorial proclamation, while five States and the District of Columbus have no provision for celebrating the day.

The effect of passage of this bill, which will carry the same number, S. 108, as it did when I introduced it in the last Congress, would be to make Columbus Day a permanent Federal holiday. This would immediately affect the District of Columbia and the Federal Government. But it would not establish October 12 as an immediate nationwide holiday, since legal holidays binding on States are established by action of State legislatures. Generally the permanent Federal holidays have also been designated as State holidays by the State legislatures, thereby making such days "national holidays" in the general meaning of the term.

The story of Columbus' epic struggle to set out on his voyage of exploration and the voyage itself is too well known to require repeating here. It is the story of a man who would not be daunted in his dream of exploration. His victory was a vindication of his study and perseverance. It was also a victory for all of us who now share in the fruits of his great discovery and his courageous example can well be followed as we personally and as a nation work to make the best of our destinies.

I was strongly influenced in my decision to introduce this legislation by my

good friend from Delaware, Joseph A. L. Errigo, and the Sons of Italy organization in Delaware.

My warmest appreciation is extended to my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware, for his cosponsorship of this bill, as well as to the 34 other Senators who are also cosponsors. In the 88th Congress the bill passed the Senate but was not acted upon in the House. It is my hope that the Senate will again approve it and that the House will speedily take it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 108) designating Columbus Day as a legal holiday, introduced by Mr. BOGGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT AUTHORIZING ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk for introduction a bill which is cosponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself. This is a bill which I introduced late in the session last year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the same explanation of the bill which was inserted last year.

Certain Members of the Senate have expressed a desire to have an opportunity to look this bill over with a view to perhaps becoming cosponsors. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill lie over for 2 days, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 109) to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

WHY THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION?

With the concentration of the marketing and distribution of agricultural products in the hands of fewer buyers, and the resulting dangers of monopolistic practices from such concentration, it has become apparent that it is not only in the best interest of farmers but also in the best interest of our entire national economy that the marketing power of farmers and ranchers be strengthened. The wider use of contract marketing also has created a greater need for strengthening the bargaining position of farmers. Many farmers and agricultural leaders are of the opinion that in the future most agricultural commodities will be produced under contract. Marketing contracts are now being used for many commodities.

The success of these marketing and bargaining associations depends to a great degree on the number of producers who join these associations and the volume of product they produce. Failure to sign a sufficient membership and tonnage results in the associations being unsuccessful in their attempt to obtain recognition from processors and handlers.

Some processors have made it well known that they are opposed to marketing and bargaining associations as they adversely affect the balance of buying power that processors now enjoy. They much prefer to deal with a grower on an individual basis rather than deal with a group of growers who have voluntarily joined together to market their crop.

Processor actions intended to discourage, and interfere with, association membership during the past few years have aroused growers to request Federal legislation to prevent discriminatory practices. Present Federal antitrust legislation does not effectively deal with certain unfair trade practices which are being carried on by some food processors.

Growers believe that they should not have to operate in an economic climate where they fear processor reprisal because they are members of an association which has as its purpose the strengthening of the market power of its farmer members.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THESE UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES?

First. Threats have been made by representatives of some processing companies that growers will not be offered contracts if they sign association membership agreements. This may eliminate the market outlet for many growers.

Second. Cases have been reported where growers who have joined a marketing association one year have not been offered contracts by processors the following year.

Third. Some processors have encouraged growers to resign from bargaining associations by providing resignation forms and advice on how to terminate their marketing contracts with the association.

Fourth. In some cases leaders of associations have been singled out as examples. They have been offered limited contracts—or no contracts at all—even though they had been reliable, high-quality producers for a company for many years. Cases have also been reported where association leaders have received undesirable unloading schedules or have been denied use of company containers in which to harvest and deliver crops.

Fifth. Some processors have employed other discriminatory tactics to prevent associations from reaching their legitimate objectives. As an example, a processor refused to buy from association members located near his processing plant and contracted with new growers at considerable distance from his plant, even though the raw product cost was higher due to hauling charges and quality factors.

Sixth. Some processors have carried on planned and organized campaigns designed to make certain that a marketing association was not successfully organized in their area.

WHAT DOES THE LEGISLATION DO?

The proposed legislation would amend chapter 12 of title 7 of the United States Code by providing for a new section 3, which establishes unlawful practices affecting associations of producers of agricultural products and members thereof.

The effect of the proposed language is to provide a new section 3 to the Capper-Volstead Act, which is the basic legislation that authorizes the establishment of associations of producers of agricultural products and members thereof.

The new section 3 would make it unlawful for any processor, handler, distributor, dealer, or agent thereof, or for any person, doing business in interstate or foreign commerce, who purchases or contracts to purchase agricultural commodities from producers, knowingly to do any of the following:

First, interfere with, restrain, coerce, or boycott any agricultural producer in the exercise of his rights to join and belong to an association of producers of agricultural products;

Second, discriminate against any agricultural producer with respect to price, quantity, quality, or other terms of purchase of raw agricultural commodities by reason of his membership in, or contract with, such association;

Third, coerce or intimidate any association member or other person to breach, cancel, or otherwise terminate a membership agreement or marketing contract with association;

Fourth, pay or loan money, or give any other thing of value, to a producer as an inducement or reward for refusing to or ceasing to belong to such association; or

Fifth, make false reports about the finances, management or activities of such associations, or interfere in any way with the efforts of such associations in carrying out the legitimate objects thereof.

WHAT ARE THE PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION?

Section 4 would provide for a criminal penalty and damages in case any person violates section 3. Any person who was found to be in violation and convicted would be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Any person who felt that he was injured in his business or property by reason of violation of section 3 could sue in his own district court and could recover triple damages he might have sustained and the cost of the suit including a reasonable attorney's fee.

The proper State courts would not be deprived of jurisdiction of any action that might be taken in them for damages.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE SECTION DEALING WITH AFFILIATION OF ASSOCIATIONS?

Section 5 recognizes the right of an association of producers to be affiliated with other agricultural associations or organizations in carrying out its objectives. There is nothing in the law at present which prohibits such an affiliation. However, section 5 would further clarify this matter.

SUMMARY

Because of the increasing importance of marketing and bargaining associations in agriculture, growers feel very strongly that they should have the right to organize voluntary associations of this type without fear of reprisal or the conducting of unfair trade practices on the part of processors or other handlers. They believe there is an urgent need to have legislation which will spell out the law so that appropriate action can be taken in the future to prevent such unfair trade practices. Failure to meet the situation will mean that in the future this type of voluntary marketing association will be severely handicapped in its ability to adequately serve the needs of farmers as it attempts to improve their marketing power.

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

The bill (S. 2849) to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AN IMMEDIATE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM WOULD ACHIEVE MANY OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the basic goals enunciated by the President in his admirable and forceful state of the Union message Monday night was stated by him as follows:

We seek full employment opportunity for every American.

I commend the President for the establishment of full employment as the No. 1 goal of the Nation. That is as it should be. Nothing can be more distressing than the plight of a breadwinner seeking employment and being unable to find it. Such an individual is not interested in high levels of gross national product or in total numbers of employed. He is interested in securing employment so that he can provide for his family adequately and decently.

In the past I have spoken out repeatedly of the need for immediate action to relieve the distress in the many—far too many—pockets of serious and chronic unemployment in the United States. I know whereof I speak, for my own State of Alaska has for years now suffered in this manner. And suffered sorely. It still suffers, and ways must be found to alleviate the immediate need while fighting the war against poverty on a more permanent and lasting scale.

I was pleased to note the President's words that "special funds for job-creating public programs should be made available for immediate use if recession threatens." But here I hope that the word "recession" will not be given too narrow a construction. The chronically idle, in a pocket of severe unemployment in an otherwise prosperous State, are not threatened by a recession. The recession is already upon them. They are not concerned with statewide or nationwide averages or in industry-wide statistics. All they know is that they are unemployed and cannot find—and have for some time been unable to find—employment, however diligently they may seek it.

A persistent unemployment rate of over 5 percent is not a healthy sign, however glowing the other economic statistics may be. Those other statistics are scant comfort to those comprising the more than 5 percent unemployed.

What is needed is an immediate revival of the accelerated public works program which has exhausted all its funds, even though there are at least $700 million worth of sound public works projects ready to go.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Public Works last March, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, on behalf of the AFL–CIO, stated:

> The overriding economic challenge to the United States today is jobs—jobs for the unemployed, jobs for those who are displaced daily by the advance of automation, jobs for the flood of newcomers entering the labor force. This is beyond dispute.
>
> Equally beyond dispute is that fact that public works programs have proved to be a most effective weapon for creating jobs—good jobs on needed public facilities of permanent worth.
>
> Therefore it would be a tragedy to allow the accelerated public works program to die. It is the conviction of the AFL–CIO that this job-creating program—which also provides vitally needed public facilities of lasting worth—should be both extended and strengthened.
>
> We are advised that there are on file already, here in Washington, some $800 million in such projects which were submitted after all the authorized Federal funds, under the 1962 act, had been committed. This is despite the fact that, as early as January 1963, Federal officials discouraged the submission of further requests because it was apparent that the number on hand exceeded the funds available.
>
> It is unquestionable, then, that a vast number of equally worthy and equally needed projects remain which have never been submitted. There is no doubt that there is work to be done; all that is lacking is the wherewithal to do it.
>
> We know that this committee, which worked so hard on behalf of the original public works acceleration program 2 years ago, is fully aware of the need. We urge your prompt approval of an extension of the existing program, backed by a Federal appropriation of $2 billion.

With these remarks, I agree.

During the 88th Congress, I introduced an amendment to the Accelerated Public Works Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated. A bill (S. 1856) to authorize an additional appropriation of $1.5 billion—slightly smaller than the one I proposed—was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Public Works, but was not acted on by the Senate as a whole.

To meet a serious, immediate need, I am introducing on behalf of myself and the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who has labored so diligently to combat unemployment, a bill to increase the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program by $1.5 billion. I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie at the table for 10 days and that its text, as well as the full testimony of Mr. Biemiller and the committee report on S. 1856, be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Alaska, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 110) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87–658; 76 Stat. 542) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,400,000,000 to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than $800,000,000 shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act."

Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended.

The testimony of Mr. Biemiller and the committee report on S. 1856 are as follows:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 11, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am director of the department of legislation of the AFL–CIO and I am appearing here today on behalf of that organization.

We are here to support the continuation of the Public Works Acceleration Act, and to endorse the purposes of S. 1856, introduced by Senator MCNAMARA.

But our appearance is not only merely a pro forma expression of approbation for a generally desirable piece of legislation. We are here because in our view this program is an essential element in the broad and varied campaign that must be undertaken to insure the security of the Nation, at home and abroad.

The overriding economic challenge to the United States today is jobs—jobs for the unemployed, jobs for those who are displaced daily by the advance of automation, jobs for the flood of newcomers entering the labor force. This is beyond dispute.

Equally beyond dispute is that fact that public works programs have proved to be a most effective weapon for creating jobs—good jobs on needed public facilities of permanent worth.

Yet the accelerated public works program is now expiring. Unless the Congress moves quickly, the 200,000 jobs it is currently providing will vanish. This must not happen.

When this committee conducted hearings on the Public Works Acceleration Act almost 2 years ago, the AFL–CIO testified to its great importance as a means of providing jobs and creating public improvement of long-term worth. Experience has verified that testimony. The benefits of the program are unquestionable. But the need is as great today as when the program was initially proposed.

The tax cut hopefully will prevent, this year, an economic downturn and the sharp rise in unemployment it would bring. However, as the AFL–CIO executive council recently pointed out, "There is no sound basis for anticipating anything more than a small reduction of joblessness in 1964. By next year, the economic stimulus of the tax cut will be wearing out—with the possibility of a renewed upward movement of unemployment."

Let us frankly face the facts about unemployment in the United States.

1. Unemployment has been in a rising trend for 10 years—up from 1.9 million, or 2.9 percent of the labor force, in 1953 to 4.3 million, or 5.7 percent of the labor force, in 1963.

2. There were fewer full-time jobs in private, profitmaking business last year than there were 10 years ago.

3. Unemployment actually increased more than 150,000 in 1963—a year of general prosperity for most Americans—despite a $30 billion rise in total national production.

4. America's job needs are accelerating. While productivity continues to increase at a rapid pace, with the spread of automation, the growth of the labor force is also speeding up—from an average of 900,000 a year in the last decade to an expected 1.4 million a year during the remainder of the 1960's.

The growth of unemployment over the last 10 years, and its persistence even during

years of so-called boom, is statistically demonstrated by the table attached to this testimony. This problem is far more serious than most Americans realize. The waste of manpower, the loss of personal income and dignity, the sharpening of labor-management and race relations conflicts, the tremendous social costs are greater than the Nation can safely endure for long. And without decisive action on many fronts, these costs will mount.

In 1963, a record production year, an average of 4.2 million Americans were unemployed and 2.3 million additional workers were compelled to work part-time because full-time jobs were not available. Moreover, an estimated 1.5 to 2 million people had given up seeking work; people who want to work, people who would return to the labor force if jobs became available again.

In order to achieve and sustain reasonably full employment in the United States more than 4 million new job opportunities must be created each year through the remainder of the 1960's, or more than 80,000 jobs every week.

It would be a dangerous illusion to believe that the tax cut, or any other single measure, could alone achieve this goal. Nor will any amount of wishful thinking achieve it. What the Nation needs is action, not just one action but many.

Therefore it would be a tragedy to allow the accelerated public works program to die. It is the conviction of the AFL–CIO that this job-creating program—which also provides vitally needed public facilities of lasting worth—should be both extended and strengthened.

Since President Kennedy signed the Public Works Acceleration Act in September 1962, thousands of workers in areas of substantial unemployment have gone back to work building public facilities of long-term value. Additional thousands have been at work providing material and equipment for those construction projects. At a time like the present, when the private sector of the economy is failing to utilize the Nation's full manpower and production resources, this is an unsurpassed way to put people to work and, at the same time, permanently enrich the Nation.

Let me summarize the record:

All of the $880 million in Federal funds made available by the Congress under this act have now been committed. As a matter of fact, by January 1963—more than a year ago and after the program had been in effect for less than 4 months—the backlog of project requests already exceeded the $900 million originally authorized for this program by the Congress.

The $280 million ultimately appropriated is helping to finance about half of the cost of nearly 8,000 projects in more than 3,000 communities where unemployment is most severe. These projects are not only putting people to work; they are also helping to create the basis for future economic growth and well-being.

These 8,000 job-creating projects are public investments of enduring value. They include about 1,200 badly needed water supply improvement and expansion projects, about 650 waste treatment works, about 600 sewer projects and over 300 new public buildings such as fire and police stations, courthouses, and libraries. In addition, they include over 500 long-needed health and recreation projects, 1,150 street and road improvements, and 1,650 conservation and natural resource undertakings.

These projects, on completion, will not only have generated 220,000 more years of work in onsite employment and in the production of materials and supplies. In addition, many of the facilities made possible by the program—like airports, libraries, water purification plants, and hospitals—will establish permanent jobs.

When State and local matching funds are added to the $880 million Federal outlay, the total adds up to almost $1¾ billion in important public improvements. Had it not been for the Public Works Acceleration Act, these improvements would not be under construction; the manpower and industrial resources they are using would otherwise have remained idle.

Within the next month or two the peak job impact of these projects will be reached. Thereafter, the number of jobs will quickly dwindle as the projects are completed. This I repeat, would be a tragedy.

A tremendous backlog of essential public works still exists in areas of substantial unemployment. If the act is extended, these job-creating projects will move forward, providing employment for thousands of workers. If the act is not extended, most of this backlog of projects will remain on the shelf.

We are advised that there are on file already, here in Washington, some $300 million in such projects which were submitted after all the authorized Federal funds, under the 1962 act, had been committed. This is despite the fact that as early as January 1963, Federal officials discouraged the submission of further requests because it was apparent that the number on hand exceeded the funds available.

It is unquestionable, then, that a vast number of equally worthy and equally needed projects remain which have never been submitted. There is no doubt that there is work to be done; all that is lacking is the wherewithal to do it.

As the recent report of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives pointed out in urging continuation of the accelerated public works program:

"It would be unrealistic to expect these huge backlogs to be eliminated in the immediate future, but it would be even more unrealistic to ignore the urgency of accelerating our efforts to meet these needs. The accelerated public works program is directing the economic potential of our idle resources toward that goal."

The value of the Public Works Acceleration Act to the jobless, to the communities that are obtaining lasting improvements, and to the Nation as a whole has been clearly demonstrated. At its recent constitutional convention, the AFL–CIO unanimously voiced its support for the extension of that act and for an additional authorization of $2 billion in order to increase its job-creating impact. Our proposed authorization is $500 million higher than the amount proposed by S. 1858.

A Federal effort of this magnitude, plus the supplemental State and local matching funds, would stimulate almost $4 billion in construction projects, at the right time and in the right places. Moreover, according to U.S. Department of Labor studies, this $4 billion outlay would directly create about 400,000 badly needed jobs in onsite construction and in the production and distribution of building materials and equipment. What is more, as these funds are spent by working people and businesses, another 200,000 to 400,000 jobs would be created indirectly. These are jobs that America badly needs.

In a sense, Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is one avenue toward the implementation, at long last, of the Employment Act of 1946.

The tax cut, just signed into law, is one such avenue. But it is only one of the many that are required. The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 was another; it must not now be closed.

We in the AFL–CIO are deeply convinced that the principles of the Employment Act of 1946—committing the Federal Government to use its resources to reach and sustain maximum production, employment, and purchasing power in the United States—are more important today than they were when the law was passed.

They can no longer be honored more in the breach than in the observance. The unprecedented growth in the American work force, the mounting impact of automation, confront us with an employment problem which few envisioned a decade and a half ago.

We must solve these problems, for even more compelling reasons than could then be seen. The economic strength of this country is no longer a matter of concern to Americans alone; it will determine the future of freedom on earth.

We know that this committee, which worked so hard on behalf of the original public works acceleration program 2 years ago, is fully aware of the need. We urge your prompt approval of an extension of the existing program, backed by a Federal appropriation of $2 billion.

This is not a time for half measures, or even three-quarter measures; the need is immediate and growing, and it can be met only by imaginative, decisive action.

Years	The unemployed		Long-term unemployed			
			Jobless 15 weeks or more		Jobless 27 weeks or more	
	Number of jobless	Percent of labor force	Number	Percent of total unemployment	Number	Percent of total unemployment
1953	1.9	2.9	211,000	11.3	72,000	4.2
1954	3.6	5.6	812,000	22.7	317.000	8.9
1955	2.9	4.4	703,000	24.2	336,000	11.6
1956	2.8	4.2	533,000	18.9	232,000	8.2
1957	2.0	4.3	580,000	19.1	239,000	8.1
1958	4.7	6.8	1,482,000	31.0	667,000	14.2
1959	3.8	3.5	1,040,000	27.3	571,000	15.0
1960	3.9	5.6	956,000	24.3	454,000	11.5
1961	4.8	6.7	1,532,000	31.9	504,000	16.7
1962	4.0	5.0	1,119,000	27.9	585,000	14.6
1963	4.2	5.7	1,068,000	26.1	553,000	13.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Accelerated Public Works Program

(Report together with individual views)

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1856), to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is indicated in the bill as reported and is shown by italic.

Summary of the Bill and Amendment

S. 1856 would amend section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act to provide authorization of $2,400 million inclusive of

the original authorization of $900 million, the increase of $1,500 million to be available until expended. The new authorization contains the same formula of distribution as the original, providing one-third of the funds for areas designated under subsection 5(b) of Public Law 87–658.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAW 87–658

The present accelerated public works program was generated from President Kennedy's desire to have standby authority to combat a recession before it might become fully developed. Among the arsenal of economic weapons devised for such a purpose, he requested authority from the Congress to commit $2 billion in Federal funds for public works projects whenever unemployment reached a critical level as defined in the draft bill the President submitted to the Congress.

On February 19, 1962, President Kennedy in a letter to the Congress requested standby authority to commit $2 billion in Federal funds to stimulate the economy whenever seasonally adjusted unemployment rates had risen 3 out of 4 or 4 out of 6 consecutive months by a total of at least 1 percentage point during that period, and whenever the President determined that use of the standby authority was necessary to realize the goals of the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Under the proposal, the President could, after determining that the requisite conditions existed, declare a 12-month "capital improvement acceleration period" during which he could commit, without further congressional approval, $750 million in direct Federal expenditures previously authorized, $750 million for grants-in-aid to State and local governments, $250 million in loans to the States and localities, and $250 million additional among the three categories.

The proposal called for automatic termination of the President's authority at the end of 12 months unless extended by Congress or previously terminated by the President. After a waiting period of 6 months, he could declare another 12-month capital improvement acceleration period, commit another $2 billion, and repeat the cycle without further limitation.

The $750 million for grants-in-aid was to be used either to accelerate work on existing Federal-State grant projects, or initiate Federal grants for projects not otherwise eligible under existing statute.

Transmitted with the President's message was a draft bill—the Standby Capital Improvements Act of 1962—which was introduced in the House (H.R. 10318) on February 21, 1962, and in the Senate (S. 2965) on March 8, 1962.

On March 26, in letters to the House and Senate Public Works Committees, the President stated that the economy had not recovered as well as had been expected during the first months of 1962, and requested the Congress to amend H.R. 10318 to permit immediate commitment of $600 million for capital improvement programs in areas designated for redevelopment under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, and areas which had an unemployment rate of over 6 percent for a year or longer.

The Senate Public Works Committee conducted hearings on April 12–13, 1962, and on April 25, 1962, reported, with amendments, the administration bill (S. 2965, S. Rept. 1358) containing a $2 billion standby authority and a $600 million immediate acceleration program.

On May 28, 1962, the Senate passed an amended version of S. 2965, authorizing the President to spend $750 million for immediate acceleration of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment, and also authorizing appropriation after June 30, 1963, of $750 million for a standby public works program.

The Senate measure provided that the standby authority could be triggered only when the adjusted unemployment rate had risen 1 percentage point over a 3- to 9-month period.

The House Public Works Committee conducted hearings from March 26 to April 6, 1962, on the administration bill (H.R. 10318) to authorize a $2 billion standby program and a $600 million immediate acceleration program, and a bill (H.R. 10113) to authorize a $2 billion standby program and an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration. On June 2, 1962, the House Public Works Committee reported, with amendments, H.R. 10113, authorizing appropriations of $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works through both direct Federal projects and grants-in-aid to State and local governments. It also provided for an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration, but no authority for a standby program.

The House passed H.R. 10113 on August 29, 1962, by a voice vote, authorizing appropriation of $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works and deleting the provision for a special Office of Coordination and Acceleration. The House then vacated passage of H.R. 10113, amended S. 2965 to conform to the House-passed version, and substituted S. 2965 for H.R. 10113.

On September 10, 1962, the Senate agreed to the House amendments by a 45 to 22 rollcall vote and the bill was signed into law by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC LAW 87–658 AND IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

The Public Works Acceleration Act includes specific provisions for designation of the areas eligible for accelerated public works projects, the requirements for State and local governments to participate, and the rules of equity to be followed by the Federal Government in approving the projects. Eligible areas, as defined in the statute, exist in each of the 50 States, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

The principal features of Public Law 87–658 are:

First, all designated redevelopment areas under sections 5(a) and 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act are eligible for accelerated public works assistance. (Sec. 5(a) areas are urban areas of high unemployment; sec. 5(b) areas are rural and semirural areas of high unemployment, underemployment and low income designated by the Secretary of Commerce, and all Indian reservations.) Also eligible are those areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as having had substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months, substantial unemployment being defined as above 6 percent.

Second, Federal public works projects in eligible areas which have been authorized by the Congress can be initiated or accelerated.

Third, public works projects of State and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized in other legislation can be initiated and accelerated. For such projects, grants up to 50 percent of the total cost are authorized, and up to 75 percent if the State or local government lacks the financial capacity to assume the full additional financial obligation.

Department of Commerce regulations have established firm and objective criteria for relating grants of above 50 percent to local financial capacity. Areas eligible for 58-percent grants are those with median family incomes between $1,700 and $1,800 per year or twice the national unemployment rate for 3 of the last 4 years.

Areas with median family annual incomes of $1,600 to $1,700 or twice the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years qualify for 66-percent grants.

Areas with median family incomes under $1,600 per year or three times the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 75-percent grants. All of the 54 Indian reservations fall within this category.

The fourth main provision of the act declares that no State may receive more than 10 percent of the funds allocated, and no less than $300 million of the $900 million originally authorized must be allocated for the nonurban small labor market areas, low-income areas, and Indian reservations designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act. The new authorization of $1,500 million recommended by the committee retains this formula of distribution, allocating an additional $500 million to areas designated under section 5(b).

Fifth, adequate consideration must be given to relative needs of eligible areas, and criteria are established which the selected projects must meet. These criteria assure that projects—

(a) Can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time, this period having been interpreted as within 120 days after the obligation of funds;

(b) Will meet an essential public need;

(c) Will have a substantial portion (51 percent) completed within 12 months after initiation;

(d) Will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment;

(e) Are not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the areas affected, where such plans exist.

It may be noted at this point that during the committee hearings testimony was submitted in criticism of the presumed failure of Federal administrative officials to fulfill two of the above five conditions. Evidence was received which would indicate that in certain instances, despite Department of Commerce requirements designed to assure the maximum employment of local labor, contractors have imported labor from outside the local labor market. Indications are that this may be due to the lack of requisite skills within the local labor market. However, the committee would urge administering officials to exert every effort to assure the employment of local labor, and to give particular priority to those qualified persons who have undergone the longest periods of unemployment.

The second criticism of administering of accelerated public works which was brought to the attention of the committee during its hearings was raised by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in its attack upon recreation projects on the presumption that such projects fail to satisfy the condition of "essential public need." Representatives of the chamber declined to offer a systematic evaluation on any specific project on this ground, and their testimony was not supported by any of the local chambers of commerce or Government officials queried by the committee.

HEARINGS

The Special Subcommittee for Accelerated Public Works conducted hearings on S. 1121 and S. 1856 on December 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1963, and March 11, 12, and 13, 1964. During the 7 days of hearings the special subcommittee received testimony from more than 60 witnesses, including Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, elected officials from the great metropolitan areas, as well as from smaller cities and rural and semirural communities throughout the Nation, from labor, farm, and management organizations, and from scholars and economists.

The evidence adduced was overwhelmingly in support of the accelerated public works program as it has been administered and was in favor of an extension of the program under a new authorization.

The following tables and charts set forth the distribution of the $880 million thus far

appropriated and demonstrate the categories of projects for which the funds have been obligated.

Table I presents the allocation of funds among the departments and agencies, which material is also presented on a percentage basis (as of December 1, 1963) in chart I.

Chart II presents the distribution of funds among categories of projects (as of December 1, 1963); and table II presents the allocation of funds to the individual States (as of April 1, 1964).

Chart III offers a comparative representation of total allocations, the value of projects approved, and the value of funds put in place.

It should be noted with reference to the following charts that an amount in excess of $12,800,000 has been allocated but will not be used on specific projects. Due to the appropriation period deadline and the failure of certain communities to fulfill their commitments, some funds were allocated which were not used and which were "returned" too late to be reallocated. These funds amounted to a lapse of $8,900,000 from the first appropriation of $450 million and as of March 31, 1964, $3,900,000 from the second appropriation. And it is expected that there will be additional funds lapsing from the second appropriation. It is for this reason that the committee has recommended amending the bill to provide that the funds be available until expended.

TABLES AND CHARTS

TABLE I.—*Accelerated public works program—Allocation of funds*

Agency	*Amount (thousands)*
A. Direct Federal projects:	
Agriculture	$59,690
Interior	50,979
Commerce	15,570
Defense (Engineers)	10,450
General Services Administration	3,000
Post Office	2,950
Justice	1,800
Tennessee Valley Authority	800
Treasury (Coast Guard)	800
Veterans' Administration	350
Total, direct Federal projects	146,389
B. Grants-in-aid projects:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	475,635
Health, Education, and Welfare	229,845
Interior	13,021
Agriculture	3,110
Commerce	2,845
Total, grant-in-aid projects	724,456
C. Administrative costs:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,600
Commerce	1,325
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,195
Interior	485
Agriculture	400
Labor	150
Total, administrative costs	9,155
D. Grand total:	
Direct Federal projects (16.6 percent)	146,389
Grant-in-aid projects (82.4 percent)	724,456
Administrative costs (1.0 percent)	9,155
Total (100 percent)	880,000

(Chart I and II omitted from printing.)

TABLE II.—*Number, estimated accelerated public works cost, and man-months of on-site employment, by States, accelerated public works projects approved through Apr. 1, 1964*

State	Number of projects	Estimated cost (thousands)		Estimated on-site man-months [1]
		Accelerated public works	Total	
Alabama	193	$27,135	$59,910	33,556
Alaska	66	7,684	12,691	7,191
Arizona	83	9,417	10,559	12,295
Arkansas	291	17,491	35,286	22,820
California	264	31,939	59,066	32,820
Colorado	57	3,575	5,242	3,413
Connecticut	55	7,392	16,229	7,978
Delaware	18	1,131	3,083	2,047
Florida	108	15,313	31,848	17,088
Georgia	203	17,005	34,665	19,849
Hawaii	9	2,733	6,097	3,366
Idaho	106	6,404	8,293	6,466
Illinois	226	21,675	40,339	23,515
Indiana	121	12,499	26,576	14,605
Iowa	3	551	855	628
Kansas	12	953	1,928	835
Kentucky	339	45,060	102,720	60,169
Louisiana	177	32,096	73,739	39,297
Maine	55	4,614	12,719	7,582
Maryland	39	3,531	8,355	4,834
Massachusetts	103	21,240	49,403	23,746
Michigan	714	67,538	146,254	85,613
Minnesota	290	14,998	25,306	22,949
Mississippi	168	13,873	29,317	18,760
Missouri	214	11,881	23,907	16,447
Montana	101	7,369	9,023	9,097
Nebraska	28	1,729	2,739	1,817
Nevada	13	1,020	1,140	1,070
New Hampshire	23	2,116	5,668	2,794
New Jersey	121	42,410	102,579	46,320
New Mexico	229	14,363	19,516	17,306
New York	209	36,295	77,763	40,316
North Carolina	228	20,749	43,098	27,155
North Dakota	22	1,335	1,608	1,868
Ohio	173	27,510	66,718	35,389
Oklahoma	222	18,515	33,597	21,720
Oregon	114	12,917	19,744	12,372
Pennsylvania	512	81,759	169,563	87,409
Rhode Island	43	12,438	38,222	18,525
South Carolina	162	11,108	28,125	18,678
South Dakota	25	2,111	2,432	2,691
Tennessee	161	21,451	48,080	28,730
Texas	184	24,437	49,958	28,774
Utah	108	7,218	10,847	8,598
Vermont	13	1,399	3,578	1,765
Virginia	61	5,491	10,258	7,181
Washington	190	15,425	26,067	16,130
West Virginia	301	43,020	78,053	43,051
Wisconsin	207	9,171	20,779	14,543
Wyoming	43	2,415	3,553	3,121
American Samoa				
Guam	2	134	160	166
Puerto Rico	345	29,525	43,335	25,793
Virgin Islands	8	724	1,008	875
Total	7,762	851,882	1,741,598	1,011,123

[1] Estimated months of employment for the HHFA-CFA projects were computed by ARA on the basis of the latest data available from BLS studies of construction costs for various types of public works projects.

(Chart III omitted from printing.)

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee has addressed the two main arguments advanced against the authorization of new funds for accelerated public works, the first of these being predicated on the assumption that the stimulus of the income tax reduction will reduce unemployment sufficiently without an additional investment in public works projects. A corollary to this argument is the presumption that the Congress—by voting for the tax reduction—pledged itself against enacting other legislation to stimulate the economy.

In this regard, the committee would draw attention to President Kennedy's plea when recommending the original program as a further Federal effort "* * * to provide useful work for the unemployed and underemployed, and to help these and other hard-pressed communities, through improvement of their public facilities, to become better places to live and work."

Thus, it is evident to the committee that neither in its conception nor in its design has the accelerated public works program been justified solely as a countercyclical economic measure. It has been designed and administered to provide additional employment and improved community facilities in those areas of greatest economic and social need. Despite the progress achieved to date, the conditions of excessive unemployment and community need still prevail in some 1,300 areas comprising one-third of the Nation.

Acknowledging the full economic stimulus of the tax reduction that its proponents claim, this will be a necessary though not a sufficient condition for fulfillment of the needs of the 1,300 designated areas of greatest distress.

Speaking with reference to the multiplicative effect of the tax cut, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, informed the Special Subcommittee on Accelerated Public Works that the $10 billion tax cut could create an additional stimulus of $35 billion and employ "something over 2 million people." However, stated Senator DOUGLAS, "* * * this is a general demand and the accelerated public works is a rifleshot increase in demand in the areas where it is most needed."

Referring to production and employment trends during the past 15 years, Dr. Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman, pointed out to the special subcommittee that: "The true level of unemployment or the full-time unemployment as officially recorded, has increased about 50 percent over 5 years, or 100 percent over 10 years, [and] we face the alarming prospect of another 50-percent increase over 5 years, or doubling over 10 years, under the impact of policies now in being, and under active consideration."

Other witnesses, taking an even more pessimistic view of the employment effect of the tax cut, referred to the prospect of additional technological unemployment growing from the plant modernization which will be stimulated by the tax cut.

In summary, it is the view of the committee that neither the tax cut nor other domestic programs now in being or submitted to the Congress are a substitute for filling the precise needs toward which the accelerated public works program is oriented.

The second major criticism against the accelerated public works program has been leveled against the inaccuracy of the early estimates of on-site employment. Overestimates of on-site employment were acknowledged by administrative officials as a result of their failure to anticipate the degree of prefabricated work involved in some construction projects. However, the committee was also informed of a corresponding increase of off-site employment over the early estimates, and in summation, Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber, Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, declared that: "As far as we know at this time, our estimate that the entire $880 million program, when completed, will generate 220,000 man-years of on-site and off-site employment should come very close to what the program will actually produce."

The committee has also taken note of the fact that these estimates do not include the permanent employment created directly by the new facilities and the indirect employment created in industries which are dependent upon some of the facilities constructed.

In the former category, for example, are the thousands of permanent hospital jobs created by the construction of new hospital and clinical facilities. As of March 1964, 256 hospital and nursing home projects had been assisted under the accelerated public works

program with a total Federal expenditure of $102 million and a total expenditure from all sources of $253 million. According to the American Hospital Association, it requires approximately $25,000 investment for each new hospital bed, and hospitals require an average of 2.8 employees for each bed served. Thus, the $253 million in hospital and nursing home projects represents approximately 10,000 new hospital beds and 28,000 new permanent jobs, many of which are of a highly skilled and technical nature. At approximately $9,000 capital investment for each new job, this compares favorably with the general increase of $15,000 to $20,000 in the gross national product which is required for each new job.

For many of the individual communities, however, the most significant achievement of the accelerated public works program is in the construction of vital water and sewage facilities on which local industries depend. These facilities may mean the difference between whether a local industry leaves the community or remains and expands; thus, in many instances noted before the committee, specific accelerated public works projects have been the critical factors in providing for a viable local economy. Table III below presents several such examples.

TABLE III

Project No.	Location	Type	Grant	Employment effect
APW-Ga-17G	Sandersville, Ga	Water	61,000	2 new industries employing 74 persons result from these 2 projects.
APW-Ga-22G	do	Sewer	84,000	
APW-Ga-34G	Blairsville, Ga	Water and sewer	61,200	400 new jobs result from new shoe plant and pepper plant.
APW-Ga-38G	Sylvania, Ga	Water	30,000	230 new jobs in new industrial area.
APW-Miss-5G	De Kalb, Miss	do	375,500	75 jobs in lumber industry saved.
APW-SC-1G	Blaney, S.C	Water and sewer	175,000	250 new jobs.
APW-Tenn-10GL	Camden, Tenn	Water	248,700	Water to industrial park made possible 200 new jobs with Genesee Shoe Co.
APW-Tenn-19G	Big Creek Utility District, Tenn	do	640,000	400 new jobs.
APW-Tenn-28G	Springfield, Tenn	do	173,500	400 new jobs in 3 industries result from water to industrial park.
APW-Ky-70GL	Quicksand Water District, Jackson, Ky	do	117,000	Water needed for University of Kentucky Wood Utilization Center to develop new uses for wood and long-term employment and for eastern Kentucky resource development project.
APW-Wash-6G	Skagit County	Dam	418,000	Made possible retention of 3 canneries otherwise forced to leave by poor water quality.

With reference to both categories of permanent employment mentioned above, it is evident that considerable benefits accrue from the accelerated public works program which are not revealed in the statistics of onsite employment created. Due to rather stringent limitations established by the Congress for administrative costs of the program, the Area Redevelopment Administration has not been able to conduct impact studies to measure the extent of such benefits on a nationwide basis. Such studies would, however, be essential for an accurate assessment of the effect of the accelerated public works program on the national economy.

BACKLOG OF UNFILLED NEEDS

As noted earlier in this report, the Public Works Acceleration Act was signed by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962. Yet, within less than 4 months the applications for assistance to State and local projects surpassed the $900 million authorization. In January 1963, it was announced that applications received after January 24, 1963, would not be processed except for those from high distress areas which qualified for grants in excess of 50 percent, applications from areas which had received nothing under the first appropriation or were newly designated, applications which had been filed earlier but with insufficient data, and applications for projects that balanced the program better than applications filed earlier.

Despite this official discouragement, as well as unofficial discouragement from many congressional offices, communities have continued to apply for accelerated public works assistance, with a present backlog, after obligation of all appropriated funds, in excess of $700 million. Table IV presents a State-by-State summary of pending projects which would be eligible for assistance under a new authorization.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated accelerated public works cost of pending projects as of May 20, 1964*

State	Accelerated public works cost (thousands)
Alabama	$12,620
Alaska	5,417
Arizona	4,011
Arkansas	9,117
California	22,987
Colorado	3,484
Connecticut	3,228
Delaware	1,138
Florida	17,758
Georgia	7,654
Hawaii	49
Idaho	$246
Illinois	19,819
Indiana	4,954
Iowa	469
Kansas	3,775
Kentucky	29,884
Louisiana	22,023
Maine	960
Maryland	2,457
Massachusetts	27,748
Michigan	33,874
Minnesota	19,401
Mississippi	4,626
Missouri	7,386
Montana	6,429
Nebraska	2,517
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	2,315
New Jersey	36,903
New Mexico	7,024
New York	40,770
North Carolina	7,212
North Dakota	666
Ohio	20,884
Oklahoma	9,556
Oregon	5,342
Pennsylvania	96,561
Rhode Island	4,380
South Carolina	3,140
South Dakota	3,193
Tennessee	19,888
Texas	22,270
Utah	6,007
Vermont	1,450
Virginia	2,787
Washington	5,044
West Virginia	18,775
Wisconsin	6,764
Wyoming	1,053
American Samoa	
Guam	
Puerto Rico	27,975
Virgin Islands	100
Total	624,090
Pending projects for which specific data are not available	93,193
Total pending	717,283

TABLE IV.—*Estimated accelerated public works cost of pending projects as of May 20, 1964*—Continued

It should be emphasized, however, that the preceding table does not accurately reflect the effective demand for Federal assistance on State and local projects. In view of the fact that applications were received prior to the announcement of January 1963, at an average volume of $200 million per month, dropped to $35 million a month and then rose to $113 million when the second appropriation of $400 million was made, it is safe to infer that the present level of demand would increase markedly with the authorization of new funds.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee noted one particular problem in the administration of the accelerated public works program which is more appropriately the subject of administrative action than legislative. The practice of importing labor from outside the local labor market has occurred, to the committee's knowledge, in the States of Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and there have doubtless been other instances not brought to the committee's attention. The committee acknowledges the high quality of administrative effort and the dedication of officials in charge of the accelerated public works program; yet we urge administration officials to exert every effort, by administrative procedure and by promulgation of new regulations, if necessary, to assure the maximum employment of local labor, with particular priority being given to the long-term unemployed and those who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

It is the opinion of the committee that extension of the accelerated public works program by authorizing an additional $1.5 billion will benefit the national economy and provide more adequate public facilities in hundreds of communities. In order to achieve full utilization of the funds appropriated the committee also recommends that the funds be available until expended. It therefore recommends enactment of the bill as amended.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT
(76 STAT. 542)

SEC. 3. * * *

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed [$900,000,000] *$2,400,000,000* to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than [$300,000,000] *$800,000,000* shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. *Appropriations*

made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR COOPER

The Public Works Acceleration Act established a good and helpful program, which has provided employment and assisted many worthwhile local development projects in the last 2 years. It has helped depressed communities, many of them rural, build the water and sewer systems which are necessary for the health of their people, and a condition for the establishment of almost any type of industry.

Following enactment of the tax cut, however, and at a time when additional expenditures will increase the deficit, we have the responsibility to limit spending authorizations to what is essential. For this reason, and because I want to see the accelerated public works program continued as long as it is needed to provide employment, I offered an amendment in the Special Senate Subcommittee for Accelerated Public Works, and also in the full Committee on Public Works, to reduce from $1.5 billion to $900 million the additional authorization proposed by S. 1856. I will again offer my amendment when S. 1856 comes before the Senate.

The amount I propose—$900 million—is the same as the amount originally authorized by the Public Works Acceleration Act, which proved acceptable to the Appropriations Committees and the Congress which must provide funds for this program. I do not wish to see the program lost because of requests for $600 million more than the original authorization, or for more than can efficiently be used. I believe extension of the accelerated public works program we have had for the last 2 years is the reasonable course for the Congress to adopt at this time.

I hope the expansion of private industry will soon be able to take up the slack in unemployment—which is one of the chief purposes of the tax cut. But until it does, we must continue measures to help those who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I approve the recommendation of the committee, which I urged, that in administering the program strong efforts be made to provide maximum employment in the communities and areas for which projects are approved, and that priorities be established for those who have been longest out of work and have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

With the adoption of my amendment, I can strongly support S. 1856 and extension of the accelerated public works program which is now providing jobs and useful public works in Appalachia, throughout Kentucky, and in hundreds of other areas throughout the country where unemployment is high and development projects can help build a better future.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at this point, I wish to stress two points.

In his state of the Union message on Monday, President Johnson stressed the need for:

New programs of help for basic community facilities and neighborhood centers of health and recreation;

A new and substantial effort must be made to landscape highways and provide places of relaxation and recreation wherever our roads run.

Within our cities imaginative programs are needed to landscape streets and transform open areas into places of beauty and recreation.

These are only a few of the many public needs stressed by the President in the satisfying of which an accelerated public works program can play an important part.

But, the question will be asked, where will the money come from? The President himself has reported that in the past year alone $3½ billion in wasted Government expenditures have been eliminated. And, he went on, "I intend to do better this year."

I am asking, Mr. President, that less than one-half of this savings be expended on needed public works which may give needed, immediate employment to at least some of our unemployed.

Is this too much to ask?

PROPOSED NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we seek to walk on the moon and to see with our own eyes what our cameras have reported.

We have sent a space vehicle toward Mars and our scientists advise us that its course is steady even as they have accomplished miracles and as wizards of space have corrected its course by remote control systems located on Earth.

We have sent our astronauts into orbit and thankfully and proudly welcomed them back to Earth.

As we are mastering space, so have our scientists developed the greatest weaponry systems known to man. Our nuclear deterrent and our nuclear capability are unsurpassed. We have much for which to be proud and we honor our scientists who have made these advances possible.

We have worked hard since the days of the Puritans in New England, of Capt. John Smith in Virginia, and of the Dutch in New York. Spanning a continent and keeping the peace of the world has been an around-the-clock job. And the work is not finished.

Because man is a human being, I suggest that this work will be with us always.

In the sciences, our progress has been aided greatly in recent years by a vast program of aids by the Federal Government to basic and applied science. This is as it should be and I can only applaud the use of any of the funds which have been intelligently spent in scientific endeavors.

But in directing our efforts to aid the sciences, we have created an imbalance in the advances in the humanities and the arts. I therefore urge that we initiate a humanities program of corresponding scope which will enable us to understand one another better. As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message Monday:

We must also recognize and encourage those who can be pathfinders for the Nation's imagination and understanding. * *

To achieve that goal, I introduce on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BASS, BAYH, BURDICK, CLARK, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, GORE, HART, HARTKE, INOUYE, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, METCALF, MILLER, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 10 days for cosponsors and that the full text of the bill appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 111) to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research, and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, humanities encompass the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations, as distinguished from the sciences, according to Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language.

The Commission on the Humanities, created by three respected bodies in American letters—the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa—tells us in its report that the humanities are "the study of that which is most human—their subject is every man." Admittedly one cannot speak of history or culture apart from the humanities.

The Commission report states:

If the interdependence of science and the humanities were more generally understood, men would be more likely to become masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants * * *. Humanist scholars have therefore a special responsibility in that the past is their natural domain. They have the privilege and obligation of interpreting the past to each new generation of men who necessarily must live in one small corner for one little stretch of time. * * * Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit.

I am concerned, as is the Commission, with the state of the humanities today. We in the United States are not materialists, although it is difficult to explain $50 billion for defense and the fact that 10.6 million students in the United States do not have access to a central library of any kind.

The Archaeological Institute of America in its report to the Commission writes:

Our greatest single need is for high school teachers who can teach the classical language * * *. Unless Greek and Latin are maintained in the secondary schools, our discipline is threatened at its roots.

Webster defines archeology as "the scientific study of the life and culture of ancient peoples, as by excavation of ancient cities, relics, artifacts, and so forth." Archeology is the key to the

humanities, yet its very existence is in jeopardy. The Archaeological Institute of America suggests that the introduction of Latin in the elementary schools would go a long way toward improving the situation. And, as do other groups which comprise the humanities, the institute urges the establishment of fellowships and scholarships adequate to pay transportation and maintenance costs abroad.

Our archeologists are not State supported as are archeologists of so many nations, nor do they want to be, but they do want a realistic appraisal of the existing situation and they would like to solve the problems. I was disturbed by the institute's observation:

> The archeologist of advanced civilizations is at a disadvantage in comparison with his colleagues in paleolithic and neolithic archeology, since the latter have a ready source of support in the National Science Foundation. The NSF, for example, has lately made two grants totaling $110,000 for the study of neolithic remains in Mesopotamia and Macedonia.

I have no wish to interject myself into the middle of a discussion involving the merits of stone age culture as opposed to that of Biblical times for both are important to the humanities. The point is that we want to know as much as possible about all mankind so that we may better walk into the future. Grants should be available for such study when the project is found meritorious and is approved.

Now, who or what is best qualified to aid our ailing humanities?

The purpose of the Commission on Humanities, headed by Chairman Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, was: "to consider the state of the humanities in America and to report its findings and recommendations to the sponsoring organizations."

The Commission report of more than 200 pages released April 30, 1964, made two major findings:

First. That expansion and improvement of activities in the humanities are in the national interest and consequently deserve financial support by the Federal Government.

Second. That Federal funds for this purpose should be administered by a new independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation.

These were no sudden decisions. The Commission members know their findings could evoke debate. But these individuals—eminent scholars in their respective fields—know from experience the state of the humanities. I ask unanimous consent that a full list of the members of the Commission, and their positions be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES

Barnaby C. Keeney, chairman, president, Brown University.

Herman B. Wells, vice chairman, chancellor, Indiana University.

Kingman Brewster, Jr., president, Yale University.

Carl Bridenbaugh, professor of history, Brown University.

Paul H. Buck, director, Harvard University Library.

Edgar M. Carlson, president, Gustavus Adolphus College.

Arthur H. Dean, senior partner, Sullivan and Cromwell.

William K. Frankena, professor of philosophy, University of Michigan.

Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

Harold Howe, II, superintendent of schools, Scarsdale, New York.

Devereux C. Josephs, former chairman, New York Life Insurance Co.

Clark Kerr, president, University of California.

Robert M. Lumiansky, professor of English, Duke University.

Whitney J. Oates, professor of classics, Princeton University.

Henri M. Peyre, professor of French, Yale University.

Mina Rees, dean of graduate of studies, the City University of New York.

Andrew C. Ritchie, director, Yale University Art Gallery.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman, International Business Machines Corp.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have read the report of the Commission on the Humanities and I hope it will be widely circulated, for its findings and conclusions affect each of us. Serious defects in the teaching of the humanities are reported, including overworked teachers, inadequate staffing of existing facilities, outmoded textbooks or none at all, lack of coordination between students and faculty at the elementary, secondary and college level, major defects in our classical libraries in nearly every area, and language instruction geared more toward the 17th century than to the 20th century.

My bill to establish the National Humanities Foundation specifies that the Foundation would be established in the executive branch of the Government as an independent agency.

The National Humanities Foundation would have as its purpose the development and promotion of a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts, but the Foundation would not attempt to direct, control, or otherwise influence the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which it would support.

The bill defines humanities and the arts as including, but not being limited to, the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; the history of religion, science, and law; the creative and performing arts, including the theater and the dance; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods. Because humanities encompass the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations, I am confident that the list I have proposed will be expanded.

Under the proposed language of my bill, the National Humanities Board will consist of 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill specifies that Board members should be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts and the membership shall be so distributed as to provide national representation. Names of prospective members of the Board may be submitted to the President for consideration by any national organization on the humanities and the arts.

Members of the National Humanities Board are to serve for terms of 6 years although persons taking office immediately after enactment of the humanities bill shall have specified terms so as to insure that at the end of each 2-year period the terms of one-third of the Board membership shall expire. A member serving 12 consecutive years will not be eligible for reappointment for a 2-year period.

The creation of a National Humanities Foundation and the National Humanities Board is relatively simple. The need for the Foundation exists. Men and women qualified to serve on the Board live in every sector of this Nation, from Alaska in the North to Puerto Rico in the South and from Hawaii in the West to the great States of the Atlantic seaboard in the East.

The National Humanities Foundation will need an able Director. I have suggested that the Director be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As chief executive officer of the Foundation the Director will serve as an ex officio voting member of the National Humanities Board. The Director will receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the Librarian of Congress and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

Matters not related to policy will be handled by an executive committee appointed by the National Humanities Board from its members, if the Board wishes. Membership on such a committee would be limited to 2 years with no member serving on the committee for more than 6 consecutive years. Again national representation would be required.

Section 10 of my bill describes the functions of the National Humanities Foundation. I consider this section of the bill of prime importance for through it the Congress authorizes and directs the Foundation to develop and to implement a national policy in the humanities and arts, including the interchange of scholarly information with foreign countries and the establishment of a program of grants and loans to educate or further educate scholars and teachers.

In section 12 of my bill, I have suggested how these scholarships and fellowships are to be awarded to citizens of the United States and its possessions. The amount of the awards are to be determined by the Board.

Subsequent language in the bill outlines the proposed general authority of the National Humanities Foundation including the making of rules and regulations, the encouraging of the development of the new curricular materials, the acquisition of real and/or personal property, the use of donated funds, the publishing of scholarly information on

the humanities and arts, and the acceptance of the services of volunteers.

The funding of the Foundation shall be determined by the Congress.

I have in my remarks made numerous references to the report of the Commission on the Humanities. At this point in my remarks I would like to have printed in the RECORD the names of the 24 learned societies reporting to the Commission, for from these reports prepared by 176 scholars, the reader will have a finer understanding of the needs of the ailing humanities.

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

REPORTS TO THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES FROM 24 LEARNED SOCIETIES

American Society for Aesthetics.
American Studies Association.
American Anthropological Association.
Archaeological Institute of America.
Society of Architectural Historians.
Association for Asian Studies.
Society of Biblical Literature.
American Dialect Society.
American Folklore Society.
Association of American Geographers.
American Historical Association.
History of Science Society.
Modern Language Association of America.
Association of American Law Schools.
Linguistic Society of America.
Metaphysical Society of America.
American Musicological Society.
American Numismatic Society.
American Oriental Society.
American Philological Association.
American Philosophical Association.
American Political Science Association.
Renaissance Society of America.
American Sociological Association.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the needs of the humanities would fill many records. The American Historical Association in its report warns:

Today, more than ever, those concerns which nourish personality, and are at the heart of individual freedom, are being neglected in our free society. These studies which refine the values and feed the very soul of a culture are increasingly starved of support. Nor is this merely a matter of popular ignorance or congressional indifference. By national science scholarships for undergraduates, by graduate fellowships and research grants in the defense sciences, the ablest young men and women—the potential humanists of the future—are being lured away. Without really intending it, we are on the road toward becoming a dehumanized society.

We can stop this senseless march.

As the American Political Science Association bluntly states in its report:

Studies which probe into the medieval roots of constitutional government may seem at first glance to have little practical relevance, but it is through such studies that light can be shed on the meaning of constitutional government itself. An understanding of the past is essential to an understanding of the present and may be useful in charting our course in the future. One obstacle to effective teaching and research in the field of medieval political theory is the lack of translations of medieval political texts and the fact that many of the original texts are available only in European libraries * * *. The study of the past is an important means of discovering our own identities and that of the civilization of which we are a part * * *. Research in political philosophy is the least well-known field of research in political science, but the questions to which it seeks answers are of ultimate concern.

Typifying the urgency for the National Humanities Foundation is the report to the Commission presented by the Renaissance Society of America. Rather than excerpt it, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson in his September 28, 1963, address at Brown University, whose president, Barnaby C. Keeney, served as Chairman of the Commission on the Humanities, spoke favorably of a National Foundation for the Humanities. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his speech be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;

(2) that a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly, literary, and artistic activity;

(3) that democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and that it must therefore foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants;

(4) that, during our early history, the Nation was largely engaged in mastering its physical environment while, more recently, advancing technology, defense, and space needs have put a claim on energies that might have gone into humane and artistic endeavors, with the result that our social, moral, and esthetic development has lagged behind our material advance;

(5) that it is in the national interest that the resulting social, cultural, and educational imbalance be redressed;

(6) that the world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology, but must be solidly founded upon worldwide respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit;

(7) that, in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Humanities Foundation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Foundation"). The Foundation shall consist of a National Humanities Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") and a Director.

PURPOSE OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. The purpose of the Foundation shall be to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts, but it shall not attempt, directly or indirectly, to direct, control, or otherwise influence the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which it supports.

DEFINITION

SEC. 5. The term "humanities and the arts", as used in this Act, includes, but is not limited to, the study of languages, linguistics, literature, history, philosophy and political theory; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; the history of politics, religion, science, and law; the creative and performing arts, including theater and dance; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

NATIONAL HUMANITIES BOARD

SEC. 6. (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio, and shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide comprehensive representation of the views of scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts in all areas of the United States. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members of the Board, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities the Association of Graduate Schools in Association of American Universities, the American Council of Learned Societies, the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, or by any other national organization on the humanities and the arts.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years, after the enactment of this Act. Any member of the Board who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the expiration of the twelfth year.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

(d) The Board shall meet annually on the first Monday in May unless, prior to April 15 in any year, the Chairman has set the annual meeting for a day in May, other than the first Monday, and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members of the Board so request in writing. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given written notice, mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(e) An election of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall take place at the first meeting of the Board following the enactment of this Act. Thereafter such elections shall take place at the second annual meeting occurring after each such election. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In

case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 7. (a) There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, and the Director shall not be appointed until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations. The Director shall serve as an ex officio member of the Board. In addition, he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the Librarian of Congress and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this Act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 11 and 12 of this Act, together with such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but no final action shall be taken by the Director in the exercise of any power granted by section 10(a)(5) or 12(a) of the Act unless in each instance the Board has reviewed and approved the action proposed to be taken, or such action is taken pursuant to the terms of a delegation of authority from the Board or the Executive Committee to the Director.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members an Executive Committee and to assign to the Executive Committee such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this Act as it deems appropriate; except that the Board may not assign to the Executive Committee the function of establishing policies.

(b) If an Executive Committee is established by the Board—

(1) Such Committee shall consist of the Director, as an ex officio member, and not less than five nor more than nine other members elected by the Board from among their number.

(2) The term of office of each member of such Committee shall be two years, except that (A) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this Act shall be one year.

(3) Any person who has been a member of such Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the two-year period following the expiration of such sixth year.

(4) The membership of such Committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, as far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

(5) Such Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee shall be included in such reports.

(c) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members or otherwise such committees as it deems appropriate, and to assign to committees so appointed such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 9. The Board may establish within the Foundation such divisions and divisioned advisory committees as it may, from time to time, deem necessary in order to carry out the powers and duties of the Foundation as set forth in this Act.

FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

1. to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of scholarship, education, research and creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts;

2. to provide suitable means (including grants, loans and other forms of assistance) for educating and developing, at any stage of their growth, artists and scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts;

3. to assist (by grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) public and other nonprofit organizations, as defined in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, engaged in encouraging and developing artists and scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts;

4. to initiate and promote by contracts or other arrangements, including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance, programs for the improvement of teaching and research in the humanities and the arts;

5. to award, as provided in Section 12 of this Act, scholarships and graduate fellowships, including postdoctoral fellowships, and grants for research and for creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts;

6. to foster the interchange of scholarly information in humanities and the arts among scholars, teachers and students in the United States and foreign countries;

7. to encourage and assist the improvement of library and museum resources and services for research and for teaching at all levels in the humanities and the arts.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen education and research in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States and its possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such education and research.

REPORTS

SEC. 11. The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the fifteenth day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Board.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 12. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to Section 15 or of funds donated or transferred to the Foundation pursuant to Sections 13 and 14, scholarships and graduate fellowships, including postdoctoral fellowships, for study or research in the humanities and the arts at public or nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicant in such manner as will tend to result in the wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia. Nothing contained in the Act shall prohibit the Foundation from refusing or revoking a scholarship or fellowship award, in whole or in part, in the case of any applicant or recipient, if the Board is of the opinion that such award is not in the best interests of the United States.

(b) The amount of the stipend and dependency allowance for scholarships and fellowships awarded under section 11(a) of this Act shall be determined by the Board and shall be reviewed and, if necessary, adjusted annually on the basis of stipends for comparable awards and allowances granted by other agencies of the Federal Government.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 13. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations or donated funds, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof with accredited public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education for the establishment and conduct of summer or academic-year institutes, or both, for the training of teachers and scholars of the humanities and the arts;

(d) to support improved teaching at all levels of education by encouraging experiments in presentation and organization, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary studies and the development of new curricular materials;

(e) to make, advance, progress, and other payments which relate to the establishment and conduct of such institutes and such experiments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(f) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, gift, or condemnation, and to hold and dispose of by grant, sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(g) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(h) to publish or arrange for the publication of scholarly information in the humanities and arts without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111);

(i) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and

(j) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for institutes in the humanities and the arts, as provided in subsection (c) of this section, shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitation of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of

this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of any divisional committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Board hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Board, may prescribe and shall be the Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director.

(c) The members of the Board and the members of the divisional committees shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(d) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of divisional committees, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(e) Funds available to any department or agency of the Federal Government for the development of the humanities or the arts, or the provisions of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

SEC. 15. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C 1704) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (s) the following new paragraph:

"(t) for financing under the direction of the National Humanities Foundation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts, programs outside the United States designed to foster the interchange of information in the humanities and the acts between the United States and other countries, including but not limited to the financing of archeological expeditions through grants, loans, or other forms of assistance;".

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

SEC. 16. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization or association.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 17. To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation such sums as the Congress may determine.

EXHIBIT 2

THE RENAISSANCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Committee: [1] Prof. Josephine Waters Bennett, Hunter College, chairman; W. G. Constable, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Prof. Paul O. Kristeller, Columbia University; Prof. George B. Parks, Queens College; Prof. Gustave Reese, New York University.

I

Since this society is interdisciplinary, some areas of your inquiry, concerned with teaching and teaching techniques, can be answered only in the most general terms. We do not aim at establishing a new teaching field, but at broadening and deepening the learning of our members who are engaged in teaching in one of the many already established disciplines of the field of the humanities. Our undertaking is the intensive study of a single period in history from every angle. We therefore promote interdepartmental exchanges of ideas and techniques—through our publications, through regional meetings and the meetings of our national council, in which Canadian scholarship is also represented, and through the international organizations in which we have representation.

We now support two publications: a quarterly of "Renaissance News" and an annual volume of "Studies in the Renaissance." Both are mailed to all members. The Casa Italiana of Columbia University gives us office space without charge. After 10 years of effort we now have barely enough in the publication fund to publish one volume in what we hope will be a series of edited texts of significant Renaissance works. These are mostly in Latin, but works in other languages are not excluded. Each volume will be provided with either a translation or a full summary in English.

The society, in its first year (1954), published on 29 rolls of microfilm M. E. Cosenza's "Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy 1300–1800." This lifetime's accumulation of notes was reproduced at the expense of a private patron and advertised and distributed by the society at cost. It sold well enough to interest a commercial publisher, who took it over and published it in book form. The society has also acted as banker for successive gifts toward the collection and publication of the letters of Lorenzo de' Medici, sponsored by the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento of Florence and the Warburg Institute. Our endorsement has helped to make possible the publication of P. O. Kristeller's "Iter Italicum," a finding list of uncataloged or incompletely cataloged manuscripts in European and American libraries—a massive work now being printed in four volumes. This is a piece of primary research upon which all future editors of Renaissance works will build, yet it had to go to the Warburg Institute to find a sponsor, and to the Bollingen Foundation for a substantial subsidy. The society makes what use it can of the prestige of a membership of over 2,000 scholars, many of them at the top of their professions (plus about 600 library members), but it lacks funds for the promotion of large cooperative projects of basic research (bibliographies, edited texts, etc.) badly needed in our field.

The society has organized an International Federation of Renaissance Societies and Institutes, with member organizations in Holland, Italy, France, Switzerland, West Germany, and Colombia. This federation, organized with six members in 1958, has now grown to over twice that number. We have, therefore, the organizational machinery for the promotion of Renaissance scholarship on a regional, national, and international scale; but without funds very little can be accomplished. Out of dues and small gifts from members we can scarcely pay for minimal secretarial services. The director serves on a voluntary basis, and the members of the executive board pay their own expenses to attend meetings, as do also the representatives of regional conferences and of various disciplines who make up our governing body.

The understanding of human activities and institutions which have created our civilization is certainly necessary to the understanding and preservation of that civilization. Democracy rests on a base of mutual understanding, and trust arising from that understanding. This trust is the result of common experience over a considerable period of time. The humanities, as they embrace all fields of human history, require continuing research if civilization is to be preserved and enriched. Just as in science, each major advance calls for reconsideration of our generalizations. For example, the relatively new development of economic history has affected art history. Discoveries in archeology throw new light on classical and Biblical texts. Unitive study of the Middle Ages has been underway since the 19th century and has produced many important discoveries, but study of the Renaissance is still in its infancy. Much of the material for such study is unpublished, and so largely unavailable. And yet the Renaissance has had a decisive influence on the modern world. Extensive and coordinated work is needed. The Renaissance Society now has the machinery for planning and promoting such work, but with such small means very little can be accomplished.

II

We feel very strongly that Federal support for the humanities is needed, and that the establishment of a national humanities foundation would be the most practical means of giving a permanent organization to this support. The main reasons are:

(a) Such support exists for the sciences, and its absence for the humanities creates an imbalance at the universities and in other connections, as has been noticed by many recent critics, including university presidents. The imbalance even affects the recruiting of talented young people into the humanities.

(b) There is foreign precedent for such a move. The main research organizations in several European countries (France, West Germany, Spain, and others) include, as a matter of course, the historical disciplines along with the natural sciences. On the other hand, in such English-speaking countries as Britain and Canada, where loss of the root meaning of scio in science has created a separation of the humanities from science, separate organizations in support of the humanities have been created recently.

(c) This country possesses few institutions, comparable to the academies of science in Europe, that are taking care of

---

[1] The report drafted by the committee was discussed and revised by the entire executive board of the Renaissance Society. The members, in addition to those listed above, are: Curt F. Bühler (The Pierpont Morgan Library), Elizabeth Story Donno (Columbia University), Charles Garside, Jr. (Yale University), Felix Gilbert (Institute for Advanced Study), Rensselaer W. Lee (Princeton University), William Nelson (Columbia University), John H. Randall (Columbia University), Helen E. Sandison (Vassar College), and M. A. Shaaber (University of Pennsylvania).

scholarly projects. The American Philosophical Society is the only one that functions in the same way, and its operations are not large enough for present needs. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences is primarily concerned with the sciences but also contributes to a limited extent to research in the humanities. Other academies are either of a local character (Connecticut, Michigan) or limited in subject matter (Mediaeval Academy of America).

(d) Private foundations have done a good deal for humanistic scholarship, but do not provide sufficiently extended support for long-range planning.

(e) The American Council of Learned Societies would be ideally equipped to serve the function we advocate, if it had adequate funds for support of the humanities on a national scale. However, at present it is unable to support certain very necessary activities, such as publication, because the foundations upon which it is dependent refuse to make grants for this purpose.

However, if and when a national humanities foundation is established, it is obvious that the ACLS and its constituent societies should have a decisive managerial role in it. What is needed is an organization comparable to the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, or the German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (in their humanistic sections), where all legitimate branches of humanistic scholarship would find their proper share of support. The merits of every program and project would be judged by the organizations, and by committees of experts, in the appropriate fields.

The humanities should have either a separate foundation or, if a foundation including the social sciences and the creative and performing arts is created, a distinct division within that foundation to make sure that the humanistic disciplines receive their proper share of support.

III

Among the many areas and levels of training where support for our branch of the humanities is needed are the following:

1. Teaching: We welcome all efforts to improve the equipment of students in languages (including English) and in history and geography. The Modern Language Association's foreign-language project has helped to improve instruction in foreign languages in the schools. The concept of area studies has done much to encourage college foreign-language study, except for the languages of Western Europe, with which we are most concerned. We should like to see intensive courses, especially in Latin and Italian, available in colleges and graduate schools.

Books for course study of Renaissance subjects are scarce or not available. Although publication of paperback editions has filled some gaps, a great many remain. There are several translations of Machiavelli's "The Prince" in print, but few of most other Italian Renaissance books, no translation of Tasso's critical writings, no copies at all in most libraries of dozens of other significant English and Continental works. The result is that courses are distorted to fit available materials and students and teachers are hampered and frustrated.

Just as the National Science Foundation has done much to improve the teaching of the sciences at all levels, so a humanities foundation could strengthen teaching in our field. Increasing emphasis on subject matter courses should help to lessen the gap in the preparation of teachers between high schools and colleges.

2. Research and publication: Research in the humanities, while it aims at increasing the sum of human knowledge, also makes available to students the materials needed to increase their knowledge. It provides self-education for the teacher-researcher and, at the same time, materials for the education of future scholars, so that, instead of taking the researcher out of teaching (as much scientific research does), it improves his competence as a teacher and enlarges the size of his audience. Through his publications, he may even continue to teach long after he is dead.

We probably should not quarrel with the fact that scholars are not paid for doing research in the humanities as they are in the sciences. We are paid for teaching and librarianship (the library is the humanist's laboratory), and some of us write or compile textbooks for profit. Research, however, is done in recreation time or on leave, although graduate schools consider it part of the service which a professor renders to his university. Leave with half pay is now usual every seventh year, but the scholar cannot afford to take a sabbatical year unless he also has a fellowship, and the best of these (most range from $3,500 to $7,000) do not fully replace the half pay sacrificed, nor do they provide adequately for necessary travel. We need not dwell upon the grant to a science colleague of $30,000 plus costly equipment, as compared with a maximum of $2,000 for an ACLS grant-in-aid.

Scholarly articles can usually find a publisher (through the self-help of learned society journals). Book publication, however, is difficult, unless the work is of a general nature and can command an audience large enough to pay for the cost of production. For this reason many scholars, discouraged by the prospect of never finding a publisher, report their findings piecemeal in short papers, and never undertake the larger (and more significant) synthesis which it would require a book to develop.

3. Cooperative scholarship: What is most difficult now is the carrying on of cooperative scholarly projects in the humanities. Here we are entirely dependent upon the interests of private patrons and private foundations. The result is adequate provision for editing the works of Thomas More, but no American funds for an edition of the enormously more influential and significant works of Erasmus. (With the encouragement of the society that work has now been undertaken by the Dutch Academy of Sciences.) While lack of financial support hampers and stifles individual research, it positively strangles cooperative scholarship. The managing committee of such a project pays its own carfare to necessary meetings, and types its own letters; the contributors type their own copy; the editors canvass the foundations for subsidy (the Milton Variorum is said to have tried 400 in vain), and many gain a cautious interest from a university press; but even if a publisher is found, he discreetly ignores hints about the cost of typing the final copy. Operation shoestring is the proper name for cooperative scholarship in Renaissance studies. A member of this board is concerned with three such enterprises, all sponsored by a committee or a section of a professional society. Two sponsors semipromise publication, one even semipromised the typing of final copy; but the editors and contributors type their own letters and pay their own carfare, as usual—except for one who luckily has a lead into the National Science Foundation, and gets typing and plane fare at will. He should be editor-in-chief, of course.

However, what is really unfortunate is that the contributors have only their spare, or leisure, time to give to research. Result: the American Bibliography of French Literature is still unfinished after 25 years, whereas the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, which had a paid editor and which paid contributors, came out in 10 years and produced a supplement 16 years later.

The Renaissance Society needs funds for promotion of cooperative research. We have in hand a catalog of Latin authors of the Renaissance. Housed in shoe boxes in a private office, it is being worked on in leisure time by a distinguished scholar whose time is valuable because his mind is valuable—yet he does his own typing and much work a filing clerk could do. We have just published as a sample for correction in various great libraries, and for evaluation, the letter A. When the rest of the alphabet will be done, even in this preliminary form, depends on what help can be secured. Another project for which funds are needed is the publication of Lorenzo de' Medici's letters. The preliminary checklist is in process of publication, but the editing is still to be done. Italy will do the publication. The society has about $5,000 given to it specifically for this project. It will take several scholars several years to do the editing, and this sum is perhaps enough to compensate one competent scholar for 3 months' work. The letters are of much interest not only for economic history, but also for literary and art history, the history of communication and travel, of the transmission of ideas, etc. A dictionary of Renaissance Latin is urgently needed as a tool, but to produce one would require cooperative organization, and therefore funds.

4. Libraries: Renaissance scholars, especially in the English field, are fortunate in having such special libraries as Folger, Huntington, and Newberry, and such great libraries as Harvard and those of the New York area to use, but these libraries will be wholly inadequate for the teachers now being trained to meet the needs of the exploding college population. The New York Public Library is now being destroyed because it lacks funds for the care, repair, and duplication of its books. University libraries generally need funds for the purchase and housing of the multiple copies of important books which they should provide, so that it will not be necessary to present a class of 50 or even a 100 with a reading list of books of which the library has only one copy. America possesses no really great library of Renaissance books in foreign languages. For those the scholar must go abroad. I Tatti, the Harvard center in Florence, is hospitable, but lacks funds for fellowships.

We need one or more American centers, or institutes, where Renaissance scholars can work together and help each other. This need is especially urgent in our field because it is cross-disciplinary. A similar center abroad would be most useful, and would do much to increase national prestige abroad.

5. The society: The Renaissance Society of America needs funds for publication and for the subsidy of publication because: (a) the existence of such funds would enormously encourage scholars to produce suitable books; (b) research in the humanities is a broadening and self-educating process which makes the scholar more valuable as a teacher; (c) publication is the means by which the scholar educates his colleagues, his students—and other people's students.

The society needs also, and urgently, funds for meetings; executive sessions; planning conferences; and learned conferences for exchange of ideas, information, and techniques among leaders of the various disciplines.

IV

The Renaissance was the great age of the spread of education. It emphasized history, ethics, literature, and scholarship. America desperately needs a reemphasis on these subjects today. Interest in the Renaissance has already been exploited by popular publications. The beauty of its pictures and architecture and music has a perennial popular appeal. What is needed is a better understanding of the forces and especially the ideas which produced this great flowering of human creativity, which produced also

sweeping reforms in religion and the reunion of Christians with classical ethics.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO 200TH ANNIVERSARY CONVOCATION OF BROWN UNIVERSITY, MEEHAN AUDITORIUM, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

President Keeney, my old and valued friend, Senator PASTORE and Senator PELL, Congressman FOGARTY, Congressman ST GERMAIN, Governor Chafee, Governor Gallagher, distinguished scholars, my fellow Americans.

This is a proud day for this university, and for the citizens of this great State. In these times, the greatness of States is measured not by their size, but by the worth of their schools. By that measure, no State stands larger than the home State of Brown University.

For 200 years Brown has honored that charter of 1764 by forming the rising generation into a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with both usefulness and reputation.

From this campus have come many of the most useful figures of our national life—great educators like Horace Mann; great leaders of business like John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and Tom Watson, Jr.; great public servants like Tom Corcoran, four Secretaries of State, and many distinguished U.S. Senators.

I speak with personal appreciation today on this subject. In the Senate, I had no more trusted counselors or cherished friends than Theodore Francis Green and JOHN E. PASTORE. And your brilliant young Senator CLAIBORNE PELL is taking his place as a leader and statesman. Today I am proud to have in my administration two men who served as deans at Brown—Dr. Robert W. Morse and Dr. Donald Hornig.

For all that has gone before, Brown's service to the Nation has never been greater than it is today. On behalf of the Nation, I am proud to salute you—and all who have made Brown University one of the really great universities in the world.

In other times we might have come to this convocation looking back upon the past—but not today. I know that the face of New England—the face of America—is turned toward the future, and it is of the future that I have come to New England to speak today. I want to consider with you today the future of an old and fruitful American partnership—the partnership of campus and country. That partnership was formed in 1787 when our forefathers gave us the command that: "The means of education shall forever be encouraged."

From that Northwest Ordinance to the Land Grant College Act, from the Smith-Hughes Act to the enactments of this present Education Congress, America has kept faith with that command. In all history, no other nation has trusted education, invested in it, or relied upon it as a means to national progress so much as we.

A former great president of the Republic of Texas, Lamar, once said that the educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freemen recognize, and the only ruler that freemen desire.

Yes, our partnership has paid us priceless returns. From a backward position American scholarship has flourished. Today, wherever our country leads, that leadership traces to the contribution of the campus. Our partnership is challenged now by new dimensions. From 1776 until the present time, our universities have grown. From 9 in the beginning to more than 2,000 today. From the present until 1980, our existing institutions must double in capacity, and 1,000 more must grow with average enrollments of 2,500 each. But before the total of American scholars has doubled, the sum of human knowledge shall have doubled or more.

These are challenges that we should welcome, and that we should go out to meet, for the increase in scholarship is not a burden, but a blessing. The growth of knowledge is not a curse, but a cure for the ills of this age. Our concepts must change in both education and in politics. But our confidence and our courage must grow.

At the desk where I sit in Washington, I have learned one great truth: The answer for all of our national problems, the answer for all the problems of the world, comes down, when you really analyze it, to one single word—education. Thus, I take a hopeful view, and I call upon you of this campus to join with us who are entrusted with the affairs of a country to help us chart a hopeful course.

President Keeney said last week that knowledge is developing so rapidly that we can take no comfort in the belief that what appears to be the whole truth today will be the whole truth tomorrow. I believe that our partnership must be committed, deeply committed, to seeking the truth, for actually it is truth alone that will finally keep us free. Knowledge is not something which threatens to overwhelm us. Knowledge promises to be our salvation, and we must seek after it, and we must nurture its growth, and we must spread it, spread it among all of our people so each one of them have some of it.

Over the years, leadership of our university system has come from a relatively few great institutions, public and private. Well, I believe we must regard our existing centers of excellence as natural resources to set standards, to supply teachers, to furnish researchers for the new centers of excellence that we develop. This is a first responsibility. A great nation and a great civilization feeds on the depth of its scholarship as well as the breadth of its educational opportunities.

In the sciences, in the arts, in our understanding of human behavior, all of our tools must be sharpened. Our public policy must encourage further the spread of research and scholarship throughout our system of higher learning. In our graduate schools, your Federal Government—your Federal Government—awards 12,000 fellowships and 35,000 trainees in science and engineering. We spend $850 million—$850 million—almost $1 billion—on the support of research in our universities alone.

The partnership of government, your government—not in any way-off-yonder, but something that belongs to you—the partnership of your government and the universities is closest in the advanced education of postgraduate students. Twenty-nine percent of engineering students, 37 percent of the students in physical science, 46 percent of those in life sciences, and 10 percent of those in humanities are aided. And there simply just must be no neglect of humanities. The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal by your own able President Keeney's commission for a national foundation for the humanities.

We must also make certain that there is no neglect or no compromise of the American devotion to democracy of educational opportunity, because universal, free, public education is the very foundation upon which our entire society rests today. So our goals must be to open the doors to education beyond the high school to all young Americans, regardless of station or the station of their families. You and I have an opportunity that is not unlike that of the men and women who first formed these New England States. We have the opportunity to plant the seed corn of a new American greatness and to harvest its yield in every section of this great land.

On the response of our partnership depends the vigor and the quality of our American way of life for many generations yet to come. As a party to that partnership, let me urge you of this campus to admit no compromise in charting our course to excellence. Concern yourselves not with what seems feasible, not with what seems attainable, not with what seems politic, but concern yourselves with only what you know is right. Your duty is the vision. The duty of the world that I represent is the reality.

There is one thing more that I would like to emphasize: 323 years ago Roger Williams founded Providence. He brought into American life a bright flame, which must never be allowed to grow dim. And he said, "I humbly conceive that it is the express and the absolute duty of the civil powers to proclaim an absolute freedom of conscience in all the world." Our partnership is not as some would have it, a conspiracy against liberty. That partnership exists to reinforce the freedom of higher learning, and it must never be otherwise. And so long as I hold any public trust, or any private responsibility, I shall devote my every effort to defending against all enemies the freedom of conscience, the freedom of belief, and the spirit of free inquiry on which our American system stands.

The statue atop the statehouse of Rhode Island is dedicated to the independent man. Man cannot be independent if he or his society are imprisoned in dogma, or bound by bias, or borne down by hate, or fear, or suspicion, or discrimination. At this moment I believe that we have a great opportunity in this country to move forward. As President Keeney has put it, "move forward toward making our society what it really should be." If we turn away from knowledge and truth, we will not succeed. If we believe the worst and suspect the best, we alone will suffer. If we deny our progress, if we are against all of it, if we tear down our accomplishments, we will fill the world with sorrow, and we will blemish our own name with shame. But if we are courageous, farsighted and farseeing, if we have no fear of the truth, if we seek only after light, then we and our children and our children's children shall know the greatness of this wonderful, beautiful land we call America.

I pray that when historians write the story of this time, of our lives, that it may be recorded that this President tried, tried to lead his Nation, tried to lead his Nation with justice and with compassion, and with courage; and there was faith, and there was firmness in his heart. May it further be written that the people of the United States cast out their doubts, took great pride on their achievements, and bravely made of this land and this world a brighter, happier place for all mankind. This is our choice. This is our decision. Let us all be greatly determined that this society shall survive and this society shall succeed. And what it should be will be for all time to come.

As I will return tonight to my large room and my lonely desk in the White House, to cope with the decisions that have come to that desk through the day from all countries of the world, and when I review the problems of our men in uniform and those on strike, when I see the farmer and the laborer seeking justice and believing that his Government will do what is right, my mind will wander back here to the little State of Rhode Island, far away from what was once the largest State in the Nation where I was born, and I will remember back 10 months ago when a terrible tragedy befell the people of this Nation and I was called upon, as best I could, with all of my limitations, to attempt to carry on. And I will think of the Presidents, Mr. Hoover in New York, Mr. Truman in Independence, Mr. Eisenhower in Gettysburg, all of whom sent me their good wishes and their prayers, who told me that they were

at the service of this Nation in this crisis. And I will remember how the butcher and the baker and the candlestick maker, the little children on the sidewalks, the folks sitting in the old folks' home as I drove by—how they all gave me their hopes and their prayers that somehow we might be able to carry on.

But there is nothing I will be more thankful for than the contribution of the people of this State, because in my moment of trial, Congressman ST GERMAIN and Congressman FOGARTY, Senators PELL and JOHN PASTORE, all walking in the tradition of that great democratic leader Theodore Francis Green, they marched up by my side and said, "You have our talents, our energy, and our prayers." And however long I may be permitted to continue in my work, I shall always feel deeply in the debt of this great university for the inspiration it has given me through the years, for the honor it has paid me by giving me a degree, and for the little State of Rhode Island, for the quality of the manhood it has produced.

Thank you.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which seeks to permit the District of Columbia to participate in the medical care for the aged program which was established by law in the fall of 1960.

As of today, a total of 43 jurisdictions, including 40 States have a medical care for the aged program which participates in the Federal funds appropriated for the purpose.

Two years ago I introduced the substance of this present bill. At that time, the District of Columbia had no program, and none was proposed in the legislative program of the District Commissioners.

Now, the District is conducting a program. But, that program is permitted only under legislative language in an appropriations act, which is precarious and temporary legislation to say the least.

We all know the aversion with which Congress regards such legislation, and we have been put on notice that no such legislation will continue under future appropriations bills.

It is imperative, then, for the life of medical care for the aged in the District of Columbia, that we enact this bill as soon as it is possible to do so. Without this legislation, medical assistance for the aged in the District will most probably have to cease operations after July 1st of this year. And, if that happens, the Federal contribution—for fiscal 1964, it was $903,841—will no longer be available for the aged in the District.

Mr. President, the Senate passed this bill on August 14, 1964. There was insufficient time for the House to act on it prior to adjournment last session.

In addition to legislative authority for conducting the medical care for the aged program, the bill includes amendments which were requested by the District Commissioners after I had introduced the bill last Congress. These amendments were acceptable to me, and the District Committee included them in the bill on my motion. They are, therefore, part of the bill which I introduce today.

In other words, the bill as I am introducing it is in identical form with the bill, S. 763, as it passed the Senate last year.

These several amendments, briefly, are:

First. A removal of residence requirements for medical assistance for the aged recipients in the District of Columbia. I understand this to be mandatory for participation in Kerr-Mills.

Second. Permission for the District to take advantage of title XVI of the Social Security Act, which allows a combined plan for the various categories of public assistance and medical assistance.

Third. Permission for 3 months' retroactive participation in the program to permit full coverage for individuals in emergency situations, where an illness occurs prior to approval of an application for coverage of the elderly.

Mr. President, I fully expect the bill to have administration support. The Commissioners endorsed its provisions last year. I recommend it to them, and I urge its early adoption by my fellow committee members, and its early consideration on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 176) to amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to provide for the furnishing of medical assistance for the aged to eligible residents of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RELIEF OF BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am today introducing for myself and my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] a bill designed to help end the annual boxcar shortage which plagues Nebraska and other Midwestern States and becomes particularly acute during the period when grain shipments normally occur.

I wish to express to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, my thanks for his help in dealing with the boxcar shortage. His leadership has been of great value, and all western boxcar users are grateful to him. I shall be happy to join Chairman MAGNUSON as a cosponsor of his bill when it is offered.

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing is similar to those I have cosponsored for the past 6 years, and hits at the heart of one of the fundamental reasons Nebraska and all the Midwest experience a boxcar crisis each year. This is the matter of clearing the way for higher car rentals or "per diem" charges paid by railroads for using cars owned by other railroads. I do not contend, of course, that inadequate car rental rates are entirely to blame for the shortages. But they represent a major factor contributing to these shortages.

The bill I am introducing is very simple. It is very brief. The bill would amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act by adding at the end of that section a new sentence to read as follows:

> In fixing the compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars, the Commission shall give consideration to the level of freight car ownership and to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply and shall, on the basis of such consideration, determine whether compensation should be computed on the basis of elements of ownership expense involved in owning and maintaining freight cars, including a fair return on value (which return shall be fixed at such level as in the Commission's judgment will encourage the acquisition and maintenance of an adequate freight car fleet), or should be computed on the basis of elements reflecting the value of use of freight cars, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

As reported by the Senate Commerce Committee last year, a new section 2 was added, reading as follows:

> The amendment made by this Act shall be effective only during the two-year period following the effective date of the first orders issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the authority of such amendment with respect to compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars.

This new section 2, somewhat restrictive in nature, is made a part of the bill I am introducing today.

Mr. President, the legislative proposal I have sent to the desk is identical with S. 1063, introduced in the 88th Congress by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and reported by that committee to the Senate on July 16, 1964. I was listed as a cosponsor of that bill which did not come before the full Senate for consideration.

Through the years, I have been in constant communication with people engaged in the grain industry in Nebraska, and all are in agreement that, while not the entire cause of the perennial boxcar shortage, inadequate per diem charges are one of the fundamental causes. Western railroads concede that the Nation's boxcar fleet is diminishing; but they are trying to do something about it. Western railroads are engaged in a huge construction program, building cars to help overcome the shortage.

Meanwhile, these same western railroads are being shortchanged by railroads in other sections which continue to rent rather than build cars. In a word, those railroads in other sections find it cheaper to rent than build cars. Understandably, they have opposed legislation of the kind I am introducing today.

I am reliably informed that during 1964 10 western railroads arranged financing to construct 2,360 box cars costing $41,140,273. This is part of those railroads' overall 1964 construction program to provide 6,021 freight cars of all types, at a total cost of $99,590,822. Plain boxcars, of course, are the workhorse of the Nation's freight car fleet,

and are vital to the movement of Midwest grains to market.

Some rather misleading information has been circulated, Mr. President, tending to minimize the critical boxcar shortage. For example, last fall it was announced that there was a decline of only 2,409 serviceable freight cars from October 1, 1963, to October 1, 1964. But during that same period, the number of serviceable boxcars declined 11,872. Since the boxcar numbers are included in the overall totals, it means that other types of cars were on the increase while the all-important boxcar fleet continued downward at a rapid rate.

Advancing the comparison of boxcar figures by 1 month—from November 1, 1963, to November 1, 1964—the decline is even more alarming. During that 1-year period, boxcar numbers dipped from 575,098 to 560,321, a decrease of 14,777.

Another misleading report is found in figures showing that 16,473 boxcars were included in freight car orders during the 12 months ending October 31, 1964, which report neglected to mention that during those same 12 months 38,464 boxcars were retired from services, for a net loss of 21,991.

Mr. President, the boxcar fleet is at its lowest level in this century. This presents a very serious problem for a vital segment of our agricultural economy, and indeed our entire national economy.

The low rental policy of the past not only has created recurring freight car shortages; it has created as well major inequities between car owners and car users. An official of one western railroad operating in my State was quoted a few months ago as saying that when his railroad builds a new $12,000 or $15,000 car, they could expect to use it on their own line only about 1 day out 10. Ninety percent of the time it will be used on other lines which rent rather than own such equipment. Older freight cars are "at home" on the owning railroad's lines about 4 days out of 10.

This same railroad official went on to say:

> We not only get an inadequate rental when our freight cars are offline, but when our colleagues are gracious enough to return some of our equipment, we get the old and they retain the new.

The bill I have introduced, as well as proposals I have cosponsored for the past 6 years, would help to remedy this condition. I want to make it clear that it is not my intention to sponsor legislation entirely for the relief of western railroads from these inequities; this is a by-product, so to speak. It is my primary intention to seek legislation which would benefit the grain industry of the Midwest through providing sufficient boxcars to ship their products when they are ready for shipment and to avoid losses occasioned by the inadequacy of this equipment.

As mentioned earlier, I have been in constant communication with people engaged in the grain industry in Nebraska and elsewhere in the farm belt. Only recently I wrote to a large number of these people advising them of my intention, with my colleague, Senator HRUSKA, to reintroduce this legislation. I solicited their comments and suggestions. I was not surprised, Mr. President, to receive unanimous endorsement of this legislation. Many of them expressed the opinion that the 1964 boxcar shortage was the most acute within their memory.

I would like to quote briefly from just a few of the letters I received.

A grain dealer in western Nebraska wrote to "urge that you spare no effort in securing its passage." He said the boxcar shortage—

> historically represents a real problem for us practically every year particularly during the harvest season and the period immediately following.
>
> We are having the worst boxcar shortage in the history of Nebraska—

Wrote the manager of an elevator and feed company in eastern Nebraska—

> I have been in the grain business for 35 years and I have never seen it so bad.

From another eastern Nebraska firm:

> We offer our wholehearted support and wish to state the following in behalf of this bill. The boxcar shortage in the State of Nebraska has been, and still is, the worst in the history of the State. Our company, among others, has suffered untold hardships due to the inadequate boxcar supply and any continuation will create unrepairable damage that cannot be overcome by the grain and grain products industry for the future.
>
> The boxcar situation has been more acute during the past 2 months than any time since I came here 6½ years ago—

Said an official of a south-central Nebraska company.

> We certainly are in favor of this bill and hope that you will be successful in getting some action on it since it without doubt will be helpful in returning cars to the ownership lines.

The manager of a cooperative firm in western Nebraska said:

> We have been resorting to a few hopper cars and trucks to move our own grain, however we must say that the movement of cars is almost at a standstill due to the lack of cars.

Another grain company official in eastern Nebraska advised that:

> We are heartily in favor of this legislation and will in any way we can vigorously support. The annual car shortage, which is the worst this year that we have ever experienced in 40 years, is a very serious economic handicap to the entire State.

This, Mr. President, is just a sampling of the many, many letters I have received on this subject. I commend this legislation to my colleagues and hope for their support in this effort to help resolve a perennial problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 179) to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS IN CERTAIN ELECTIONS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress is given the responsibility and authority to appropriate the moneys in the Federal Treasury. Again and again the Congress has required that the money appropriated be used only for the purposes for which it has been appropriated. Title 31 of the United States Code, section 628, states that "sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others."

In addition to this general restriction, Congress has specifically and repeatedly stated that the appropriated moneys should not be used for unauthorized publicity and lobbying activities. Public Law 87–844, section 701, states that "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress." Public Law 87–741, section 301, again expresses the intention of Congress:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

The 88th Congress made this provision permanent when Public Law 88–257, section 509, was enacted. It states, "No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act" shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

Congress has felt so strongly about the unauthorized use of appropriated money that in addition to the statute restricting the use of appropriated funds we have a criminal statute which carries a penalty for any Government employee who is convicted of using appropriated funds to influence Members of Congress.

Title 18, section 1913, of the United States Code reads:

> No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.
>
> Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power

of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

The meaning is clear. Government employees can communicate with Members of Congress about legislation and appropriations they want only when requested to do so by that Member of Congress with whom they communicate. This is as it should be. In addition, the government employees and agencies can present their needs and problems to the Congress as a whole by the "proper official channels."

It is not the purpose of this statute to limit the use of appropriated funds in the exercise of the basic responsibilities of the executive branch to inform and consult with the Congress on legislative considerations, draft bills, and urge in messages, speeches, reports, committee testimony, and by direct contact, the passage or defeat of various measures. House Report 3138, 81st Congress, 2d session, page 51.

However, 18 U.S.C. 1913 does have a real purpose by imposing limitations on what an administration can do with taxpayers' moneys to further its position. It is this—the misuse of appropriated funds by the administration to enhance its own image and its own program at the expense of all else—that concerns me.

These statutes, the restrictive statute and the criminal statute, have been set forth to protect the taxpayers' money, and yet, in too many instances the administration has used appropriated moneys, taxpayers' dollars, to improperly influence Members of Congress.

On July 25, 1963, during the 88th Congress, I introduced S. 1939, which is the same bill I am now introducing, and cited several examples which clearly demonstrated the improper use by the administration of appropriated funds. That speech can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 10, page 13383.

Mr. President, the unauthorized use of appropriated funds is a serious violation of the trust that the people of America have placed in their Government. We have a criminal statute which makes it a crime to use appropriated moneys to influence Members of Congress, but we do not have a statute which makes it a crime to use appropriated moneys to improperly influence the general public.

Unfortunately, it is easy for administration officials and employees, in their eagerness to push for their programs, to use taxpayers' moneys to advance their cause without due regard to the opposition or the public's money. During this coming session, I am sure that there will be several instances which will tempt the zealous administration supporters to take their ideas to the public. This is well and good, but it should not be done with the taxpayers' money. Additional safeguards must be enacted if we are to protect the American people from those in Government who seek to convince, by whatever means possible, that their way is the one and only way. There is no room in Government for such employees and officials.

If we are to protect the liberty of our people and retain freedom of choice, as well as freedom of speech, we must restrain those in Government who improperly use Federal funds to influence and prejudice the American public.

Mr. President, I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill patterned after 18 U.S.C. 1913 which will make it a crime to use appropriated funds directly or indirectly to influence the vote of any person in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress or to influence public opinion in favor of or against any matter or issue to be voted upon by the Congress or either House thereof.

It should be stressed that this much needed bill would not prohibit any Government employee or official from furnishing to any person upon request a factual explanation of the matter to be voted upon by the Congress or by the people in a referendum.

It is sad to think that our form of government would need such a criminal statute, but the need does exist. Not only is there the need for such a law, but there is also the need for strong enforcement of this law. I ask Congress to pass this legislation which will protect the public funds and the people of America from lobbying pressures by Government employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 180) to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED STUDY OF POSSIBILITY OF OPENING GREAT LAKES TO YEAR-ROUND SHIPPING TRAFFIC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, CLARK, and DOUGLAS, proposed legislation authorizing a study of the possibility of opening the Great Lakes to year-round shipping traffic. At the present time, severe weather necessitates the shutdown of lake traffic over the winter months. This has an adverse economic impact on the United States as a whole and particularly on the Great Lakes region.

It is estimated that a Federal study of the feasibility of keeping the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway open on a permanent basis would cost only $50,000. It would take 2 years from the time funds were appropriated, and would be conducted by the Corps of Engineers.

There is considerable information available on deicing harbors and waterways. The study proposed by my bill would include a review of such information including previous reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any other departments of the Government, and methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments.

My measure provides for the submission of a final report together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as are deemed advisable.

Mr. President, the potential profits from such a study to our national economy and defense posture are great indeed. The cost of the study is low. I hope that the Senate will take speedy action on this measure as it did in 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that my bill be placed on the table for 10 days so that other interested Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 201) to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward a bill to amend the Federal Power Act, and ask that a statement explaining its contents be printed immediately after its introduction. This bill is being cosponsored by my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 218) to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanation presented by Mr. HOLLAND is as follows:

STATEMENT

In July of last year, hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Commerce on two bills to amend the Federal Power Act in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. These bills were S. 2028 introduced by the then Senator Humphrey for himself and six others and S. 3038 introduced on behalf of Senator SMATHERS and myself.

Although no action on these bills was taken by the Senate in the closing days of the last Congress, the Commerce Committee, in its Report No. 1363 dated August 10, 1964, made clear that it intended to consider in this Congress appropriate amendments to the Federal Power Act in respect of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction.

The committee's report stated: "During the course of the committee hearings, other issues were raised, including the question of FPC jurisdiction over public utilities selling electric power at wholesale primarily for consumption in the States in which they operate.

"The committee considers that this issue, in addition to the issue of Commission jurisdiction over cooperatives, merits extensive

hearing and consideration during the next session of Congress."

The purpose of this legislation introduced by me today is to clarify the Federal Power Act by further defining the limits of the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction with respect to operations of cooperatives and companies engaged in what are essentially local activities which are primarily of local concern and which ought to be subject to State and local, rather than Federal, regulation.

This bill would reaffirm the original intent of the Congress in enacting the Federal Power Act; that the act was to supplement and not supplant State and local regulation.

The bill would, in general, exempt from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction any company, including any nonprofit corporation engaged in rural electrification, having all of its generating and transmission facilities within a single State and having no direct connections with the facilities of any public utility deriving the major portion of its electric revenues from sales in another State. The Federal Power Commission would continue to have jurisdiction over companies having generating or transmission facilities in more than one State as well as over the single-State companies which are directly connected with public utilities having their major operations in another State. The bill would also provide an exemption for what are essentially local sales to governmental bodies, cooperatives and exempt single-State companies.

Specifically, the bill amends section 201(f) of the Federal Power Act by adding two sentences.

The first sentence exempts from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction any company, including any nonprofit corporation, or membership or cooperative corporation or association, engaged in rural electrification, where (a) all of the generating and transmission facilities of such company are wholly within one State; and (b) none of the facilities of such company is directly connected with the facilities of any public utility otherwise than by an authorized or approved emergency connection or by a connection within the same State with the facilities of a public utility deriving the major portion of its electric revenues from sales at retail or for resale at retail within such State.

The second sentence of the bill exempts transactions involving the sale or, within the State in which delivery takes place, the transmission of electric energy to any entity exempted by subsection 201(f), as amended by this bill, or to any nonprofit corporation, or membership or cooperative corporation or association, engaged in rural electrification, where a substantial portion of the seller's electric revenues from sales within such State is derived from the sale of electric energy at retail.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, legislation to create the Oregon Dunes National Seashore has been before each session of the Congress since March 25, 1959, when the first bill on this subject was introduced by Senator Richard L. Neuberger and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

On November 27, 1963, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs favorably reported S. 1137 to the Senate Calendar. I am introducing today the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill in the form in which it was approved by the Senate Interior Committee over a year ago, with the exception that I have incorporated into it amendments proposed on January 22, 1964, by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The bill which I introduce is the product of many conferences, discussions, studies, and hearings by congressional committees and by the numerous Federal, State, county, and local officials, as well as individual citizens in the State of Oregon. During the period of nearly 6 years when the first bill was introduced there has been ample opportunity for the expression of all viewpoints regarding this new unit of the national park system. As a spokesman for Oregon Gov. Mark O. Hatfield said at hearings of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee at Eugene, Oreg.: "It is now time for action on the Oregon dunes." I am hopeful that the Senate Interior Committee can again complete favorable action on the legislation in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask consent to include with my remarks some excerpts from the favorable Senate Interior Committee report on S. 1137, the bill which was before the Senate in the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 250) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The excerpts presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE REPORT NO. 674

BACKGROUND

The proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore contains what an eminent biologist and ecologist and recognized authority on dunes has described as the most beautiful and impressive coastal dunes in North America, if not the world. He is Dr. William S. Cooper, of Boulder, Colo., who reports that the transverse ridge pattern of the northern dunes in the area, while common in deserts, is uncommon in coastal areas.

In a comprehensive study of all of the Nation's shorelines, the National Park Service has found the proposed seashore 1 of the 10 most important, relatively unspoiled natural seashore areas in the 48 continguous States.

It is an area of unusual scenes and beauty. The vast dunes of moving sand adjoining the Pacific Ocean beach, which varies from 40 to 125 yards in width with the tides. They are interlaced with fresh water lakes. Inland from the moving dunes are ancient, forested, stable dunes ranging 450 feet above sea level, interspersed with other lakes popular for boating, fishing, swimming, and water sports.

The Oregon Dunes National Seashore, as proposed in the amended bill, stretches approximately 31 miles along the Pacific coast from the Siuslaw River south to Tenmile Creek, which is 10 miles north of Coos Bay. It contains 30,000 acres of land and water lying chiefly between U.S. Highway 101 and the ocean, but jutting east across the highway to reach, and include in the seashore area, stretches of inland shores on lakes Tahkenitch, Siltcoos, and Woahink, which would provide seashore visitors access and opportunity to enjoy water sports. The ocean itself is too cold even in summer for all but the hardiest swimmers and skiers. It is, however, one of the world's most renowned salmon fishing areas.

U.S. Highway No. 101, skirting its east side or passing through the seashore, extends from Canada to Mexico. It is the main Pacific coastal artery and connects with numerous east-west roads.

The Interior Department has accurately reported, as committee members who have inspected the area can attest, that no area on the Pacific coast can present such an association of spectacular dunes, seashore, fresh water lakes, and forests, plus the tidal bays and harbors formed by the Siuslaw and Umpqua Rivers which reach the ocean through the seashore area.

A few miles north of the proposed seashore is a second great tourist attraction, not now proposed for Federal acquisition, the famed Oregon Sea Lion Caves.

The area fully meets the criteria of outstanding scenic beauty and unusual character qualifying it to become a national seashore. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has recommended it for such status.

The committee is in full agreement on the desirability of a national seashore in the area.

IMPLEMENTING THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

The establishment of such a seashore would be a further step by the Federal Government to meet the growing needs of the Nation for outdoor recreational opportunities and a further step toward implementation of the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which recommended: "Immediate action * * * by Federal, State, and local governments to reserve or acquire additional water, beach, and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population."

This recommendation was backed by these findings:

"About 90 percent of all Americans participated in some form of outdoor recreation in the summer of 1960. In total, they participated in one activity or another on 4.4 billion separate occasions. It is anticipated that by 1976 the total will be 6.9 billion, and by the year 2000 it will be 12.4 billion, a threefold increase by the turn of the century.

"Most people seeking outdoor recreation want water—to sit by, to swim and to fish in, to ski across, and to run their boats over. Swimming is now one of the most popular outdoor activities and likely to be the most popular of all by the turn of the century. Boating and fishing are among the top 10 activities. Camping, picnicking, and hiking, also high on the list, are most attractive near water sites."

CONDEMNATION

Seashore and recreation area bills adopted in the 87th and 88th Congresses have included provisions to give special consideration to property owners and to minimize numbers of houses and businesses taken. Exemption from condemnation in areas not necessary for public use developments has been granted where use of the property is consistent with recreation area objectives. Residence owners have been given options of 25 years continued tenure, life tenure for the owner and spouse, or until the youngest surviving child reaches age 21.

The majority of the committee agrees that Congress should not go beyond such extended tenure provisions in delaying full acquisition of properties in the main body of a seashore or other recreation area. Some private inholdings interfere with needed public use facilities—a highway, campground, visitor center, water access, or other essential development. The ultimate authority to condemn is necessary to assure proper development of the new recreation areas and safeguard against unreasonable acquisition costs. The committee feels, as courts have held, that the acquisition of some of our vanishing

shorelines and other recreational areas, is a public purpose justifying use of condemnation where necessary.

The extended tenure provisions, revision of boundaries to minimize private properties affected, and other provisions have been adopted to minimize the necessity and onerous effects of condemnation. But it is the majority's firm belief that the power of condemnation is essential, and that it would not be equitable to property owners in other areas of acquisition, nor a wise precedent, to delete condemnation entirely from S. 1137. It has consequently been retained along with the extended tenure provisions in previous, comparable legislation. A summary of such provisions appears as an appendix to this report. A study of the constitutional power of State, local, and Federal governments to condemn land for outdoor recreation and related open space purposes will be found in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report No. 16 entitled "Land Acquisition for Outdoor Recreation—Analysis of Selected Legal Problems."

OWNERSHIP OF LANDS INVOLVED

Most of the land involved in the proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore is in public ownership. About 6,000 acres is water area. The character of land ownership, by acreage, is:

	Acres
National Forest Service	13,399
Bureau of Land Management	1,773
State, including parks	3,493
County and local government	1,194
Private	4,242
Total land	24,101

COSTS

The committee has amended S. 1137 to include a section 12 authorizing appropriations for acquisitions under the act not to exceed $1,500,000.

The estimated cost of acquiring all private lands within the new boundaries, exclusive of scenic easements authorized in the new section 4(d), was $1,392,000. These costs may be reduced by retentions of tenure to residences, and the committee feels that the authorization is adequate at this time.

The estimated development costs of the seashore area, which includes roads, campgrounds, picnic facilities, beach development, boat ramps, headquarters, visitor centers, sanitary facilities, etc., is $6,274,000. Annual operating and maintenance costs are estimated in the fifth year at $310,000. The National Park Service has continuing authorization of development, maintenance, and operating funds so authority for their appropriation is not necessary in S. 1137.

PROPOSAL TO END SENATE CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, to end Senate confirmation of postmasters. In this era of equal employment opportunities it is indeed strange that first-, second-, and third-class postmasters are appointed not solely on the basis of merit but rather on the strength of political pull, only partly modified by civil-service provisions.

Such a change has been recommended in every major study in the executive government since President Taft's administration in 1911.

Let me outline briefly a few of the reasons for eliminating this system of discriminatory appointments.

First, it weakens the Post Office Department by eliminating for consideration many qualified applicants who do not have political affiliations. The Hatch Act prohibits political activity on the part of Post Office employees. This means that a career civil servant in the Post Office Department cannot participate in the type of political activity which often is a prerequisite to appointment to a postmastership. Yet these career civil servants have the experience and the acquired skills to do an excellent job in this position.

Second, it has a severe impact on the morale of career postal personnel. They know that, no matter how good they are, a postmaster vacancy will in all likelihood be filled on the basis of political considerations rather than merit.

Third, for every successful appointee, there are from 2 to 10 unhappy or even infuriated rejectees who resent their Senator's action. Consequently, party harmony can be strained rather than strengthened by the awarding of a postmastership for faithful party service.

Fourth, the many hundreds of letters received by Senate offices recommending postmaster candidates as well as a Senator's role in processing and recommending consume valuable staff time in this period of unprecedented legislative and administrative burdens. This time-consuming job ties up committee staffs as well as Senators.

Fifth, the concept of equal opportunity as a basic part of our democratic ideals makes any reliance on political qualifications rather than job ability repugnant to the basic principles upon which this country was founded.

My bill, then, would provide that the Postmaster General, rather than the President, shall appoint postmasters at post offices for the first, second, and third classes in the competitive civil service without term. No Senate confirmation would be required and the law would read as follows:

> In making such appointments, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but such appointments shall be made solely on the basis of merit and efficiency.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my bill be permitted to lie on the desk 1 week for cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 252) to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first, second, and third class post offices, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF OREGON WATER RESOURCES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, rampaging rivers and streams in Oregon caused tragic loss of life and costly property damage throughout my State during Christmas week. Devastation from this natural disaster will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Despite havoc in every county of Oregon, the people of my State have responded to the disaster with characteristic energy and initiative, with compassion for the needy and homeless. Oregonians proved equal to their pioneer heritage.

There will be need for emergency disaster relief funds to repair damaged roads, bridges, water supply and sanitation installations. There will be need for financial aid to business, farmers, and individuals. I have pledged my best efforts to restoration of all facilities so that Oregon's economy can be brought back to normal at the earliest possible date.

The great flood of 1964 has focused attention on the valuable contribution of water resource development projects throughout the Columbia and Willamette River Basins. Without these dams and reservoirs, the destruction would reached much higher figures. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that the Willamette Basin project cut 4.5 feet from the crest of the flood at Portland. Without the dams, it is possible that Portland would have lost five of its six bridges. Damage at upstream points also was reduced by existence of flood control dams.

However, the flood has shown that the construction completed is not enough. We must go forward with a program aimed at maximum comprehensive development of Oregon's water resources. Our ultimate goal must be to harness and control our State's rivers and streams so that the threat of future floods is curbed. The Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation will need to restudy the reports to determine feasible locations for new projects.

As the beginning of an expanded Oregon water resource development and control program, I am introducing a bill for the construction of the Tualatin reclamation project. This measure is being cosponsored by my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE]. This project is essential to the battle against flood threats in Oregon. It provides additional benefits for irrigation, water quality, conservation of fish and wildlife, and other purposes. The project has the approval of local and State officials and the development plans have been sent to Congress with a favorable report from the Secretary of the Interior.

The Tualatin project plan of development provides for a 61,000 acre-foot reservoir behind the proposed Scoggin Dam to store excess wintertime flows of the river and release the water as needed for municipal and industrial supplies, irrigation, the maintenance of fish life in the river, flood control, and water quality control.

Included in the plan are some 70 miles of main canals and necessary pumping plants, laterals, drains, and appurtenant facilities to irrigate 17,000 acres of productive lands. Project facilities would provide for the foreseeable water needs of three cities in the project area and for other nonagricultural uses. Specific facilities would also be provided at Scoggin Reservoir for recreation and fish enhancement, and modifications at an existing downstream industrial diversion dam will assure the passage of anadromous fish.

Washington County cities of Hillsboro, Forest Grove, and Beaverton, Tigard water district, as well as the Lake Oswego Corp., will require about 14,000 acre-feet of water annually from the project.

Construction cost of the Tualatin project is estimated at $19,235,300 of which $14,431,500 is reimbursable. Tentative allocations of the project cost to functions are as follows: Irrigation, $13,089,000; municipal and industrial water supply, $1,342,500; water-quality control, $1,720,700; fish and wildlife, $1,977,200; recreation, $795,100; flood control, $30,800; highway transportation, $280,000.

Mr. President, this project has been strongly endorsed by the Oregon State Water Resources Board, as well as the local units of government concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 254) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to reduce the excise tax on automobiles from 10 to 5 percent over a 3-year period. Under the provisions of this measure, the tax will drop to 7 percent on July 1, 1965, to 6 percent in the following year, and reach 5 percent in 1967.

Of the major wartime excise taxes, only that on passenger cars has remained unchanged since the Korean conflict. Taxes on refrigerators, jewelry, cameras, sporting goods, electric, gas, and oil appliances have been reduced; also taxes on general admissions and local phone services.

In the transportation field, the 10-percent levy on bus and rail fares was lifted. The tax on freight and oil pipeline transportation also was repealed; and the 15-percent tax on airlines was reduced to 5 percent.

All competing forms of transportation have enjoyed significant tax relief. Only the tax on automobiles remains at its peak wartime level.

My efforts to reduce the excise tax on cars go back to 1958. In March of that year, the automobile manufacturers endorsed reduction or repeal of these excise taxes. At the same time, I was assured that the savings would be passed along to the retail customers.

On June 18, 1958, I introduced amendments to the excise tax extension bill. These amendments sought to repeal the 10-percent Federal excise tax levied on automobiles sold after March 1, 1958. They also would have reduced the rate imposed on trucks and buses by one-half—to 5 percent—also retroactive to March 1, 1958. They were defeated.

On September 5, 1959, I tried again to reduce the Federal excise tax on auto passenger cars. I introduced an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959 which would have amended section 4061(a)(2) to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by providing for automatic reductions in the 10-percent rate applied on passenger automobiles to 7 percent on July 1, 1960; 6 percent on July 1, 1961; and 5 percent on July 1, 1962. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 7-to-78.

Each year since 1954 Congress has failed to reduce the 10-percent tax on automobiles—the only major Korean war excise tax not to be cut. The consumer was shelling out as much as $400 more in taxes for his new car, while excise taxes on "essential" items such as golf clubs, cameras, cosmetics and appliances for the home had been reduced.

In September, of 1962, the Congress had another opportunity to vote on major tax legislation. As far as the rank-and-file taxpayer was concerned, the tax grabbag offered by the Congress was an empty bag. It did not lower his tax rate—or increase his deductions—or raise personal exemptions from $600 to a more realistic figure.

Nor did it reduce unfair consumer taxes such as the one I am trying to reduce today—the Korean-inspired 10-percent excise tax on the purchase of a new passenger car. I voted against it.

Now in 1965—is the time to correct the tax abuses of other years. Obviously, the administration is of a mind to do this. President Johnson has given support to the recommendation that excise taxes now levied on many items be reduced or repealed.

Treasury Secretary Dillon testified before the Democratic platform committee last summer that excise tax cuts should precede additional income tax reductions. And President Johnson made a campaign pledge to reduce these taxes in 1965.

In addition, the President, in three statements, advocated this action.

Accordingly, I introduce my bill with the hope that the Senate will at last act favorably upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 255) to provide for the reduction over a 3-year period of the excise tax on passenger automobiles, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption to a taxpayer for each son or daughter under the age of 23 years who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution.

This bill is intended to make possible the achievement of some of the goals about which many spoke during the past Congress. Other Senators have introduced similar bills and I am hopeful that all of them can be given active consideration during the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 258) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer for each dependent son or daughter under the age of 23 who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SAND AND GRAVEL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in 1955 Congress enacted Public Law 167 which provided:

> Common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders shall not be deemed a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws of the United States so as to give effective validity to any mining claim hereafter located under such mining laws.

The principal purpose for this legislation was apparently to remove the possibility of unauthorized and fraudulent locations by speculators who had no interest in developing mining operations, but were only interested in acquiring title to surface land.

I believe sincerely that this is a sound purpose. My concern today, however, is not with the intent of Public Law 167, but with the interpretation given it by the Department of the Interior since its enactment.

The decisions rendered since 1955 have been equally as restricting on bona fide sand and gravel operations as on the fraudulent operators. Regulations have been drawn which have greatly impaired and, in fact, threatened to totally cripple the construction and building industry in Nevada and other Western States.

Section 7 of the 1955 act provides that there be no limit or restrictions on existing rights under valid mining claims. In spite of this, however, the Department of the Interior has consistently ruled that those claims validly located prior to 1955 must meet a marketability test at a date not later than the time of the act. This flatly violates the historical idea that an operator was entitled to locate and protect his reserves even though he did not in fact remove and market them prior to the time he sought patent.

An arbitrary date is set by the Department ruling at which time any operator, no matter how well intentioned, must be able to prove that he could have economically mined the materials located.

In an area expanding at such an accelerated rate as is Nevada, the effect of the Department's ruling is a serious threat. In my State, for example, 86.9 percent of the total area is controlled by the Federal Government. All Western States have a significant, though lesser, amount of land in public domain. It is imperative, therefore, that, to meet the demands of growth, we have access to the materials held in these lands.

I am not proposing that carte blanche permission be given any operator to remove minerals. I am proposing that more reasonable interpretations be given to existing law and that certain clarifications be made in order that valid mining operations can be conducted.

The first bill which I send to the desk, therefore, would simply provide that a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws can be proven by establishing that such deposit was marketable at the time application for patent was made. This bill would only apply to claims located prior to July 23, 1955, the date of enactment of Public Law 167.

The second bill deals with the interpretation of the term "common varieties" as applied in the 1955 act. The Department in this case has held that all sand and gravel was of a common variety and therefore not locatable under the Minerals Act.

In my judgment, such interpretation is not realistic and does not take into consideration the type of materials which are needed by the construction industry. The adoption of this position again seems to ignore the intent of Congress at the time it passed Public Law 167, for had the purpose been elimination of all varieties, the language would have been so worded. Congress, in fact, added the word "common," however, to indicate that only common varieties were excluded leaving all special varieties of building materials subject to the mining laws.

I therefore send to the desk a second bill which would clarify the intent of Congress in this connection.

May I point out that in terms of mine units produced, the sand and gravel industry is the largest member of the mining family. In 1963, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the industry produced 831 million tons valued at $838 million.

The executive director of the American Society of Planning Officials, Mr. Dennis O'Harrow, has pointed out that if the present sand and gravel production should remain static, there would have to be produced 25 billion tons in the next 30 years. With the anticipated increase in population, however, he estimates that it will be necessary to produce 42 billion tons during that time period. By 1993, annual production would have to be approximately 2,100 million tons.

I believe these figures will dispel any erroneous notions that although gravel is commonly found and not regarded as valuable, it is a vital natural resource and an important, essential element to our economy. It is an unrenewable resource that needs to be used with prudence but needs to be available to the honest operators who seek to keep pace with the demands of our growing population.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CANNON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 259. A bill with respect to the proof of value necessary in the case of certain mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955; and

S. 260. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN TO ESTABLISH ACTUAL PERMANENT RESIDENCE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of certain homestead entrymen, residents of Mesquite, Nev., who have filed applications on land in the so-called Arizona strip, just 12 miles from Mesquite.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 261) to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MILAGROS ARAGON NERI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri, which passed the Senate during the last Congress and which I am hopeful will be passed by this body again and by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 262) for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELECTED MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL AND NONVOTING DELEGATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for an elected mayor and city council and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 268) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to the retention by Congress of the ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital which is granted by the Constitution, it is the intent of Congress to restore to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia the powers of local self-government which are a basic privilege of all American citizens; to reaffirm through such action the confidence of the American people in the strengthened validity of principles of local self-government by the elective process; to promote among the inhabitants of the District the sense of responsibility for the development and well-being of their community which will result from the enjoyment of such powers of self-government; to provide for the more effective participation in the development of the District and in the solution of its local problems by those persons who are most closely concerned; and to relieve the National Legislature of the burden of legislating upon purely local District matters. It is the further intention of Congress to exercise its retained ultimate legislative authority over the District only insofar as such action shall be necessary or desirable in the interest of the Nation. Finally, it is recognized that the restoration of the powers of local self-government to the inhabitants of the District by this Act will in no way change the need, which arises from the unique character of the District as the Nation's Capital, for the payment by the Federal Government of a share of the expenses of the District government; and it is intended that an equitable share thereof shall be paid annually.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Definitions

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Title II—Status of the District

Sec. 201.201. Status of the District.

Title III—The District Council

Part 1—Creation of the District Council

Sec. 301. Creation and membership.
Sec. 302. Qualifications for holding office.
Sec. 303. Compensation.
Sec. 304. Procedure for changes.

Part 2—Principal Functions of the District Council

Sec. 321. Functions heretofore exercised by the Board of Commissioners.
Sec. 322. Functions relating to zoning and other agencies.
Sec. 323. Certain delegated functions.
Sec. 324. Powers of and limitations upon District Council.

Part 3—Organization and Procedure of the District Council

Sec. 331. The Chairman.
Sec. 332. Secretary of the District Council; records and documents.
Sec. 333. Meetings.
Sec. 334. Committees.
Sec. 335. Acts and resolutions.
Sec. 336. Passage of acts.
Sec. 337. Procedure for Zoning Acts.
Sec. 338. Investigations by District Council.

Titles IV—Mayor

Sec. 401. Election, qualifications, and salary.
Sec. 402. Powers and duties.

Title V—The District budget

Sec. 501. Fiscal year.
Sec. 502. Budgetary details fixed by District Council.
Sec. 503. Adoption of budget.
Sec. 504. Budget establishes appropriations.
Sec. 505. Supplemental appropriations.

Title VI—Borrowing

Part I—Borrowing for Capital Improvements

Sec. 601. Borrowing power; debt limitations.
Sec. 602. Contents of borrowing legislation; referendum on bond issue.
Sec. 603. Publication of borrowing legislation.
Sec. 604. Short period of limitation.
Sec. 605. Acts for issuance of bonds.
Sec. 606. Public sale.

Part 2—Short Term Borrowing

Sec. 621. Borrowing to meet supplemental appropriations.
Sec. 622. Borrowing in anticipation of revenues.
Sec. 623. Notes redeemable prior to maturity.
Sec. 624. Sale of notes.

Part 3—Payment of Bonds and Notes

Sec. 631. Payment of bonds and notes.

Part 4—Tax Exemption—Legal Investment

Sec. 641. Tax exemption.
Sec. 642. Legal investment.

Title VII—Financial affairs of the District

Part 1—Financial Administration

Sec. 701. Surety bonds.
Sec. 702. Financial duties of the Mayor.
Sec. 703. Control of appropriations.
Sec. 704. Accounting supervision and control.
Sec. 705. When contracts and expenditures prohibited.
Sec. 706. General fund.
Sec. 707. Contracts extending beyond one year.

Part 2—Annual Post Audit by General Accounting Office

Sec. 721. Independent annual post audit.
Sec. 722. Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act.

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

Sec. 731. Adjustment of Federal and District expenses.

Title VIII—Elections in the District

Sec. 801. Board of elections.
Sec. 802. What elections shall be held.
Sec. 803. Elective offices; terms of office.
Sec. 804. Vacancies.
Sec. 805. What candidates are elected.
Sec. 805a. Recall.
Sec. 806. Qualified electors.
Sec. 807. Registration.
Sec. 808. Qualified candidates.
Sec. 809. Nominations.
Sec. 810. Nonpartisan elections.
Sec. 811. Method of voting.
Sec. 812. Recounts and contests.
Sec. 813. Interference with registration or voting.
Sec. 814. Violations.

Title IX—Miscellaneous

Sec. 901. Agreements with United States.
Sec. 902. Personal interest in contracts or transactions.
Sec. 903. Compensation from more than one source.
Sec. 904. Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in development of District merit system.

Title X—Succession in Government

Sec. 1001. Transfer of personnel, property, and funds.
Sec. 1002. Existing statutes, regulations, and so forth.
Sec. 1003. Pending actions and proceedings.
Sec. 1004. Vacancies resulting from abolition of Board of Commissioners.

Title XI—Separability of provisions

Sec. 1101. Separability of provisions.

Title XII—Temporary provisions

Sec. 1201. Powers of the President during transition period.
Sec. 1202. Reimbursable appropriation for the District.

Title XIII—Effective dates

Sec. 1301. Effective dates.

Title XIV—Submission of charter for referendum

Sec. 1401. Charter referendum.
Sec. 1402. Board of Elections.
Sec. 1403. Registration.
Sec. 1404. Charter referendum ballot; notice of voting.
Sec. 1405. Method of voting.
Sec. 1406. Acceptance or nonacceptance of charter.

Title XV—Delegate

Sec. 1501. District Delegate.

Title XVI—Referendum

Sec. 1601. Power of referendum.
Sec. 1602. Effect of certification of referendum petition.
Sec. 1603. Submission to electors.
Sec. 1604. Availability of list of qualified electors.
Sec. 1605. Results of referendum.

Title XVII—Initiative

Sec. 1701. Initiative.

Title XVIII—Title of Act

Sec. 1801. Title of Act.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Definitions

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The terms "District Council" or "Council" means the Council of the District of Columbia provided for by title III.

(3) The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the District Council provided for by title III.

(4) The term "Mayor" means the Mayor provided for by title IV.

(5) The term "qualified elector" means a qualified elector of the District as specified in section 806, except as otherwise specifically provided.

(6) The term "Act" includes any legislation adopted by the District Council, except where the term "Act" is used to refer to this Act or other Acts of Congress herein specified.

(7) The term "District Primary Act" means the Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699).

(8) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, joint-stock company, trust, or corporation.

(9) The term "capital project", or "project", means (a) any physical public betterment or improvement and any preliminary studies and surveys relative thereto; (b) the acquisition of property of a permanent nature; or (c) the purchase of equipment for any public betterment or improvement when first erected or acquired.

(10) The term "pending", when applied to any capital project, means authorized but not yet completed.

(11) The term "Board of Elections" means the Board of Elections created by section 3 of the District Primary Act.

(12) The term "election", unless the context otherwise indicates, means an election held pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(13) The term "domicile" means that place where a person has his true, fixed, and permanent home and to which, when he is absent, he has the intention of returning.

(14) The term "municipal office" means an office of any governmental unit subordinate to a State government.

(15) The terms "publish" and "publication", unless otherwise specifically provided herein, mean publication in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District.

(16) The term "Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia" means the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the District of Columbia Tax Court, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and such other municipal courts as the District Council may hereafter establish by act.

TITLE II—STATUS OF THE DISTRICT

Status of the District

SEC. 201. (a) All the territory constituting the permanent seat of the Government of the United States shall continue to be designated as the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is hereby declared to be a body politic and corporate in perpetuity for governmental purposes and as such may sue and be sued, contract and be contracted with, and have a corporate seal. Such body politic and corporate is the successor of the District of Columbia created by section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia and continued by the first section of the Act of June 11, 1878 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–102). So far as is consistent with the provisions of this Act, all powers, rights, privileges, immunities, duties, obligations, assets, and liabilities of the District of Columbia created by such section 2 are hereby transferred to, vested in, and imposed upon the body politic and corporate created by this section.

(b) Section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1871 (16 Stat. 419), and section 1 of the Act of June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 102), are hereby repealed.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia as the same was established or may be subsequently established under the provisions of title I of the Act of October 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 552).

TITLE III—THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Part I—Creation of the District Council

Creation and membership

SEC. 301. There is hereby created a Council of the District of Columbia consisting of nine members elected as provided in title VIII.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR HOLDING OFFICE

SEC. 302. No person shall hold the office of member of the District Council unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated, has, during the three years next preceding his nomination resided and been domiciled in the District and has for one year preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated, (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. A member of the Council shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

Compensation

SEC. 303. Each member of the District Council, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at a rate of $6,500 per annum, payable in periodic installments. The Chairman shall receive compensation at a rate of $8,500 per annum, payable in periodic installments. All members shall receive such additional allowances for expenses as may be approved by the District Council to be paid out of funds duly appropriated therefor.

Changes in Membership and Compensation of District Council Members

SEC. 304. The number of members constituting the District Council, the qualifications for holding office, and the compensation of such members may be changed by Act passed by the District Council; except that no such Act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the District voting at an election on the proposition set forth in any such Act.

Part 2—Principal functions of the District Council

Functions Heretofore Exercised by the Board of Commissioners

SEC. 321. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all functions granted to or imposed upon the Board of Commissioners of the District are hereby transferred to the District Council except those powers hereinafter specifically conferred on the Mayor.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District is hereby abolished, and all provisions of law providing for the Board of Commissioners of the District, and the offices of Commissioner, Engineer Commissioner, and Assistants to the Engineer Commissioner of the District, are hereby repealed.

(c) The Board of Education provided for in section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), is hereby abolished and its functions are hereby transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

Functions Relating to Zoning and Other Agencies

SEC. 322. (a) The Zoning Commission created by the first section of the Act of March 1, 1920, creating a Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–412), is hereby abolished, and its functions are transferred to the District Council.

(b) The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia; the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; the Armory Board; and the National Capital Housing Authority are hereby abolished and their functions transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

Certain Delegated Functions

SEC. 323. No function of the Board of Commissioners of the District which such Board has delegated to an officer or agency of the District shall be considered as a function transferred to the Council by section 321. Each such function is hereby transferred to the officer or agency to whom or to which it was delegated, until the Mayor or Council, or both, pursuant to the powers herein granted, shall revoke, modify, or transfer such delegation.

Powers of and Limitations Upon District Council

SEC. 324. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and subject to the reserved powers of the Congress as provided in section 324(d), there shall be vested (1) in the District Council, and (2) in the qualified electors of the District of Columbia as provided in section 1701 of this Act, complete legislative power over the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District: *Provided,* That such subjects are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. Except as otherwise provided in sections 321 and 322, nothing in this section shall be construed as vesting in the District government any greater authority over the Commission on Mental Health, the National Zoological Park, the Washington Aqueduct, the National Guard of the District of Columbia, or any Federal agency, than the authority which was vested in the Board of Commissioners prior to the date of the enactment of this Act. The District Council shall, by majority vote of those present, confirm or reject nominees proposed by the Mayor, and shall have power, by vote of two-thirds of its members, to override any veto by the Mayor.

(b) The qualified electors of the District of Columbia or the District Council may not pass any act contrary to the provisions of this Act or—

(1) impose any tax on property of the United States;

(2) grant any exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise;

(3) authorize any lottery or the sale of lottery tickets or authorize any form of gambling;

(4) authorize the use of public money in support of any sectarian, denominational, or private school except as now or hereafter authorized by Congress;

(5) lend the public credit for support of any private undertaking;

(6) authorize the issuance of bonds except in compliance with the provisions of title VI; or

(7) pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to the Act of June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463), as amended by the Act of April 30, 1926 (44 Stat. 374), the Act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 781); and the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), and the people or the Council shall not pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to any provision of any Act of Congress as it specifically pertains to any duty, authority, and responsibility, of the National Capital Planning Commission; except insofar as the above-cited or other referred to Acts refer to the Engineer Commissioner or the Board of Commisioners, the former of which terms, after the enactment of this Act, shall mean the Mayor or some District Government official deemed by the Mayor to be best qualified, and designated by him to sit in lieu of the Mayor as a member of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and the latter term shall mean the District Council.

(c) An act, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall become effective thirty days after its passage or at such later time as the Council may designate: *Provided,* That an act may become effective at any time after its passage if the Council by vote of two-thirds of its members shall state in such act that an emergency exists requiring such earlier effective date. Every act or resolution shall include a preamble, or be accompanied by a report, setting forth concisely the purposes of its adoption. Every act or resolution shall be published, within seven days after its passage, as the District Council may direct.

(d) The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District of Columbia, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the qualified electors of the District of Columbia and the District Council by this Act, including without limitation legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this Act and any act or resolution passed by the Council or any act passed by the qualified electors of the District of Columbia.

(e) Upon the effective date of this title, jurisdiction over the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia shall vest with the District Council in all matters pertaining to the organization and composition of such Courts, and to the appointment or selection, qualification, tenure, and compensation of the judges thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the tenure of any judge occupying the position of a judge of one of the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that his compensation may be increased.

(f) On or after the effective date of this title, any person appointed or elected to serve as judge of one of the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia shall not (1) be appointed or elected to serve for a term of less than ten years, or (2) receive as compensation for such service an amount less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions on the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) Nothing in subsection (e) of this section shall be construed to curtail the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or any other United States court other than the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia.

Part 3—Organization and Procedure of the District Council

The Chairman

SEC. 331. The District Council shall elect from among its members a Chairman who shall be the presiding officer of the District Council and a Vice Chairman, who shall preside in the absence of the Chairman. When the Mayor is absent or unable to act, or when the office is vacant, the Chairman shall act in his stead. The term of the Chairman shall be for two years.

Secretary of the District Council; Records and Documents

SEC. 332. (a) The District Council shall appoint a secretary as its chief administrative officer and such assistants and clerical personnel as may be necessary. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the compensation and other terms of employment of such secretary, assistants, and clerical personnel shall be prescribed by the District Council.

(b) The secretary shall (1) keep a record of the proceedings of the District Council, (2) keep a record showing the text of all acts and resolutions introduced, and the ayes and noes of each vote, (3) authenticate by his signature and record in full in a continuing record kept for that purpose all acts passed by the District Council, and (4) perform such other duties as the District Council may from time to time prescribe.

Meetings

SEC. 333. (a) The first meeting of the District Council after this part takes effect shall be called by the member who receives the highest vote in the election provided in title VIII. Such member shall preside until a Chairman is elected. The first meeting of the District Council in each odd-numbered year commencing with the first odd-numbered year next following such election shall be called by the Secretary of the District Council for a date not later than January 7 of such year.

(b) The District Council shall provide for the time and place of its regular meetings. The District Council shall hold at least one regular meeting in each calendar week except that during July and August it shall hold at least two regular meetings in each month. Special meetings may be called, upon the giving of adequate notice, by the Mayor, the Chairman, or any three members of the Council.

(c) Meetings of the District Council shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators. The records of the Council provided for in section 332(b) shall be open to public inspection and available for copying during all regular office hours of the Council Secretary. Any citizen shall have the right to petition and be heard by the Council at any of its meetings, within reasonable limits as set by the Council Chairman, the Council concurring.

Committees

SEC. 334. The Council Chairman, with the advice and consent of the Council, shall appoint such standing and special committees as may be expedient for the conduct of the

Council's business. All committee meetings shall be open to the public except when ordered closed by the committee chairman, with the approval of a majority of the members of the committee.

Acts and Resolutions

SEC. 335. (a) The Council, to discharge the powers and duties imposed herein, shall enact acts and adopt resolutions, upon a vote of a majority of the members of the Council, unless otherwise provided herein. Acts shall be used for all legislative purposes. Resolutions shall be used to express simple determinations, decisions, or directions of the District Council of a special or temporary character.

(b)(1) The enacting clause of all acts passed by the District Council shall be, "Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia:".

(2) The resolving clause of all resolutions passed by the District Council shall be "The Council of the District of Columbia hereby resolves,".

(c) A special election may be called by resolution of the District Council to present for referendum vote of the people any proposition upon which the District Council desires to take such action.

Passage of Acts

SEC. 336. The District Council shall not pass any act before the thirteenth day following the day on which it is introduced. Subject to the other limitations of this Act, this requirement may be waived by the unanimous vote of the members present.

Procedure for Zoning Acts

SEC. 337. (a) Before any zoning act for the District is passed by the District Council—

(1) the District Council shall deposit the act in its introduced form, with the National Capital Planning Commission. Such Commission shall within thirty days after the date of such deposit, report to the District Council whether the proposed act is in conformity with the comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia. The District Council may not pass the act unless it has received such report or the Commission has failed to report within the thirty-day period above specified; and

(2) the District Council (or an appropriate committee thereof) shall hold a public hearing on the act. At least thirty days' notice of the hearing shall be published as the Council may direct. Such notice shall include the time and place of the hearing and a summary of all changes in existing law which would be made by adoption of the act. The District Council (or committee thereof holding the hearing) shall give such additional notice as it finds expedient and practicable. At the hearing interested persons shall be given reasonable opportunity to be heard. The hearing may be adjourned from time to time. The time and place of the adjourned meeting shall be publicly announced before adjournment is had.

(b) The District Council shall deposit with the National Capital Planning Commission each zoning act passed by it. If in the opinion of the Commission such act as passed would adversely affect the interests of the Federal Government, the Commission shall within thirty days after the date of such deposit certify to the District Council its disapproval of such act. If such certification of disapproval is not made within such thirty-day period, the zoning act shall take effect as law on the day following the expiration of such period. If the Commission makes such certification of disapproval within the thirty-day period above specified, the zoning act shall take effect as law only if, within thirty days after the day on which such certification is received, the act be readopted by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the District Council; in which case the zoning act shall take effect as law on the day following the day on which it is readopted, or at such later date as the Council may designate.

Investigations by District Council

SEC. 338. (a) The District Council, or any committee or person authorized by it, shall have power to investigate any matter relating to the affairs of the District; and for that purpose may require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and other evidence. For such purpose any member of the District Council (if the District Council is conducting the inquiry) or any member of the committee, or the person conducting the inquiry, may issue subpenas and may administer oaths.

(b) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the District Council, committee, or person conducting the investigation shall have power to refer the matter to any judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, who may by order require such person to appear and to give or produce testimony or books, papers, or other evidence, bearing upon the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof as in the case of failure to obey a subpena issued, or to testify, in a case pending before such court.

TITLE IV—MAYOR

Election, Qualifications, and Salary

SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby created the office of Mayor of the District of Columbia. The Mayor shall be elected as provided in title VIII.

(b) No person shall hold the office of Mayor unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is domiciled and resides in the District and has during the three years next preceding his nomination been resident in and domiciled in the District, (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. The Mayor shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

(c) The Mayor shall receive an annual salary of $15,000, and an allowance for official expenses, which he shall certify in reasonable detail to the District Council, of not more than $2,500 annually. Such salary shall be payable in periodic installments.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the method of election, the qualifications for office, the compensation and the allowance for official expenses pertaining to the office of Mayor may be changed by act passed by the District Council; except that no such act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the District voting at an election of the proposition set forth in any such act.

Powers and Duties

SEC. 402. The Mayor shall be the chief executive officer of the District government. He shall be responsible for the proper administration of the affairs of the District coming under his jurisdiction or control, and to that end shall have the following powers and functions:

(1) He shall designate the officer or officers of the executive department of the District who shall, during periods of disability or absence from the District of the Mayor, the Chairman, and the Vice Chairman of the District Council, execute and perform all the powers and duties of the Mayor.

(2) He shall act as the official spokesman for the District and as the head of the District for ceremonial purposes.

(3) He shall administer all laws relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment of personnel in the office of the Mayor, personnel in executive departments of the District, and members of boards, commissions, and other agencies, who, under laws in effect on the effective date of this section, are subject to appointment and removal by the Commissioners. All actions affecting such personnel and such members shall, until such time as legislation is enacted by the District Council superseding such laws and establishing a permanent civil service system or systems, based on merit, pursuant to section 402(4), continue to be subject to the provisions of Acts of Congress relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment applicable to officers and employees of the District government; to section 1001(d) of this Act, and, where applicable, to the provisions of the joint agreement between the Commissioners and the Civil Service Commission authorized by Executive Order Numbered 5491 of November 18, 1930, relating to the appointment of District personnel. He shall appoint or assign personnel to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners and shall have power to remove such personnel from such positions. The officers and employees of each agency with respect to which legislative power is delegated by this Act and which, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, was not subject to the administrative control of the Board of Commissioners of the District, shall continue to be appointed and removed in accordance with applicable laws until such time as such laws may be superseded by legislation passed by the Council establishing a permanent civil service system or systems, based on merit, pursuant to section 402(4): *Provided*, That all appointments of department heads and members of boards and commissions, all appointments and assignments to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners of the District, and appointments made pursuant to section 804 of this Act, shall be by and with the consent of the Council.

(4) He shall administer the personnel functions of the District covering employees of all District departments, boards, commissions, offices, and agencies, except as otherwise provided by this Act. Personnel legislation enacted by Congress prior to or after the effective date of this section, including, without limitation, legislation relating to appointments, promotions, discipline, separations, pay, unemployment compensation, disability and death benefits, leave, retirement, insurance, and veteran's preference, applicable to employees of the District government, as set forth in section 1002(c), shall continue in effect until such time as the Council shall, pursuant to this section, provide similar or comparable coverage under a District civil service system or systems, based on merit. The District civil service system or systems shall be established by legislation of the Council and shall provide coverage similar or comparable to, or shall provide for continued participation in, all or part of the Federal civil service system. The District civil service system or systems shall take effect not earlier than one year or later than five years after the effective date of this section.

(5) He shall, through the heads of administrative boards, offices, and agencies, supervise and direct the activities of such boards, offices, and agencies.

(6) He shall, at the end of each fiscal year, prepare reports for such year of (a) the finances of the District, and (b) the administrative activities of the executive office of the Mayor and the executive departments of the District. He shall submit such reports to the Council within ninety days after the close of the fiscal year.

(7) He shall keep the District Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the District and make such

recommendations to the Council as may seem to him desirable.

(8) He may submit drafts of acts to the District Council.

(9) He shall perform such other duties as the District Council, consistent with the provisions of this Act, may direct.

(10) He may delegate any of his functions (other than the function of approving contracts between the District and the Federal Government under section 901) to any officer, employee, or agency of the executive office of the Mayor, or to any director of an executive department who may, with the approval of the Mayor, and if the Council has given assent, make a further delegation of all or a part of such functions to subordinates under his jurisdiction.

(11) The Mayor or the District Council may propose to the executive or legislative branch of the United States Government, legislation or other action dealing with any subject not falling within the authority of the District government, as defined in this Act.

(12) As custodian, he shall use and authenticate the corporate seal of the District in accordance with the rules of the Council.

(13) He shall have the right, under rules to be adopted by the District Council, to be heard by the Council or any of its committees.

(14) If empowered by the District Council, he is authorized and directed to promulgate, adopt and enforce such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with any Act of the Congress or any act of the Council, as are necessary to carry out his functions and duties.

(15) He shall within ten days after the adoption of any act by the District Council approve or disapprove such act. If he disapproves such act, he shall state in writing his reasons therefor. Upon such disapproval, such act shall not become law unless pursuant to section 324(a) it shall within thirty days of such disapproval be readopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the District Council, whereupon it shall become law in accordance with the provisions of this Act. If the Mayor fails to approve or disapprove such act within ten days after its adoption, such act shall become law as provided in this Act.

TITLE V—THE DISTRICT BUDGET

Fiscal Year

SEC. 501. The fiscal year of the District of Columbia shall begin on the 1st day of July and shall end on the 30th day of June of the succeeding calendar year. Such fiscal year shall also constitute the budget and accounting year.

Budgetary Details Fixed by District Council

SEC. 502. (a) The Mayor shall prepare and submit, not later than April 1, to the District Council, in such form as the Council shall approve, the annual budget estimates of the District and the budget message.

(b) The Mayor shall, in consultation with the District Council, take whatever action may be necessary to achieve, insofar as is possible, (1) consistency in accounting and budget classifications, (2) synchronization between accounting and budget classifications and organizational structure, and (3) support of the budget justification by information on performance and program costs as shown by the accounts.

Adoption of Budget

SEC. 503. The District Council shall by act adopt a budget for each fiscal year not later than May 15, except that the District Council may, by resolution, extend the period for its adoption. The effective date of the budget shall be July 1 of the same calendar year.

Budget Establishes Appropriations

SEC. 504. The adoption of the budget by the District Council shall, from the effective date thereof, operate to appropriate and to make available for expenditure, for the purposes therein named, the several amounts stated therein as proposed expenditures, subject to the provisions of section 702.

Supplemental Appropriations

SEC. 505. The District Council may at any time adopt an act by vote of a majority of its members rescinding previously appropriated funds which are then available for expenditure, or appropriating funds in addition to those theretofore appropriated to the extent unappropriated funds are available; and for such purpose unappropriated funds may include those borrowed in accordance with the provisions of section 621.

TITLE VI—BORROWING

Part 1—Borrowing for capital improvements

Borrowing Power; Debt Limitations

SEC. 601. The District may incur indebtedness by issuing its bonds in either coupon or registered form to fund or refund indebtedness of the District at any time outstanding and to pay the cost of constructing or acquiring any capital projects requiring an expenditure greater than the amount of taxes or other revenues allowed for such capital projects by the annual budget: *Provided,* That no bonds or other evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued in an amount which, together with indebtedness of the District to the Treasury of the United States pursuant to existing law, shall cause the aggregate of indebtedness of the District to exceed 12 per centum of the average assessed value of the taxable real and tangible personal property of the District subject to taxation by the District as of the first day of July of the ten most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available, nor shall such bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued for purposes other than the construction or acquisition of capital projects connected with highway, water and sanitary sewage works purposes or other revenue-producing capital projects which are determined by the District Council to be self-liquidating exceed 6 per centum of such average assessed value. Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness may be issued by the District pursuant to an act of the District Council from time to time in amounts in the aggregate at any time outstanding not exceeding 2 per centum of said assessed value, exclusive of indebtedness owing to the United States on the effective date of this title. All other bonds or evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued only with the assent of a majority of the qualified electors of said District voting at an election on the proposition of issuing such bonds. In determining the amount of indebtedness within all of the aforesaid limitations at any time outstanding there shall be deducted from the aggregate of such indebtedness the amount of the then current tax levy for the payment of the principal of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the District and any other moneys set aside into any sinking fund and irrevocably dedicated to the payment of such bonded indebtedness. The District Council shall make provision for the payment of any bonds issued pursuant to this title, in the manner provided in section 631 hereof.

Contents of Borrowing Legislation; Referendum on Bond Issue

SEC. 602. (a) An act authorizing the issuance of bonds may be enacted by a majority of the District Council members at any meeting of the Council subsequent to the meeting at which such act was introduced, and shall contain at least the following provisions:

(1) A brief description of each purpose for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred;

(2) The maximum amount of the principal of the indebtedness which may be incurred for each such purpose;

(3) The maximum rate of interest to be paid on such indebtedness; and

(4) In the event the District Council is required by this part, or it is determined by the Council in its discretion, to submit the question of issuing such bonds to a vote of the qualified electors of the District, the date on which such election will be held, the manner of holding such election, the manner of voting for or against the incurring of such indebtedness and the form of ballot to be used at such election. The ballot shall be in such form as to permit the electors to vote separately for or against the incurring of indebtedness for each of the purposes for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred.

(b) The District Council shall cause the proposition of issuing such bonds to be submitted by the Board of Elections to the qualified electors at the first general election to be held in the District not less than forty days after the date of enactment of the act authorizing such bonds, or upon a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the District Council, the Council may call a special election for the purpose of voting upon the issuance of said bonds, such election to be held by the Board of Elections at any date set by the Council not less than forty days after the enactment of such act.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized and directed to prescribe the manner of registration and the polling places and to name the judges and clerks of election and to make such other rules and regulations for the conduct of such elections as are not specifically provided by the District Council as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section, including provisions for the publication of a notice of such election stating briefly the proposition or propositions to be voted on and the designated polling places in the various precincts and wards in the District, which said notice shall be published at least once a week for four consecutive calendar weeks on any day of the week, the first publication thereof to be not less than thirty nor more than forty days prior to the date fixed by the District Council for the election. The Board of Elections shall canvass the votes cast at such election and certify the results thereof to the District Council in the manner prescribed for the canvass and certification of the results of general elections. The certification of the result of the election shall be published once by the Board of Elections within three days following the date of the election.

Publication of Borrowing Legislation

SEC. 603. The Mayor shall publish any act authorizing the issuance of bonds at least once within five days after the enactment thereof, together with a notice of the enactment thereof in substantially the following form:

"Notice

"The following Act authorizing the issuance of bonds published herewith has become effective, and the time within which a suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of such bonds can be commenced as provided in the District of Columbia Charter Act will expire twenty days from the date of the first publication of this notice or in the event the proposition of issuing the proposed bonds is to be submitted to the qualified electors, twenty days after the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of the election ordered by said act to be held.

——— ———,

"MAYOR".

Short Period of Limitation

SEC. 604. Upon the expiration of twenty days from and after the date of publica-

tion of the notice of the enactment of an act authorizing the issuance of bonds without the submission of the proposition for the issuance thereof to the qualified electors, or upon the expiration of twenty days from the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of an election upon the proposition of issuing bonds, as the case may be, all as provided in section 603—

(1) Any recitals or statements of fact contained in such act or in the preambles or the titles thereof or in the results of the election of any proceedings in connection with the calling, holding, or conducting of election upon the issuance of such bonds shall be deemed to be true for the purpose of determining the validity of the bonds thereby authorized, and the District and all others interested shall thereafter be estopped from denying same;

(2) Such act and all proceedings in connection with the authorization of the issuance of such bonds shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly and regularly taken, passed, and done by the District and the Board of Elections in full compliance with the provisions of this Act and of all laws applicable thereto;

(3) The validity of such act and said proceedings shall not thereafter be questioned by either a party plaintiff or a party defendant, and no court shall have jurisdiction in any suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of same, except in a suit, action, or proceeding commenced prior to the expiration of such twenty days.

Acts for Issuance of Bonds

SEC. 605. After the expiration of the twenty-day limitation period provided for in section 604 of this part, the District Council may by act establish an issue of bonds as authorized pursuant to the provisions of sections 601 to 604, inclusive, thereof. An issue of bonds is hereby defined to be all or any part of an aggregate principal amount of bonds authorized pursuant to said sections, but no indebtedness shall be deemed to have been incurred within the meaning of this Act until the bonds shall have been sold, delivered, and paid for, and then only to the extent of the principal amount of bonds so sold and delivered. The bonds of any authorized issue may be issued all at one time, or from time to time in series and in such amounts as the District Council shall deem advisable. The act authorizing the issuance of any series of bonds shall fix the date of the bonds of such series, and the bonds of each such series shall be payable in annual installments beginning not more than three years after the date of the bonds and ending not more than thirty years from such date. The amount of said series to be payable in each year to be so fixed that when the annual interest is added to the principal amount payable in each year the total amount payable in each year in which part of the principal is payable shall be substantially equal. It shall be an immaterial variance if the difference between the largest and smallest amounts of principal and interest payable annually during the term of the bonds does not exceed 3 per centum of the total authorized amount of such series. Such act shall also prescribe the form of the bonds to be issued thereunder, and of the interest coupons appertaining thereto, and the manner in which said bonds and coupons shall be executed. The bonds and coupons may be executed by the facsimile signatures of the officer or officers designated by the act authorizing the bonds, to sign the bonds, with the exception that at least one signature shall be manual. Such bonds may be issued in coupon form in the denomination of $1,000, registerable as to principal only or as to both principal and interest, and if registered as to both principal and interest may be issuable in denominations of multiples of $1,000. Such bonds and the interest thereon may be payable at such place or places within or without the District as the District Council may determine.

Public Sale

SEC. 606. (a) All bonds issued under this part shall be sold at public sale upon sealed proposals at such price or prices as shall be approved by the District Council after publication of a notice of such sale at least once not less than ten days prior to the date fixed for sale in a daily newspaper carrying municipal bond notices and devoted primarily to financial news or to the subject of State and municipal bonds published in the city of New York, New York, and in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District. Such notice shall state among other things that no proposal shall be considered unless there is deposited with the District as a downpayment a certified check or cashier's check for an amount equal to at least 2 per centum of the par amount of bonds bid for, and the District Council shall reserve the right to reject any and all bids.

(b) The Treasurer of the United States, and any administrative officer or agency of the United States Government may purchase bonds issued under this part with funds under the control of such officer or agency to the same extent as the Treasurer, officer, or agency is permitted by law to invest such moneys in obligations of the United States Government, and such sale may be negotiated without the necessity of complying with the provisions of this section, relative to a public sale of the bonds.

Part 2—Short-term borrowing

Borrowing To Meet Supplemental Appropriations

SEC. 621. In the absence of unappropriated available revenues to meet supplemental appropriations made pursuant to section 505, the District Council may by act authorize the issuance of negotiable notes, in a total amount not to exceed 5 per centum of the total appropriations for the current fiscal year, each of which shall be designated "supplemental" and may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes and renewals thereof shall be paid not later than the close of the fiscal year following that in which such act becomes effective.

Borrowing in Anticipation of Revenues

SEC. 622. For any fiscal year, in anticipation of the collection or receipt of revenues of that fiscal year, the District Council may by act authorize the borrowing of money by the execution of negotiable notes of the District, not to exceed in the aggregate at any time outstanding 20 per centum of the total anticipated revenue, each of which shall be designated "Revenue Note for the Fiscal Year 19 ". Such notes may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes, together with the renewals, shall mature and be paid not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the original notes have been issued.

Notes Redeemable Prior to Maturity

SEC. 623. No notes issued pursuant to this part shall be made payable on demand, but any note may be made subject to redemption prior to maturity on such notice and at such time as may be stated in the note.

Sale of Notes

SEC. 624. All notes issued pursuant to this part may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at private sale without previous advertising.

Part 3—Payment of bonds and notes

SEC. 631. (a) The act of the District Council authorizing the issuance of bonds pursuant to this title, shall, where necessary, provide for the levy annually of a special tax without limitation as to rate or amount upon all the taxable real and personal tangible property within the District in amounts which, together with other revenues of the District available and applicable for said purposes, will be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on said bonds and the premium, if any, upon the redemption thereof, as the same respectively become due and payable, which tax shall be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner as other District taxes are levied and collected, and when collected shall be set aside for the purpose of paying such principal, interest, and premium.

(b) The full faith and credit of the District shall be and is hereby pledged for the payment of the principal of and the interest on all bonds and notes of the District hereafter issued pursuant to this title whether or not such pledge be stated in the bonds or notes or in the act authorizing the issuance thereof.

Part 4—Tax Exemption—Legal Investment

Tax Exemption

SEC. 641. Bonds and notes issued by the District Council pursuant to this title and the interest thereon shall be exempt from all Federal and District taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

Legal Investment

SEC. 642. Notwithstanding any restriction on the investment of funds by fiduciaries contained in any other law, all domestic insurance companies, domestic insurance associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees and other fiduciaries within the District of Columbia may legally invest any sinking funds, moneys, trust funds, or other funds belonging to them or under or within their control in any bonds issued pursuant to this title, it being the purpose of this section to authorize the investment in such bonds or notes of all sinking, insurance, retirement, compensation, pension and trust funds. National banking associations are authorized to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell, for their own accounts or for the accounts of customers, bonds and notes issued by the District Council to the same extent as national banking associations are authorized by paragraph seven of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (title 12, U.S.C., sec. 24), to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell obligations of the United States, States, or political subdivisions thereof. All Federal building and loan associations and Federal savings and loan associations; and banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and savings and loan associations, domiciled in the District of Columbia, may purchase, sell, underwrite, and deal in, for their own account or for the account of others, all bonds or notes issued pursuant to this title: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as relieving any person, firm, association or corporation from any duty of exercising due and reasonable care in selecting securities for purchase or investment.

TITLE VII—FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT

Part 1—Financial administration

Surety Bonds

SEC. 701. Each officer and employee of the District required to do so by the District Council shall provide a bond with such surety and in such amount as the District Council may require. The premiums for all such bonds shall be paid out of appropriations for the District.

Financial Duties of the Mayor

SEC. 702. The Mayor, through his duly designated subordinates, shall have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the District and to that end he shall—

(1) prepare and submit in the form and manner prescribed by the District Council under section 502 the annual budget estimates and budget message;

(2) supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions to insure adequate control of revenues and resources and to insure that appropriations are not exceeded;

(3) maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide—

(A) full disclosure of the financial results of the District government's activities,

(B) adequate financial information needed by the District government for management purposes,

(C) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets: *Provided*, That as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Mayor shall cause the accounts of the District to be maintained on a basis that will facilitate the preparation of cost-based budgets;

(4) submit to the District Council a monthly financial statement, by appropriation and department, and in any further detail the District Council may specify;

(5) prepare, as of the end of each fiscal year, a complete financial statement and report;

(6) supervise and be responsible for the assessment of all property subject to assessment within the corporate limits of the District for taxation, make all special assessments for the District government, prepare tax maps, and give such notice of taxes and special assessments as may be required by law;

(7) supervise and be responsible for the assessment and collection of all taxes, special assessments, license fees, and other revenues of the District for the collection of which the District is responsible and receive all money receivable by the District from the Federal Government, or from any court, or from any agency of the District;

(8) have custody of all public funds belonging to or under the control of the District, or any agency of the District government, and deposit all funds coming into his hands, in such depositories as may be designated and under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by act of the District Council;

(9) have custody of all investments and invested funds of the District government, or in possession of such government in a fiduciary capacity and have the safekeeping of all bonds and notes of the District and the receipt and delivery of District bonds and notes for transfer, registration, or exchange.

Control of Appropriations

SEC. 703. The District Council may provide (1) the transfer during the budget year of any appropriation balance then available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation, and (2) the allocation to new items of funds appropriated for contingent expenditure.

Accounting Supervision and Control

SEC. 704. The Mayor, through his duly authorized subordinates, shall—

(1) prescribe the forms of receipts, vouchers, bills, and claims to be used by all the agencies of the District government;

(2) examine and approve all contracts, orders, and other documents by which the District government incurs financial obligations, having previously ascertained that moneys have been appropriated and allotted and will be available when the obligations shall become due and payable;

(3) audit and approve before payment all bills, invoices, payrolls, and other evidences of claims, demands, or charges against the District government and with the advice of the legal officials of the District determine the regularity, legality, and correctness of such claims, demands, or charges; and

(4) perform internal audits of central accounting and department and agency records of the District government, including the examination of any accounts or records of financial transactions, giving due consideration to the effectiveness of accounting systems, internal control, and related administrative practices of the respective agencies.

When Contracts and Expenditures Prohibited

SEC. 705. No officer or agency of the District shall, during any budget year, expend or contract to expend any money or incur any liability, or enter into any contract which by its terms involves the expenditure of money, for any purpose, in excess of the amounts appropriated for any item of expenditure. Any contract, verbal or written, made in violation of this Act shall be null and void. Any officer or employee of the District who shall violate this section, upon conviction thereof, may be summarily removed from office. Nothing in this section, however, shall prevent the making of contracts or of expenditures for capital improvements to be financed in whole or in part by the issuance of bonds, nor the making of contracts of lease or for services for a period exceeding the budget year in which such contract is made, when such contract is permitted by law.

General Fund

SEC. 706. The general fund of the District shall be composed of the revenues of the District other than the revenues applied by law to special funds. All moneys received by any agency, officer, or employee of the District in its or his official capacity shall belong to the District government and shall be paid promptly to the Mayor, or his duly authorized subordinates, for deposit in the appropriate funds.

Contracts Extending Beyond One Year

SEC. 707. No contract involving expenditure out of the appropriations for more than one year shall be made for a period of more than five years; nor shall any such contract be valid unless made or approved by act of the District Council.

Part 2—Audit by General Accounting Office

Independent Audit

SEC. 721. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. In the determination of the auditing procedures to be followed and the extent of the examination of vouchers and other documents, the Comptroller General shall give due regard to generally accepted principles of auditing, including consideration of the effectiveness of the accounting organizations and systems, internal audit and control, and related administrative practices. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the District and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) (1) The Comptroller General shall submit such audit reports as he may deem necessary to the Congress, the Mayor, and the Council. The reports shall set forth the scope of the audits and shall include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Mayor and the Council informed of the operations to which the reports relate, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The reports shall show specifically every program, expenditure, and other financial transactions or undertaking which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

(2) After the Mayor and his duly authorized subordinates have had an opportunity to be heard, the Council shall make such report, together with such other material as it deems pertinent thereto, available for public inspection.

(3) The Mayor, within ninety days after the report has been made to him and the Council, shall state in writing to the Council what has been done to comply with the recommendations made by the Comptroller General in the report.

Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act

SEC. 722. Section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (U.S.C., title 31, sec. 2), is hereby amended by striking out "and the municipal government of the District of Columbia".

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District expenses

Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

SEC. 731. Subject to section 901 and other provisions of law, the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the District Council, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, are authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement or agreements concerning the manner and method by which amounts owed by the District to the United States, or by the United States to the District, shall be ascertained and paid.

TITLE VIII—ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Board of Elections

SEC. 801. (a) The members of the Board of Elections in office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue in office for the remainder of the terms for which they were appointed. Their successors shall be appointed without regard to political affiliations, by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the District Council. The term of each such successor (except in the case of an appointment to fill an unexpired term) shall be three years from the expiration of the term of his predecessor. Any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. When a member's term of office expires, he may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified. Section 3 of the District Primary Act is hereby modified to the extent that it is inconsistent herewith.

(b) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections shall also, for the purposes of this Act—

(1) maintain a permanent registry;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) in addition to determining appeals with respect to matters referred to in sections 807 and 811, determine appeals with respect to any other matters which (under regulations prescribed by it under subsection (c)) may be appealed to it;

(4) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(5) divide the District into three wards as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular as possible, and establish voting precincts therein;

(6) operate polling places;

(7) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(8) perform such other functions as are imposed upon it by this Act.

(c) The Board of Elections may prescribe such regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as may be necessary or appropriate for the purposes of this title, including regulations providing for appeals to it on questions arising in connection with nominations, registrations, and elections (in addition to matters referred to it in sections 807 and 811) and for determination by it of appeals.

(d) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board

of Elections, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable such Board properly to perform its functions.

(e) In the performance of its duties, the Board of Elections shall not be subject to the authority of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(f) The Board of Elections, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 801 and 807. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(g) The Board of Elections is authorized to employ such permanent and temporary personnel as may be necessary. The appointment, compensation, and other terms of employment may be set by the Board of Elections without regard to the provisions of section 402 of this Act.

(h) Each member of the Board of Elections shall be paid at the rate of $1,500 per annum in periodic installments.

What Elections Shall Be Held

SEC. 802. (a) The Board of Elections shall conduct a general election—

(1) in any even-numbered calendar year commencing with 1966; and

(2) in any odd-numbered calendar year commencing with 1967, if an act authorizing the issuance of bonds required by section 602 to be submitted for a referendum at an election is enacted at least forty days prior to the date for conducting the election in such year.

(b) Such general elections shall be held on the fourth Tuesday before the Tuesday in November prescribed hereafter for runoff elections.

(c) Any runoff elections required to be held pursuant to section 805 shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

Elective Offices; Terms of Office

SEC. 803. (a) The offices of the District to be filled by election shall be the elective offices on the District Council, the Mayor and the District Delegate.

(b) The term of an elective office on the District Council shall be two years beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

(c) The term of office of the Mayor shall be four years, beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year next following his election.

(d) The term of office of the District Delegate shall be two years beginning at noon on January 3 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

Vacancies

SEC. 804. (a) Vacancies in the office of Mayor or in the District Council shall be filled at the next general election held pursuant to section 802 for which it is possible for candidates to be nominated following the occurrence of the vacancy. A person elected to fill a vacancy shall take office as soon as practicable following the certification of his election by the Board of Elections and shall hold office for the duration of the unexpired term to which he was elected but not beyond the end of such term.

(b) If the office of Delegate becomes vacant at a time when the unexpired term of such office is six months or more, a special election and, if necessary, a runoff election shall be held, at such time and in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for general elections) as the Board of Elections shall prescribe.

(c) Until a vacancy in the office of Mayor or in the District Council can be filled in the manner prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a vacancy in the office of Mayor shall be filled by appointment by the District Council; and a vacancy in the District Council shall be filled by appointment by the Mayor. No person shall be qualified for appointment to any office under this subsection unless, if nominated, he would have been a qualified candidate for such office at the last election conducted prior to or on the date the vacancy occurred. A person appointed to fill a vacancy under this subsection shall hold office until the time provided for an elected successor to take office, but not beyond the end of the term during which the vacancy occurred.

What Candidates Are Elected

SEC. 805. At any general election, a candidate for Delegate or a candidate for Mayor who receives a majority of the votes validly cast for such office shall be elected. At any general election, each of the three candidates in each ward for positions on the District Council receiving the highest number of valid votes, shall be elected if he receives more than one-sixth of the total number of votes validly cast for all candidates in his ward for the position for which he is a candidate. In case any office is unfilled because of failure of any candidate to receive in any general election the necessary proportion of votes validly cast, there shall be a runoff election to fill such office. In such runoff election the candidates shall be the persons who were the unsuccessful candidates for the unfilled offices in the general election, and who received the highest number of valid votes in that election, to the number of twice the offices to be filled. The candidate or candidates receiving the highest number of votes validly cast in the runoff election shall be elected. In any election in which there are two or more similiar positions to be filled in any ward, a vote for any candidate for such a position in that ward will be valid only if the ballot records votes for as many candidates for such positions in that ward as there are positions to be filled.

Recall

SEC. 805a. (a) Any elective officer of the District of Columbia shall be subject to recall by the qualified electors of the District. Any petition filed demanding the recall by the qualified electors of the District of any such elective officer shall be signed by not less than 25 per centum of the number of qualified electors of the District voting at the last preceding general election. Such petition shall set forth the reasons for the demand and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council. If any such officer with respect to whom such a petition is filed shall offer his resignation, it shall be accepted and take effect on the day it is offered, and the vacancy shall be filled as provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause. If he shall not resign five days after the petition is filed, a special election shall be called by the Council to be held within twenty days thereafter to determine whether the qualified electors of the District will recall such officer.

(b) There shall be printed on the ballot at such election, in not more than two hundred words, the reason or reasons for demanding the recall of any such officer, and, in not more than two hundred words, the officer's justification or answer to such demands.. Any officer with respect to whom a petition demanding his recall has been filed shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of such special election is officially declared by the Board of Elections. No petition demanding the recall of any officer filed pursuant to this section shall be circulated against any officer of the District until he has held his office six months.

(c) If a majority of the qualified electors voting on any petition filed pursuant to this section vote to recall any officer, his recall shall be effective on the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the special election, and the vacancy created thereby shall be filled immediately in a manner provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause.

(d) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of a petition for recall filed pursuant to this section, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any special election held pursuant to this section.

Qualified Electors

SEC. 806. No person shall vote in an election unless he meets the qualifications of an elector specified in this section and has registered pursuant to section 807 of this Act or section 7 of the District Primary Act. A qualified elector of the District shall be any person (1) who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the one-year period ending on the day of the election, (2) who is a citizen of the United States, (3) who is on the day of the election at least twenty-one years old, (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or, if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned, (5) who is not mentally incompetent, as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (6) who certifies that he has not, within one year immediately preceding the election, voted in any election at which candidates for any municipal offices (other than in the District of Columbia) were on the ballot.

Registration

SEC. 807. (a) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he shall be able to qualify otherwise as an elector on the day of the next election; and

(2) he executes, in the presence of an employee of the Board of Elections authorized to take oaths for such purposes a registration affidavit on a form prescribed by the Board of Elections showing that he will meet on the day of the election all the requirements of section 806 of this Act.

(b) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections, but not later than three days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied the appellant may, within three days after such denial, appeal to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. The court shall decide the issue not later than eighteen days before the day of the election. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged", as provided in section 811.

(c) For the purposes of this Act, the Board of Elections shall keep open, during normal hours of business, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays excepted, a central registry office and shall conduct registration at such other times and places as the Board of Elections shall deem appropriate. The Board of Elections may suspend the registration of voters, or the acceptance of changes in registrations for such period, not exceeding thirty days, next preceding any election as it may deem necessary and appropriate.

Qualified Candidates

SEC. 808. The candidates at an election in the District shall be the persons, registered

under section 807 of this Act or under section 7 of the District Primary Act, who have been nominated as provided in section 809 of this Act: *Provided*, That no member of the Board of Elections may be such a candidate.

Nominations

SEC. 809. (a) Nomination of a candidate shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition in accordance with rules, not inconsistent with this Act, prescribed by the Board which is either—

(1) a declaration of candidacy accompanied by a filing fee equal to 5 per centum of the annual compensation for which nomination is sought; and said fee to be refunded—

(A) if the candidate withdraws his candidacy in writing received by the Board not more than three days after the last day on which nominations may be made; or

(B) if the candidate polls 10 per centum or more of the total vote cast for that office; or

(2) A nominating petition signed by the number of registered voters specified below, without payment of a filing fee: *Provided*—

(A) that any petition for a candidate for the office of District Delegate or Mayor be signed by six hundred qualified electors registered in the District, and

(B) that any petition for a candidate for the District Council be signed by three hundred qualified electors registered in the ward from which he is nominated for such office.

(b) No person may be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall, within three days after the last day on which nominations may be made (as prescribed by the Board of Elections), notify the Board of Elections as to which such office he shall seek.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized to accept any nominating petition as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto: *Provided*, That the originals or facsimile copies thereof shall have been posted in a suitable public place for at least ten days: *And provided further*, That no challenge as to the qualifications of the signatories shall have been received in writing by the Board of Elections within ten days of first posting of such petition.

(d) The Board of Elections may, at its discretion, declare elected, without an actual count of the votes cast, any unopposed candidate.

Nonpartisan Elections

SEC. 810. (a) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliations, emblem, or slogan.

(b) Section 16 of the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), is amended by inserting immediately after "exists in" the following: "the District of Columbia or".

Method of Voting

SEC. 811. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) The ballot shall show the wards from which each candidate (other than for District Delegate and Mayor) has been nominated. Each voter shall be entitled to vote for three candidates for the District Council from the ward in which such voter resides; for one candidate for Mayor and for one candidate for District Delegate. No person shall be a candidate from more than one ward.

(c) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(d) Absentee balloting shall be permitted under regulations adopted by the Board of Elections.

(e) At least ten days prior to the date of any referendum or other election, any group of citizens or individual candidates interested in the outcome of the election may petition the Board of Elections for credentials authorizing watchers at any and all polling places during the voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board of Elections shall formulate rules and regulations, not inconsistent with provisions of this title, to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern their conduct, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed.

(f) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any challenge or acting on his own with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged". Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (g).

(g) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections within three days after election day. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(h) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or to operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one what votes were cast. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(i) In any election held pursuant to this Act, any voter entitled to vote for any office shall not vote more than once for that office.

(j) Copies of the regulations of the Board of Elections with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

(k) Before being allowed to vote the voter shall sign a certificate, on a form to be prescribed by the Board of Elections, that he has duly registered under the election laws of the District and that, to his best knowledge and belief, he has not since such registration done any act which might disqualify him as an elector.

Recounts and Contests

SEC. 812. (a) The provisions of section 11 of the District Primary Act with respect to recounts and contests shall be applicable to any election or referendum held under this Act, except that in the case of any initiative, referendum, or recall election any qualified voter who has voted in any such election may petition the Board of Elections for a recount of the votes cast in one or more precincts under the same conditions required of a candidate for office under section 11(a) of the District Primary Act.

(b) If the court voids all or part of an election under this section, and if it determines that the number and importance of the matters involved outweigh the cost and practical disadvantages of holding another election, it may order a special election for the purpose of voting on the matters with respect to which the election was declared void.

(c) Special elections shall be conducted in a manner comparable to that prescribed for regular elections and at times and in the manner prescribed by the Board of Elections by regulation. A person elected at such an election shall take office on the day following the date on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the election.

(d) Vacancies resulting from voiding all or part of an election shall be filled as prescribed in section 804.

Interference With Registration or Voting

SEC. 813. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration of voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for a breach of the peace then committed or for treason or felony.

Violations

SEC. 814. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this title, or of any regulation prescribed and published by the Board of Elections under authority of this title, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Agreements With United States

SEC. 901. (a) For the purpose of preventing duplication of effort or of otherwise promoting efficiency and economy, any Federal officer or agency may furnish services to the District government and any District officer or agency may furnish services to the Federal Government. Except where the terms and conditions governing the furnishing of such services are prescribed by other provisions of law, such services shall be furnished pursuant to a contract (1) negotiated by the Federal and District authorities concerned, and (2) approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the District Council. Each such contract shall provide that the cost of furnishing such services shall be borne in the manner provided in subsection (c) by the Government to which such services are furnished at rates or charges based on the actual cost of furnishing such services.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out any contract negotiated and approved pursuant to subsection (a), any District officer or agency may in the contract delegate any of his or its functions to any Federal officer or agency, and any Federal officer or agency may in the contract delegate any of his or its functions to any District officer or agency. Any function so delegated may be exercised in accordance with the terms of the delegation.

(c) The costs to each Federal officer and agency in furnishing services to the District pursuant to any such contract shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the contract, out of appropriations made by the District Council to the District officers and agencies to which such services are furnished. The costs to each District officer and agency in furnishing services to the Federal Government pursuant to any such contract shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the contract, out of appropriations made by the Congress to the Federal officers and agencies to which such services are furnished.

Personal Interest in Contracts or Transactions

SEC. 902. No member of the District Council and no other officer or employee of the District with power of discretion in the making of any contract to which the District is

a party or in the sale to the District or to a contractor supplying the District of any land or rights or interests in any land, material, supplies, or services shall have a financial interest, direct or indirect, in such contract or sale. Any willful violation of this section shall constitute malfeasance in office, and any officer or employee of the District found guilty thereof shall thereby forfeit his office or position. Any violation of this section with the knowledge express or implied of the person contracting with the District shall render the contract voidable by the Mayor or the District Council.

Compensation From More Than One Source

SEC. 903. (a) Except as provided in this Act, no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the District Council, or the Board of Elections because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source.

(b) The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service or receipt of compensation as a member of the District Council or such Board, if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

(c) For the purpose of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), no person shall, by reason of membership on the District Council, or the Board of Elections or by reason of his serving in any position in or under the government of the District of Columbia, be considered to be an officer or employee of the United States.

Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in Development of District Merit System

SEC. 904. The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to advise and assist the Mayor and the District Council in the further development of the merit system required by section 402(3) and the said Commission is authorized to enter into agreements with the District of Columbia government to make available its registers of eligibles as a recruiting source to fill District positions as needed. The costs of any specific services furnished by the Civil Service Commission may be compensated for under the provisions of section 901 of this Act.

TITLE X—SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT

Transfer of Personnel, Property, and Funds

SEC. 1001. (a) In each case of the transfer, by any provision of this Act, of functions to the Council or to any agency or officer, there are hereby transferred (as of the time of such transfer of functions) to the Council or to such agency or to the agency of which such officer is the head, for use in the administration of the functions of the Council or such agency or officer, the personnel (except the members of boards or commissions abolished by this Act), property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds, which relate primarily to the functions so transferred.

(b) If any question arises in connection with the carrying out of subsection (a), such question shall be decided—

(1) in the case of functions transferred from a Federal officer or agency, by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and

(2) in the case of other functions (A) by the District Council, or in such manner as the District Council shall provide, if such functions are transferred to the District Council, and (B) by the Mayor if such functions are transferred to any other officer or agency.

(c) Any of the personnel transferred to the Council or any agency by this section which the Council or the head of such agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of its or his functions shall, in accordance with law, be retransferred to other positions in the District or Federal Government or be separated from the service.

(d) No officer or employee shall, by reason of his transfer by this Act, be deprived of a civil-service status held by him prior to such transfer.

Existing Statutes, Regulations, and So Forth

SEC. 1002. (a) Any statute, regulation, or other action in respect of (and any regulation or other action issued, made, taken, or granted by) any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by this Act, shall, except to the extent modified or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made; but after such transfer references in such statute, regulation, or other action to an officer or agency from which a transfer is made by this Act shall be held and considered to refer to the officer or agency to which transfer is made.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "other action" includes any rule, order, contract, policy, determination, directive, grant, authorization, permit, requirement, or designation.

(c) Unless otherwise specifically provided, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as affecting the applicability to the District of Columbia government of personnel legislation relating to the District government until such time as the District Council may otherwise elect to provide similar and comparable coverage as provided in section 402(4).

Pending Actions and Proceedings

SEC. 1003. (a) No suit, action, or other judicial proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any officer or agency in his or its official capacity or in relation to the exercise of his or its official functions, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but the court, unless it determines that the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding is not necessary for purposes of settlement of the questions involved, shall allow the same to be maintained, with such substitutions as to parties as are appropriate.

(b) No administrative action or proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but such action or proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties and officers or agencies as are appropriate.

Vacancies Resulting From Abolition of Board of Commissioners

SEC. 1004. Until July 1, 1967, no vacancy occurring in any District agency by reason of section 321, abolishing the Board of Commissioners, shall affect the power of the remaining members of such agency to exercise its functions, but such agency may take action only if a majority of the members holding office vote in favor of it.

TITLE XI—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Separability of Provisions

SEC. 1101. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XII—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

Powers of the President During Transition Period

SEC. 1201. The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to take such action during the period following the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the first meeting of the District Council, by Executive order or otherwise, with respect to the administration of the functions of the District of Columbia government, as he deems necessary to enable the Board of Elections properly to perform their functions under this Act.

Reimbursable Appropriations for the District

SEC. 1202. (a) The sum of $500,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the District of Columbia, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for use (1) in paying the expenses of the Board of Elections (including compensation of the members thereof), and (2) in otherwise carrying into effect the provisions of this Act.

(b) The full amount of expenditures out of the appropriations made under this authorization shall be reimbursed to the United States, without interest, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, from the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE XIII—EFFECTIVE DATES

Effective Dates

SEC. 1301. (a) As used in this title and title XIV the term "charter" means titles I to XI, both inclusive, and titles XV, XVI, and XVII.

(b) The charter shall take effect only if accepted pursuant to title XIV. If the charter is so accepted, it shall take effect on the day following the date on which it is accepted (as determined pursuant to section 1406) except that—

(1) part 2 of title III, title V, and title VII shall take effect on the day upon which the council members first elected take office, and

(2) section 402 shall take effect on the day upon which the Mayor first elected takes office.

(c) Titles XII, XIII, and XIV shall take effect on the day following the date on which this Act is enacted.

TITLE XIV—SUBMISSION OF CHARTER FOR REFERENDUM

Charter Referendum

SEC. 1401. (a) On a date to be fixed by the Board of Elections, not more than nine months after the enactment of this Act, a referendum (in this title referred to as the "charter referendum") shall be conducted to determine whether the registered qualified electors of the District of Columbia accept the charter.

(b) As used in this title, a "qualified elector" means a person who meets the requirements of section 806 on the day of the charter referendum.

Board of Elections

SEC. 1402. (a) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections established under the District Primary Act shall conduct the charter referendum and certify the results thereof as provided in this title.

(b) Notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of section 801 of this Act shall govern the Board of Elections in the performance of its duties.

Registration

SEC. 1403. (a) The Board of Elections shall conduct within the District of Columbia a registration of the qualified electors commencing as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty days nor less than fifteen days prior to the date set for the charter referendum as provided in section 1401 of this title.

(b) Prior to the commencement of such registration, the Board of Elections shall publish, in daily newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(c) The applicable provisions of section 807, notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted, shall govern the registration of voters for this charter referendum.

Charter Referendum Ballot; Notice of Voting

SEC. 1404. (a) The charter referendum ballot shall contain the following, with the blank space appropriately filled:

"The District of Columbia Charter Act, enacted _____, proposes to establish a new charter for the District of Columbia, but provides that the charter shall take effect only if it is accepted by the registered qualified electors of the District in this referendum.

"By marking a cross (X) in one of the squares provided below, show whether you are for or against the charter.

☐ For the charter

☐ Against the charter"

(b) Voting may be by paper ballot or by voting machine. The Board of Elections may make such changes in the second paragraph of the charter referendum ballot as it determines to be necessary to permit the use of voting machines if such machines are used.

(c) Not less than three days before the date of charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall mail to each person registered (1) a sample of the charter referendum ballot, and (2) information showing the polling place of such person and the date and hours of voting.

(d) Not less than one day before the charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall publish, in newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the polling places and the date and hours of voting.

Method of Voting

SEC. 1405. Notwithstanding the fact such sections do not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of sections 811, 812, 813, and 814 of this Act shall govern the method of voting, recounts and contests, interference with registration or voting, and violations connected with this charter referendum.

Acceptance or Nonacceptance of Charter

SEC. 1406. (a) If a majority of the registered qualified electors voting in the charter referendum vote for the charter, the charter shall be considered accepted as of the time the Board of Elections certifies the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States, as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The Board of Elections shall, within a reasonable time, but in no event more than thirty days after the date of the charter referendum, certify the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XV—DELEGATE

District Delegate

SEC. 1501. (a) Until a constitutional amendment or subsequent congressional action otherwise provide, the people of the District shall be represented in the House of Representatives of the United States by a Delegate, to be known as the "Delegate from the District of Columbia", who shall be elected as provided in this Act. The Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives, with the right of debate, but not of voting. The Delegate shall be a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and shall possess in such committee the same powers and privileges as in the House of Representatives, and may make any motion except to reconsider. His term of office shall be for two years.

(b) No person shall hold the office of District Delegate unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is at least twenty-five years old, (3) holds no other public office, and (4) is domiciled and resides in the District and during the three years next preceding his nomination (a) has been resident in and domiciled in the District and (b) has not voted in any election (other than in the District) for any candidate for public office. He shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this subsection.

(c)(1) Subsection (a) of section 601 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "from the Territories".

(2) Clause (b) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (70 Stat. 743), is hereby amended by striking out "from a Territory".

(3) The second paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" in the Act of July 16, 1914 (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 37), is hereby amended by striking out "from Territories".

(4) Paragraph (i) of section 302 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 241), is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "and the District of Columbia".

(5) Section 591 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting "and the District of Columbia" before the period at the end thereof. Section 594 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "Territories and possessions" the following: "or the District of Columbia". The first paragraph of section 595 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "from any Territory or possession" the following: "or the District of Columbia".

TITLE XVI—REFERENDUM

Power of Referendum

SEC. 1601. (a) The qualified electors (as defined in section 806) shall have power, pursuant to the procedure provided by this title, to approve or reject in a referendum any act of the District Council, or part or parts thereof, which has become law, whether or not such act is yet operative. This power shall not extend, however, to acts authorizing the issuance of bonds, which shall be subject to the referendum provisions contained in section 602, or to acts continuing existing taxes or making appropriations which in the aggregate are not in excess of those for the preceding fiscal year. Within forty-five days after an act subject to this title has been enacted, a petition signed by qualified electors equal in number to at least 10 per centum of the number who voted at the last preceding general election may be filed with the Secretary of the District Council requesting that any such act or any part or parts thereof, be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors.

(b) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of petitions for referenda and with respect to the conduct of any referendum held under this title.

Effect of Certification of Referendum Petition

SEC. 1602. (a) When a referendum petition has been certified as sufficient, the act, or the one or more items, sections or parts thereof, specified in the petition shall not become operative, or further action shall be suspended if it shall have become operative, until and unless approved by the electors, as provided in this title. The filing of a referendum petition against one or more parts of an act shall not alter the operative effect of the remainder of such act.

(b) If, within thirty days after the filing of a referendum petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed sufficient for the purposes of this title.

Submission to Electors

SEC. 1603. An act with respect to which a petition for a referendum has been filed and certified as sufficient shall be submitted to the qualified electors at a referendum to be held in connection with the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of the sufficiency of the petition. The District Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of conducting the referendum.

Availability of List of Qualified Electors

SEC. 1604. If any organization or group requests it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the act to be voted on at a referendum, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

Results of Referendum

SEC. 1605. An act which is submitted to a referendum which is not approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall thereupon be deemed repealed. If a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon approved the act, it shall become operative on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the referendum. If conflicting acts are approved by the electors at the same referendum, the one receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict. As used in this section, the word "act" shall mean the complete act, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the petition for referendum.

TITLE XVII—INITIATIVE

SEC. 1701. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 324 of this Act, the qualified electors of the District shall have the power, independent of the Mayor and Council, to propose and enact legislation relating to the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District.

(b) In exercising the power of initiative conferred upon the qualified electors by subsection (a) of this section, not more than 10 per centum of the number of qualified electors voting in the last preceding general election shall be required to propose any measure by an initiative petition. Every such petition shall include the full text of the measure so proposed and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council to be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors. Any such petition which has been filed with the Secretary, and certified by him as sufficient, shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the District at the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of sufficiency. The Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of considering the petition. Any measure so proposed by the petition shall, if approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon in such election, take effect and become law on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of such election or on the date provided for by such measure. If conflicting meas-

ures proposed are approved by the electors at the same election, the measure receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict.

(c) If, within thirty days after the filing of a petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed certified as sufficient for purposes of this section.

(d) The style of all measures proposed by initiative petition shall be as follows: "Be it enacted by the People of the District of Columbia".

(e) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of initiative petitions, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any election during which any such petition is considered.

(f) If any organization or group request it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the measures proposed to be voted on, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

TITLE XVIII—TITLE OF ACT

SEC. 1801. This Act, divided into titles and sections according to table of contents, and including the declaration of congressional policy which is a part of such Act, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill is an old legislative friend in the Senate. This is the latest revision of the so-called Neely-Morse home rule bill.

When the late great and beloved Senator from West Virginia, Matt Neely, was in this body, and I had the opportunity of sitting at his feet and to become a student of District of Columbia problems, I had the privilege of being joined with him on several occasions as the author of the Neely-Morse home rule bill.

After the Senator from West Virginia had died, at the next session of Congress I introduced the Neely-Morse bill. It has borne my name ever since. On the floor of the Senate again, as I have in the past, I wish to extend my thanks and express my sense of deep gratitude to the late Senator Matt Neely for the leadership that he extended to the several hundred thousand residents in the District of Columbia, as he battled during his service in the Senate for first-class citizenship for these several hundred thousand American citizens in the District of Columbia, which we in Congress unfortunately have kept as second-class citizens for these many years.

It is a shameful thing, Mr. President, and it is a shame that ought to be erased from the ledger of the District of Columbia by Congress this year.

We have passed the Neely-Morse home rule bill, or the Morse home rule bill, as it is known now, in the Senate several times, only to have it killed and embalming fluid injected into it by the House District of Columbia Committee.

We Americans participate in a great deal of hypocrisy. We do not like to face the fact that we are sometimes shocking hypocrites, and that as a people we are hypocrites when it comes to the matter of providing freedom to all of our people. We do not like it.

Here in the District of Columbia we deny the right of self-government in municipal affairs to several hundred thousand fellow Americans. If anyone thinks that that fact is not known around the world, let him come with me to international conferences.

I tell the Senate again today, as I have in the past, that the denial of freedom and rights of freedom bearing upon first-class citizenship in the District of Columbia, the Capital of this Republic, is better known in the capitals of backward countries of the world than in the State capitals of the 50 States of the United States.

As we discuss matters with people in international conferences anywhere in the world, we do not carry on our discussion very long before they raise the question, "Why does not your Congress give to the citizens of the Capital of your Nation the right to govern themselves?"

We can no longer hide behind the facade that under the Constitution Congress has certain prerogatives in the District of Columbia and is the ultimate source of government of the District of Columbia.

That is true of every State legislature in the 50 States in respect to the capital city of each State.

The final and ultimate residue of power rests in the State legislature. The Morse bill on home rule makes no attempt to deny the ultimate power of Congress. It does seek to give to the people of the District of Columbia the right to govern themselves.

Could it still be true, even after the passage of the civil rights bill, that the fact that the population of the District of Columbia is somewhere between 54 and 56 percent Negro is the main reason for the denial of freedom to the people of the District of Columbia?

Let Congress soon answer that question for itself, for if it continues to deny home rule to the people of the District of Columbia, it will continue to be charged around the world as a Congress that denies freedom to the people of the District of Columbia because a majority of its residents are colored.

Therefore, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon will again press for action in this session of Congress for the adoption of the home rule bill.

I am not wedded to my bill. I shall give consideration to any fair and reasonable amendment to it. I shall support any reasonable proposal including the administration's bill, if and when it will send one to Congress, that seeks to give to the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect—and these are minimum rights—a mayor, the right to elect a city council, the right to elect a school board, the right to govern themselves under a municipal law system, as the citizens of any State, in this instance, have a similar right. That is the issue. All the alibiing and rationalizing and excusing for not doing it cannot be justified.

I discuss this subject more outside of Washington than I do in Washington—which perhaps may come as a surprise to Senators who listen to me speak so often on this subject. If Senators believe that I talk a great deal about it in the Senate, I talk a great deal more about it across the length and breadth of America.

Today I repeat that only when the people at the precinct level in the States of America make clear to their politicians under this Capitol Dome in Washington, D.C., that they wish full, first-class citizenship delivered to the people of the District of Columbia, are we going to get passage of a home rule bill.

I say to State party organizations of both parties that here is a job to get busy on if they really wish to strengthen democratic processes.

They will remove the shameful blot on the existing record of this country by seeing to it that a home rule bill is passed this year which is a home rule bill in fact and not in name.

HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families.

Existing law provides that the Government pay a specific dollar amount of the cost of the premium, but in no case more than 50 percent. The result is that the Government contribution equals 50 percent of the low option of the least expensive of the governmentwide plans. However, 86 percent of Federal employees having health insurance have chosen high-option plans, costing approximately $23.75 a month. Of this amount, the Government contributes $6.76 a month.

This bill would increase the Government contribution to approximately $10.80 a month, but in no case more than one-half the cost. The Government would then be contributing approximately 40 percent of the cost of the high option.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 271) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended.

This proposal would have the following effects:

First. It would increase maximum life insurance coverage from $20,000 to $27,500.

Second. It would allow certain reemployed annuitants to have life insurance coverage.

Third. It would clarify existing law as to the designation of beneficiaries.

Fourth. It would increase the Government contribution from one-third to one-half of the cost of the program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 272) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RETIREMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system and to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service.

This bill is urgently needed. The unfunded liability of the retirement fund is now in excess of $34 billion. This deficiency, which threatens the stability of the entire retirement system, stems from inadequate Government contributions over the years since the fund was established; retirement liberalizations; credit for past service; and salary increases boosting retirement benefits.

The unfunded liability is increasing by $1.1 billion per year. By 1972, unless legislative steps are taken, outgo will exceed income and the deficit will have to be made up out of principal. By 1990, the fund will be exhausted, requiring outright appropriations of $2 or $3 billion a year.

This bill would establish a permanent supplemental contribution on the part of the Government of one-half of 1 percent of the payroll of each agency, increasing one-half of 1 percent each year until a supplemental contribution of 3½ percent is reached over a period of 7 years. The total Government contribution would then be 10 percent. The regular 6½-percent employee contribution would continue.

Further, this bill provides that the Department of Defense will reimburse the retirement fund for the cost of crediting military service for civil service retirement purposes. Under existing law, the cost of crediting military service toward civilian retirement is a drain on the fund. This provision would add to the fund revenues approximately $62 million the first year, an amount increasing by $5 million a year, and leveling off at approximately $230 million a year after the turn of the century.

The provision permitting retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service is a liberalization of the retirement system which will benefit both the Federal service and the individual employee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 273) to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference two bills to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reconvey to former owners, lands, or interest in lands, not deemed necessary and acquired by the Federal Government for the Hartwell and Clarks Hill Dam projects.

This legislation will enable landowners in South Carolina and Georgia, whose acreage was condemned for the Federal projects, to buy their land back from the Government after the Secretary of the Army has announced that certain acreage is no longer necessary in order to accomplish the projects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. 274. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Hartwell Dam project, South Carolina and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; and

S. 275. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Clarks Hill Dam and Reservoir project, South Carolina, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

RESIDENCE FOR CAPITOL PAGES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages. Since I have been a Member of the Senate many instances have come to my attention which make it very necessary to have such a home for these young men.

I feel very keenly that it is our duty and moral obligation to establish a residence board which would properly supervise these pages.

I sincerely hope that Congress will see fit to take some action this year on this legislature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 276) to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the people of this country are outraged by the apparently approved wanton destruction of American embassies and libraries at the hands of mobs and rioters in foreign nations so generously assisted by the United States.

These assaults have done violence to the American sense of decency and justice. The failure of the constituted authorities of those countries to take precautionary measures to protect American property transgresses international rules of conduct among nations.

I, therefore, offer for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to eliminate our aid to such countries for the 12 months following the occurrence in which property was damaged or destroyed by mob action if police or other local authorities of the host nation have failed to take reasonable measures of protection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 278) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to provide for reductions in aid to countries in which property of the United States is damaged or destroyed by mob action introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Acting President pro tempore, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and myself, I send to the desk a bill which would authorize the United States to cooperate with Canada in the reconstruction and improvement of the Alaska Highway. The legislation is identical with the bill we sponsored in the 88th Congress.

Both Senator METCALF and I have felt for some time that the Federal Government should take the lead in encouraging our neighbors to the north to look favorably on the reconstruction of this important highway. The Alaska Highway provides a very valuable link between the Northwest and our sister State of Alaska. To date there is no adequate surface transportation between Alaska and the rest of the United States. I recognize that the major portion of the highway is on Canadian soil; but when the highway is completed, the United States will be a major beneficiary.

In the past, legislative proposals similar to the text of this bill have not been acted upon, largely because of a lack of interest in Canada and its Provinces. I am now pleased to report that the situation is changing. In fact, the Canadian Government has ordered studies to provide up-to-date cost estimates for the entire project, the sections which need blacktopping, reconstruction, or completely new construction. To date, there is no really accurate estimate of these costs.

Legislators and civic groups on both sides of the border are actively promoting the project. This is the time for the United States to express its support and interest. This can best be done by authorizing our Federal Government to participate in a 50–50 cooperative project.

This proposal is of sufficient interest to the Northwest, Alaska, and the entire country to be included on the agenda of the next meeting between President Lyn-

don Johnson and Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

This legislative proposal was before the appropriate departments and agencies during the 88th Congress, and I hope they will now be able to expedite early and favorable reports on this bill.

I send this bill to the desk, and request its reference to the appropriate committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am particularly interested in the first bill the distinguished Senator from Montana has mentioned—the one to ask the cooperation of Canada in connection with the reconstruction and improvement of the Alaskan highway. In order to show that this problem is one of general interest to the United States, not merely of interest to the States along our border with Canada and to Alaska, I should like very much to join as one of the cointroducers of that measure, if I may be permitted by the Senator from Montana to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We would be most happy to have that done; and I ask unanimous consent that it be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 282) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska highway, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I enthusiastically join the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] in their proposed legislation to pave the Alaskan highway.

The proposed legislation is highly desirable. It emphasizes that Alaska is a part of the Union and deserves the same assistance as the other 49 States.

I hope that I may be able to be a cosponsor and do everything that I can to assist in the bill's speedy enactment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946 TO ESTABLISH POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government.

This is the same capital budget bill that I have introduced for some years in the Senate. We are making progress. Last year there was a considerable amount of interest in and support for this bill. I am always somewhat at a loss to understand why there need be such a lag between legislation against which there is no successful answer and final passage of legislation. I have not heard, in the years I have introduced the bill, one single argument of merit in opposition to the setting up of a capital budget.

The only way we can tell the American people factually what the fiscal status of the Government is is to establish a capital budget. It happens to be the accounting system of any business of size in our Republic.

I sincerely hope this bill will be passed not only by the Senate but by the House as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 285) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 285

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employment Act Amendments of 1961."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(b) To assistant in achieving these objectives it is the further policy of the Federal Government (1) to distinguish between its operating expenditures and capital investments, (2) to exclude certain productive capital investments from the public debt, and (3) to retire the public debt."

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SEC. 3. Section 4(c) of such Act (relating to the duties and functions of the Council of Economic Advisers) is amended by changing the designation of paragraph (5) to (6) and inserting after paragraph (4) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) to evaluate each year the Federal budgetary situation as related to the prospective gross national product and other economic indicators and needs, and to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments;".

CAPITAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) In transmitting to Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, the President shall also—

"(1) to the extent and in such detail as he shall designate by Executive order (and so far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service) distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments of the Government, and further set forth the productive capital investments, including mortgage loans, which have a useful economic life of more than ten years and which are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature;

"(2) advise the Congress as to the progress made in identifying and computing capital investments and more particularly such productive capital investments; and in computing the public debt exclude therefrom an amount equal to such productive capital investments;

"(3) advise the Congress as to a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments; and

"(4) advise the Congress as to the amount of the public debt as computed in accordance with this section and of the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

"(b) The amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of limitations on the public debt contained in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to each budget transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, after the date of enactment of this Act.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 5. The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, with respect to budgets, reporting, auditing, and accounting, shall apply to the functions exercised by any officer or agency of the Government proposing the investment of Federal bond proceeds in productive capital, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

FILING OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another bill, which I have introduced in various forms, but without great modifications, from year to year since 1946. I received a vote on it last year. I had to use it as a rider to another bill, a legislative practice which I am not enthusiastic about, but at least I got a vote on it. I received 25 votes for it. I have been around here long enough to realize that when one starts getting 25 votes on the floor of the Senate, the opponents had better take note.

This is a bill to require Members of Congress, certain employees of the United States, and certain officials to file statements setting forth the value of their assets and their dealings in other securities and commodities.

This is the old bewhiskered Morse public disclosure bill. Since I first offered this proposal in 1946, I have been a successful evangelist, because I have made some converts in the Senate. So enthusiastic are they for the purposes of this bill that they are introducing their own bills in various forms. It delights me. I have no pride of authorship. When a bill embodies the principle I am for, I do not care whose name it carries. But in order to encourage them again to introduce their bills or join in the cosponsorship of this bill, I am introducing it today, and ask that it lie on the desk for 1 week, and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say, on the merits of the bill, that one argument that is made by some of my political colleagues is that the bill interferes with their right of privacy. They do not have any right of privacy. Once they offer themselves for public office, so far as any rights of theirs are concerned, the public has the right to full knowledge of their financial transactions.

If they do not wish to disclose the sources and amounts of their income, for the voter to pass his or her value judgment on them, they do not have to run for office. No one is imposing the office on them. They seek it.

In a democracy, as I have been heard to say so many times in support of the bill, there is no substitute for full public disclosure of the public's business. It is the business of the public to know the sources and amounts of income of the representatives who sit in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and cast votes on legislation.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate know the great concern that I developed before I introduced this bill in the first place, when it became a matter of public knowledge that a member of a Senate committee was making use of certain confidential information he had in regard to securities, growing out of his position in the Senate.

I said then on the floor of the Senate that the public is entitled to know the financial dealings of Members of Congress, and, for that matter, of all the other public officials who are covered by the bill.

I ask that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 286) to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 286

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE STUDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, the fellowship bill. I ask unanimous consent that it may lie at the desk until the close of business January 12, 1965, to permit as many other Senators as may wish to do so to join with us in cosponsoring the bill. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed as requested.

The bill (S. 287) to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fellowships for Teachers Act of 1965".

FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") is authorized to award under the provisions of this Act not to exceed twenty five thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, thirty thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and thirty five thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Fellowships, awarded under the provisions of this Act shall be for graduate study leading to a master's or equivalent degree in the field of education for the purpose of teaching in elementary or secondary schools. Such fellowships may also be awarded in fields ancillary to elementary and secondary education such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, special education for handicapped children, and other fields having the purpose of assisting or improving elementary or secondary education, or both. Such fellowships shall be awarded for such periods as the Commissioner may determine but not to exceed two academic years.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this Act but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR RECENT GRADUATES

SEC. 3. One-half the number of fellowships under the provisions of this Act for any fiscal year shall be awarded by the Commissioner to persons recommended to the Commissioner for such fellowships by institutions of higher education. An institution of higher education may for the purposes of this section recommend any individual who has received a bachelor's degree with high standing from such institution, except that such recommendation shall be made not later than six months after the awarding of such degree.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

SEC. 4. The remaining half of the number of fellowships awarded under the provisions of this Act for any fiscal year shall be awarded by the Commissioner to persons with at least eight academic years of experience teaching in an elementary or secondary school, who are recommended to the Commissioner for such fellowships by local educational agencies. A local educational agency may for the purposes of this section recommend any such person who is teaching in such agency's elementary or secondary schools upon condition that such agency agree to rehire such individual upon his completing the course of study under such fellowship.

FELLOWSHIPS IN ANCILLARY FIELDS

SEC. 5. Not less than 20 per centum of the fellowships awarded under sections 3 and 4 shall be awarded to persons for graduate work in fields ancillary to elementary and secondary education, as defined in section 2.

DISTRIBUTION OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 6. In awarding fellowships under the provisions of this Act the Commissioner shall endeavor to provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the Nation, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest, the Commissioner shall give preference in such awards to persons already serving, or who intend to serve, in elementary or secondary schools in low-income rural or metropolitan areas.

STIPENDS

SEC. 7. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of section 3 shall receive a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year of study and $2,200 for the second such year. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of section 3 shall receive a stipend of $4,800 for each academic year of study. In both cases an additional amount of $400 for each such academic year of study shall be paid to each such person on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amount paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study, $2,500 per academic year in the case of a person receiving a fellowship pursuant to section 3 and $5,000 per academic year in the case of a person receiving a fellowship pursuant to section 4. Amounts paid pursuant to this subsection shall be less any amount charged any such person for tuition.

(c) The Commissioner shall reimburse any person awarded a fellowship pursuant to this Act for actual and necessary traveling expenses of such person and his dependents from his ordinary place of residence to the institution of higher education where he will pursue his studies under such fellowship, and to return to such residence.

LIMITATION

SEC. 8. No fellowship shall be awarded under this Act for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 9. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this Act shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 7(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

(2) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

(3) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other private nonprofit institution or agency having administrative control and direction of an elementary or secondary school.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION— UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the new year period is one in which we traditionally cast up our accounts to see where we stand. At the outset of a new Congress especially, it is important to learn how far along we are in meeting the goals we had previously set, so that we may chart anew the course we should follow. This I propose to do briefly for educational legislation of the 88th Congress as a preface to the introduction of bills on educational assistance on which I hope to schedule early hearings.

The omnibus education bill of the last Congress, S. 580, contained 24 separate programs covering the full spectrum of our educational system from the first grade through postdoctoral research. Twenty of the 24 proposals were substantially enacted. In the case of some of the proposals notably in the field of vocational education and in the broadening of the scope and content of the National Defense Education Act, the Congress exceeded the expectations of the administration. Roughly 80 percent of the Kennedy program became law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, an article prepared by the Office of Education entitled "Milestones in Education," which documents in detail the point I make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while this record is one in which we can take some measure of quiet satisfaction, candor compels me to say that there were areas, and among them the most important, in which we did not measure up to our responsibility to the American people, to those who are engaged in teaching our children, and especially to the young men and women who are engaged in learning at every level.

We did not provide the full measure of Federal aid to education to supplement State and local effort, needed for a prosperous and healthy America in the last third of this century.

There are three main areas where Federal financial supplementation can usefully be given to our public educational system. These are first, grants for physical facilities construction and equipment purchase; second, money to bear part of the cost of the operation and maintenance of our school systems; and third, financial incentives to bring into the teaching profession young men and women of high potential achievement, and to help those already engaged in teaching to improve, through training, their professional skills, techniques, and abilities.

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I shall welcome the recommendations of the administration which will accompany the President's message on education, and I pledge to the Senate that early and careful consideration will be given to each program proposed, so that the Senate can vote upon each of them in the lifetime of this Congress. It is my hope that the legislation proposed by the administration will cover the unfinished business of the 88th Congress, in such areas as, first, student loan guarantees, which although reported from committee, did not pass the Congress; and second, the general university extension proposal which, although it had previously passed the Senate, remained unenacted at the close of the 88th Congress.

I am confident that proposals to improve the educational quality of our public school system by providing Federal grants to bring aid where it is needed most, in our rural and urban poverty areas, will be included.

I am, however, today reintroducing a measure upon which the Education Subcommittee held hearings last July, S. 2528, which is directed to this goal through the addition of more categories of children upon which to base impacted area payments, so that full information can be developed during the hearings this session as to the most practicable method which should be followed in achieving the desired objective.

I am also reintroducing S. 2725, of the 88th Congress, which concerns the provision of financial aid to school districts adversely affected by major disasters. The Christmas week toll of property damage in our Western States has convinced me that such legislation deserves careful and, I hope, favorable consideration.

The third measure I shall introduce today should be of major interest to all who are concerned with the problem of recruitment and training of our teachers in all of our schools. It is a fellowship bill for both, prospective teachers regardless of the field of their undergraduate training, and, for those who are already teaching but who are recommended by their school systems for further graduate work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an outline of the bill, a memorandum of the consonance of the proposed bill with the November 1, 1964, White House Policy Paper on Education, and the policy paper itself, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the outline, memorandum and paper were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF TEACHERS FELLOWSHIP BILL

Testimony taken in connection with the omnibus education bill, S. 580 of the 88th Congress, and S. 2826, the improvement of education quality, of the 87th Congress, indicates that there may be merit in establishing a new federally supported program of teacher training at the graduate level.

Such legislation might either (a) be drafted as a new section to title IV of the National Defense Education Act or (b) be introduced as a clean bill conferring additional responsibility upon the Commissioner of Education. Since the National Defense Education Act has so recently been extensively amended, the latter procedure is recommended.

Briefly, under the proposed bill the Commissioner of Education would be empowered to establish for fiscal year 1966, 25,000, for fiscal year 1967, 30,000, and for fiscal year 1968, 35,000 1- and 2-year fellowships to be held at institutions of higher education offering the master's degree in the field of education or similar first professional degrees in closely related fields, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, and the education of the handicapped child.

Fifty percent of the fellowships could be held by young men and women who have received a bachelor's degree with high standing regardless of the field of undergraduate preparation who are recommended by their undergraduate institution for such a master's program. These fellowships should be parallel to the National Defense Education Act, title IV fellowships; e.g., carrying a stipend of $2,000 per annum for the first year which would rise to $2,200 in the second year.

Such fellowships, as in the title IV National Defense Education Act program, would be accompanied by a $2,500 grant to the institution in which the graduate work is taken, to enable the institution to improve its graduate curriculum offerings to such graduate students. The award language, however, should contain the standard clause of the present National Defense Education Act, which states in effect, that any tuition or fees charged to the fellow would be offset by a corresponding reduction in the flat grant made to the institution.

Fifty percent of the fellowships authorized would be reserved for teachers with 8 or more years experience as teachers in elementary or secondary schools. These awards would be made by the Commissioner on the basis of recommendations received by him from local school authorities proposing candidates from their systems. Such fellowships should be funded in view of the maturity and financial commitments of the candidates at not less than $4,800 per annum plus $400 for each dependent and should be awarded only to those recommended teachers who are placed on leave of absence with return rights to the system from which they were selected.

These fellowships, since they may involve expansion of existing graduate programs which are designated primarily for students without field teaching experience, should be accompanied by a flat grant to the institution of $5,000 per fellow to encourage program improvement. It is anticipated that most of the experienced teachers since they are presumably certificated, would wish training in subject matter areas of concentrations such as are to be found in many master of arts in teaching degree programs, notably at Harvard and Duke among others.

Language should be included to pay for the travel expenses of the selected candidate and his dependents from the home community of the school system from which he was selected to the institution which has accepted him for training and for his return upon completion of training. Language should also be included permitting the Commissioner to reaward lapsed fellowships in both categories.

In awarding both types of fellowships the Commissioner should seek for an equitable geographic selection and distribution of the fellowships but should accord special consideration to those teachers or prospective teachers who are serving or who intend to serve in areas of rural poverty or in the low income areas of metropolitan school systems.

Twenty percent of the fellowships in each category should be reserved for individuals seeking the first professional degree in the ancillary educational fields, including but not restricted to, library services, school social work, guidance and counseling, and special education for the physically, mentally, and emotionally handicapped child.

CONSONANCE OF FELLOWSHIP PROPOSAL WITH WHITE HOUSE POLICY PAPER ON EDUCATION

On November 1, 1964, the White House released a policy paper on education which is reproduced as attachment A. The proposed bill would seek to meet the five purposes outlined in that statement. The policy paper states: "First, we must broaden and improve the quality of our school base. We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession. But most of all we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives."

The draft bill will provide a recruitment incentive to the above average undergraduate (regardless of his field of academic preparation) to enter the teaching field through the provision of a prestige financing of his professional training. Currently, less than one-fourth of our Nation's teachers hold the master's degree or higher degree. Enactment of this program would provide the financing of 45,000 new teachers within the 3-year period of the bill or 80,000 new teachers within 5 years if a further 2-year extension were to be granted, while simultaneously providing refresher professional training to an additional 45,000 to 80,000 experienced teachers. The impact of such a program upon the quality of education in the American school system should become apparent shortly after the inception of the program and its cumulative effect after a decade of use would be of massive proportions.

The second point in the policy statement indicates the importance of concentrating of teaching resources in urban slums and poor rural areas. The bill meets this criterion through the special consideration accorded in it to those who teach or intend to teach in just such areas.

The third goal outlined in the President's statement is the expansion and enrichment of our colleges. Through the cost of education allowances which accompany the fellowships, the financial resources available to the graduate education centers to improve their offerings would be enhanced in the first 3 years of the program by more than $300 million. Since there are some 800 to 900 institutions of higher education which offer graduate programs in education and thus presumably could qualify, sums in excess of $300,000 each for the improvement of graduate training programs are made available.

The fourth point recognized by the President is that education is a lifelong process. The draft bill is consonant with this objective in that it provides at a critical point in a teacher's career an opportunity for significant retraining which would be of continuing professional value for the balance of the individual's professional career.

The fifth yardstick in the presidential program is the strengthening of State and community education systems respecting our tradition that control of our schools remain at the local level. The program set forth in the draft bill measures up fully to this standard. The changes and improvements in both the graduate centers and the local school systems which would follow upon the operation of the program would be guaranteed by those most closely concerned. The Federal Government's role is in making such changes as the collegiate and local systems wish to have occur, financially possible. No direction as to course content would be given, but the dynamics of the marketplace in training should lead most condidates to try to enter the schools they perceive as best suited to provide the training they wish to take.

Essentially, the draft proposal recognizes the advances which have been made in pilot and demonstration programs carried on at institutions such as Harvard University and Duke University and generalizes upon the success of those programs. The proposal is complementary to the existing fellowship proposals but it does not overlap nor supplant them, since the objective of the instant fellowship program is the attainment for ever increasing numbers of teachers of a working not a research degree.

Commissioner Keppel, when a dean at Harvard, recognized the importance of strengthening the recruitment procedures of elementary and secondary education through improved standards of selection of candidates for teaching positions. If enacted, the proposed bill should provide material inducements to those individuals who desire to teach, but for whom the financial barrier of advanced training in the past has acted as a deterrent.

Comments have been made by nationally recognized educators such as Dr. Conant, attacking the present systems of teacher certi-

fication through claims that such procedures act as barriers to the undergraduate whose bachelor's degree is in the field of liberal arts. The selection procedures for the able undergraduate student envisaged by the draft bill should go far to bringing into the teaching mainstream a significant number of young men and women whose undergraduate preparation has been broad and whose professional preparation through this program will be thorough.

One aspect of the proposal deserves particular attention and that is the effect upon the graduate institution of a student body mixture such as is here proposed. The mature teacher in the graduate learning situation should be able to bring to his classmates and to the instructing faculty, insights based upon experience which could prove invaluable in modifying and reforming the graduate training curriculum.

As important, however, as this contribution is, it is overweighted by the greater contribution that the mature master's candidate who has taught will be able to make to his colleagues in the form of a personification of those value systems which are held by teachers who in the regular practice of their profession, are regarded by their supervisors and their colleagues as being of superior ability. Conversely, the mature teacher should find the intellectual challenge posed by the bachelor candidates highly stimulating.

It is anticipated that the response from local school systems in supplying the names of candidates for such fellowships would be on a large scale.

Since the safeguards contained in the legislation insist upon return rights to the originating systems for the selected teacher, it is to the interest of the recommending school system to furnish the names only of those teachers whom they would willingly and enthusiastically receive back upon completion of the training program.

The career teacher recognition aspect of the bill should have the effect in the local community of bringing to the attention of the public the value of the educational work being accomplished in the local school system and the regard of the Federal Government for improvement of education.

ATTACHMENT A

THE WHITE HOUSE POLICY PAPER ON EDUCATION, NOVEMBER 1, 1964

I believe that every child has the right to as much education as he has the ability to receive. I believe that this right does not end in the lower schools, but goes on through technical and higher education—if the child wants it and can use it.

I want this not only for his sake, but also for our Nation's sake. America badly needs educated men and women. And America needs not just more education, but better education.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country. Not our military preparedness—for armed power is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace. Not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower. Not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "If we expect a nation to be ignorant and free, we expect what never was and never will be." Our Nation's school systems were founded on that proposition.

Today, 41 million students are enrolled in our public schools. Four million more will enter by the end of this decade. But that is not enough. One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if we let him. Almost a million young people will quit school each year—if we let them. And over 100,000 of our smartest high school graduates each year will not go to college—if we do nothing.

This cannot continue. It costs too much: we cannot afford it. The whole Nation suffers when your youth is neglected.

Twenty percent of our 18- to 24-year-olds with an eighth grade education are unemployed—four times the national average—while jobs in America are hunting for trained men and women. Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

In the next 10 years, 30 million boys and girls are going to enter our job force. Unless we act now, 2½ million of them will not see the inside of a high school; 8 million will not finish high school; and too many of our schools and colleges will be jammed like city buses at rush hour. Our youth will suffer a handicap that no amount of time—no amount of money—can remove.

We must act. I pledge now to put education at the head of our work agenda. First, we must broaden and improve the quality of our school base. We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace unsatisfactory facilities. We will need over 800,000 new public school teachers in the next 5 years to keep up with expanding enrollments and to replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession. But most of all we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives.

Second, we must concentrate our teaching resources in the urban slums and the poor rural areas. Our war on poverty can be won only if those who are poverty's prisoners can break the chains of ignorance. This means that we must give our best a chance to do their best.

Third, we must expand and enrich our colleges. Our college enrollment is due to double within this decade. It will reach almost 9 million by 1975, and will probably expand to four or six times its present size before this century ends.

Fourth, we must recognize that education is a lifelong process. In today's world, we cannot neglect the adult's need for schooling to keep up with technology.

Fifth, we must strengthen our State and community education systems. We do not intend to forsake our tradition that schools and colleges should be controlled at the local level.

This is neither new nor radical. The late Senator Taft declared, "Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

Every President from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to John Fitzgerald Kennedy worked to build that floor. I plan to get on with the task.—LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for myself and Senator RANDOLPH, for appropriate reference, the first bill to which I have referred relating to the additional categories of children to be counted in the computation of impacted area payments, and I ask that it be held until the close of business January 8, to permit such additional Senators as may wish to cosponsor it.

I ask further that it be printed at the close of my remarks on the education bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the interest that other western Senators may have in the proposal to assist disaster-stricken school districts, I send the bill to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and ask unanimous consent that it may lie at the desk until the close of business January 12, so that as many other Senators as may wish to cosponsor the measure may have an opportunity to do so. I ask unanimous consent that the bill also be printed in the RECORD at the close of my speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

MILESTONES IN EDUCATION: WHAT THE 88TH CONGRESS DID FOR AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

(Prepared by the Office of Information of the Office of Education)

FOREWORD

Federal legislation enacted in 1963 and 1964 to strengthen education will benefit Americans and contribute to the progress of the Nation for generations.

Colleges and universities can now expand to help meet the critical educational needs of increasing numbers of students seeking higher education. New and needed facilities can be built—especially junior colleges and technical schools. Thousands of bright young people who otherwise might have had to forgo a college education can now obtain the financial assistance they need to continue their studies. Specific aids are provided to increase the Nation's supply of doctors, dentists, and nurses. New quality and versatility in keeping with modern needs is being introduced into vocational education. Libraries and library services will be improved in both urban and rural areas. There will be more and better-trained teachers.

This is greater progress in education than in any comparable period in our history. But the needs are also greater today than ever before. There must be no slackening in the Nation's total educational effort until every American has the opportunity to acquire all the education he wants and needs for the demands of an increasingly complex world. A full commitment to that goal is a full commitment to the future progress and strength of America.

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–129)

In the hearings which preceded passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, it was pointed out that while we have the scientific knowledge to save about half of the 450,000 Americans who develop cancer every year, we actually are saving only one-third. Lack of public understanding and cooperation is a contributing factor. But the prime factor is lack of enough physicians to conduct the regular examinations on which early diagnosis of cancer depends.

In virtually all the health fields, population growth is outracing our output of professionally trained practitioners. In 1950

there was 1 physician per 1,300 people; in 1960, 1 per 1,700; the outlook for 1975 is 1 per 2,000. In pharmacy and optometry the number of graduates in the past 10 years has actually declined.

A two-pronged attack

The legislation Congress enacted to try to right this situation makes a two-pronged attack on the problem—funds to expand teaching facilities and loans to help deserving youngsters meet the high cost of education for the health professions.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 authorizes a 3-year program of grants to help construct new teaching facilities and improve existing facilities for the training of additional physicians, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, optometrists, podiatrists, and professional public health workers. The size of the Federal share of construction costs varies according to the gains in trained personnel which the facility will make possible: in the case of schools of public health (there are only 12 in the Nation), the Federal share can range up to 75 percent.

Both public and nonprofit private institutions are eligible for construction grants, but they must (except in the case of new institutions) be fully accredited by recognized accrediting bodies. The act places responsibility for determining eligibility in the hands of the Commissioner of Education and the responsibility for administering the grants in the hands of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. A National Advisory Council on Education for the Health Professions has been created to assist the Surgeon General. The Commissioner of Education is a member ex officio.

Student loans in four fields

The act's loan provisions are designed to assist students who have the capacity and ambition to be physicians, dentists, osteopaths, and optometrists [1] but who would not otherwise be able to afford training. The act authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work out arrangements for the establishment of loan funds with schools in those four fields of acute shortage. The schools, which may be either public or private nonprofit institutions, administer the loans themselves according to criteria set up in the act. Loans can be made only to full-time students who are pursuing courses leading to degrees in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry, and who are not receiving National Defense Education Act funds. Loans are limited to $2,000 per student per academic year and are repayable over a 10-year period beginning 3 years after the student finishes his full-time study.

The act authorized the following funds:

	Fiscal 1964	1965	1966
New teaching facilities: medicine, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, public health	$15,000,000	$45,000,000	$55,000,000
New teaching facilities: dentistry	5,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Replacement, rehabilitation, existing facilities	5,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Student loans	5,100,000	10,200,000	15,400,000

Congress subsequently appropriated $110,782,000 for these purposes for fiscal 1965, including a $25,582,000 supplemental appropriation to cover authorizations not funded in 1964.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1693—TITLE III, EDUCATION PROVISIONS (PUBLIC LAW 88–164)

Handicaps—blindness, mental retardation, and others—make traditional schooling inaccessible to some 5,000,000 American children.

Yet only one-fourth of the Nation's handicapped children are enrolled today in schools of any kind, largely because teachers with the specialized training to educate them are in short supply. At least 200,000 such teachers are needed, but there are only an estimated 60,000.

Title III of Public Law 88–164, dealing with education, is a pioneering attempt on the part of the Federal Government to remove what the Commissioner of Education, in his Congressional testimony, called the greatest obstacles to the advance of special education: "the extreme shortage of qualified personnel and lack of scientifically tested knowledge."

Teacher will be trained

Title III authorizes grants to help public and other nonprofit colleges and universities train a corps of teachers of the handicapped—and as part of that endeavor, to educate supervisors, speech correctionists, researchers, and college instructors. State education agencies are eligible for grants to help train people to teach the handicapped. Enlarging the pool of trained manpower is to be accomplished both through grants-in-aid to the sponsors of the training programs and through fellowships and traineeships to encourage people to enter the field. Grants to State education agencies are to be apportioned on the basis of population.

The act's enormous scope is suggested in the broad definition it gives to the term "handicapped children." Included are blind, partially-seeing, deaf, hard-of-hearing, speech-impaired, crippled, seriously emotionally disturbed, and metally retarded youngsters, and those who suffer other forms of health impairment.

Stimulates research and demonstration

In addition to its grants for training purposes, the act seeks to stimulate needed research and demonstration projects through grants to institutions and research organizations. It stipulates that the research be aimed at knowledge which is directly applicable to the education of the handicapped. Demonstrations are expected to translate research results and observations into practice—in the form, for instance, of new classroom methods and materials.

The act also extends previous legislation supporting education of the mentally retarded and deaf through teacher-training scholarships and grants to educational institutions (Public Laws 85–926 and 87–276).

Administration of title III is vested in the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth of the Office of Education. The act calls for the creation of technical advisory committees in the various fields of handicapping to advise the Commissioner of Education on policy.

The following allocations were authorized to carry out the objectives of title III:

	For teacher training	For research and demonstrations
Fiscal 1964	$11,500,000	$2,000,000
Fiscal 1965	14,500,000	2,000,000
Fiscal 1966	19,500,000	2,000,000

Appropriations of $16,500,000 were subsequently voted for fiscal 1965.

[1] Optometrists were added to the provisions of this act by Public Law 88–665, enacted on Oct. 16, 1964.

Two additional titles of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act attack other important aspects of the burden inflicted by handicapping. In summary, titles I and II authorize the following:

Title I, part A: Project grants to public or other nonprofit institutions for research on human development—to find the causes of mental retardation and ways to prevent and mitigate it. These grants are administered by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service. Part B: Grants for the construction of university-affiliated clinical facilities for the mentally retarded—to provide patient services, to demonstrate diagnosis, treatment, and care, and to demonstrate in the education of specialists attending the retarded. These grants are administered by the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service. Part C: Grants to States for construction, expansion, remodeling, etc., of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded; administration is the same as for part B.

Title II: Grants for the establishment and construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers offering a wide range of services. These grants are administered by the National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–204)

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1964 will provide buildings to house classrooms, libraries, and laboratories to expand enrollment capacity.

The act authorized a $1.2 billion investment by the Federal Government in the academic facilities needed by public and other nonprofit colleges and universities. By making special provisions for their growth, it takes note of the unique role of public community colleges and technical institutes in the national scheme of post-high-school education. And it takes measures to spur the development of graduate schools and their better geographic distribution across the Nation.

In short, what the Congress has done is to supply higher education with grants and loans that will ease the struggle to accommodate the growing swarm of students and meet the accelerating demand for educated minds. The act reflects a view of trained intelligence as an indispensible national resource.

The primary goal of the bill was to expand enrollment capacity. The reasons for enacting it were compelling. By 1970, the number of college students is expected to be double the number in 1960, or 7 million. To keep pace, colleges will need to spend $1 billion more a year until 1970 than they now are able to spend. As the Commissioner of Education put it in his testimony before a Senate committee: "States and municipalities cannot provide the additional funds—nor can contributions from private sources." The enrollment crisis foreseen for higher education was already at the doorstep.

Needed for economic growth

Other aspects of the problem are just as troubling. Trained manpower needs call for the creation of additional graduate schools of top quality and for adjustment of a situation which finds the graduate schools of a handful of States producing 55 percent of the doctorates. At a lower level of education, there is need to train another 600,000 highly skilled technicians by 1970.

Under title I of the act a 5-year program of grants is authorized to construct and improve academic facilities in undergraduate

colleges and universities, both public and private nonprofit.

Of these funds, 22 percent is earmarked for public community colleges and public technical institutes which meet requirements specified by the act. These latter institutions are eligible to have the Federal Government pay 40 percent of their improvements for the stated purposes, while other institutions qualifying under title I are entitled to Federal shares of up to 33⅓ percent.

Specific uses are spelled out in the legislation for the grants made to public and private nonprofit universities and 4-year colleges and 2-year private nonprofit colleges out of the remaining 78 percent of title I funds. The funds are designated for the construction of teaching or research facilities in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, or engineering, or for libraries. A State commission "broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education" determines relative priorities of eligible projects and submits a priority list to the Commissioner of Education. High school enrollment, college and university enrollment, and per capita income all figure in the determination of State allotments.

To benefit graduate education

The 5-year program of grants under title II will expand and improve academic facilities at present graduate schools and centers and establish top-flight new ones. The Commissioner will make these grants directly to the institutions but may not allocate more than 12½ percent of any year's appropriation to institutions in one State. The Federal share of construction costs is limited to 33⅓ percent.

In reviewing projects, the Commissioner is to consider the advice of a committee on graduate education which he chairs and which is to include, among others, representatives of the Office of Science and Technology and the National Science Foundation, and leaders from the humanities, education, and other graduate fields.

Title III differs from the others primarily in one respect: it authorizes loans instead of grants for academic facilities. The Commissioner again deals directly with the institutions, which in this case range from 2-year schools to graduate schools, both public and private nonprofit. Not less than one-fourth of the development cost must be paid out of non-Federal funds.

All three titles exclude the following kinds of facilities: those to which the public will be charged admission, those designed for athletics or recreation (though not those designed for teaching physical education), those to be used for sectarian instruction or worship, those to be used primarily by a department or school of divinity, and those to be used for a school of the health professions, which are covered under Public Law 88–129.

The act makes the following authorizations:

	Fiscal 1964	1965	1966	1967–68
Construction grants for undergraduate facilities	$230,000,000	$230,000,000	$230,000,000	To be authorized.
Construction grants for graduate facilities	25,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	Do.
Construction loans for undergraduate and graduate facilities	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	Do.

For fiscal 1965 Congress appropriated $463,150,000 for these purposes, including carryover funds from fiscal 1964 not previously appropriated.

Allotments to States under title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, fiscal year 1965

State	Total	For public community colleges and public technical institutes [1]	For undergraduate institutions other than public community colleges and public technical institutes [2]
U.S. and outlying parts	$230,000,000	$50,600,000	$179,400,000
50 States and District of Columbia	227,755,334	49,951,705	177,803,629
Alabama	3,792,266	1,161,234	2,631,032
Alaska	173,044	34,640	138,404
Arizona	2,075,312	441,438	1,633,874
Arkansas	2,305,346	675,760	1,629,586
California	23,647,473	3,770,269	19,877,204
Colorado	2,590,141	488,984	2,101,157
Connecticut	2,924,141	520,836	2,403,305
Delaware	501,141	83,580	417,561
Florida	5,713,768	1,371,448	4,342,320
Georgia	4,510,292	1,241,148	3,269,144
Hawaii	887,495	238,400	649,095
Idaho	981,732	273,453	708,279
Illinois	11,461,804	2,099,039	9,362,765
Indiana	6,026,900	1,329,064	4,697,836
Iowa	3,843,504	948,388	2,895,116
Kansas	3,141,136	755,571	2,385,565
Kentucky	3,513,562	910,444	2,603,118
Louisiana	4,121,306	1,112,553	3,008,753
Maine	1,180,112	327,504	852,608
Maryland	3,651,720	761,870	2,889,850
Massachusetts	7,004,607	1,202,327	5,802,280
Michigan	10,213,516	2,262,998	7,950,518
Minnesota	5,019,166	1,194,015	3,825,151
Mississippi	2,732,233	745,866	1,986,367
Missouri	5,193,192	1,187,717	4,005,475
Montana	946,361	232,825	713,536
Nebraska	1,946,320	457,648	1,388,672
Nevada	322,612	53,792	268,820
New Hampshire	$802,018	$176,297	$625,721
New Jersey	6,063,579	1,330,510	4,733,069
New Mexico	1,269,005	306,493	962,512
New York	19,303,194	3,293,519	16,009,675
North Carolina	5,983,904	1,631,375	4,352,529
North Dakota	1,000,654	273,453	727,201
Ohio	11,552,972	2,543,162	9,009,810
Oklahoma	3,451,567	820,205	2,631,362
Oregon	2,731,544	582,166	2,149,378
Pennsylvania	13,406,602	3,146,597	10,260,005
Rhode Island	1,078,197	218,112	860,085
South Carolina	2,829,174	859,181	1,969,993
South Dakota	982,449	262,767	719,682
Tennessee	4,455,372	1,216,007	3,239,365
Texas	11,792,046	2,717,703	9,074,343
Utah	1,824,266	355,845	1,468,421
Vermont	616,351	138,043	478,308
Virginia	4,404,365	1,116,941	3,287,424
Washington	4,193,154	877,508	3,315,646
West Virginia	2,319,653	642,876	1,676,777
Wisconsin	5,518,080	1,369,176	4,148,904
Wyoming	443,970	101,338	342,632
District of Columbia	1,313,016	89,620	1,223,396
American Samoa	14,565	3,665	10,900
Canal Zone			
Guam	69,264	19,049	50,215
Puerto Rico	2,137,444	616,857	1,520,587
Virgin Islands	23,393	8,724	14,669

[1] Distributed according to the State products of (1) 1962–63 high school graduates and (2) allotment ratios with limits of 0.3333 and 0.6667.

[2] Half is distributed according to fall 1963 enrollment in grades 9 to 12, and half is distributed according to fall 1963 enrollment in institutions of higher education. Data on enrollments in institutions of higher education were partially estimated.

Allotment of funds for administrative expenses of State commissions for title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, fiscal year 1965

Alabama	$43,000
Alaska	30,000
Arizona	30,000
Arkansas	30,000
California	120,000
Colorado	34,000
Connecticut	42,000
Delaware	30,000
Florida	71,000
Georgia	59,000
Hawaii	30,000
Idaho	30,000
Illinois	120,000
Indiana	71,000
Iowa	57,000
Kansas	47,000
Kentucky	47,000
Louisiana	45,000
Maine	30,000
Maryland	54,000
Massachusetts	112,000
Michigan	120,000
Minnesota	64,000
Mississippi	44,000
Missouri	76,000
Montana	30,000
Nebraska	30,000
Nevada	30,000
New Hampshire	30,000
New Jersey	71,000
New Mexico	30,000
New York	120,000
North Carolina	77,000
North Dakota	30,000
Ohio	120,000
Oklahoma	45,000
Oregon	38,000
Pennsylvania	120,000
Rhode Island	30,000
South Carolina	37,000
South Dakota	30,000
Tennessee	59,000
Texas	120,000
Utah	30,000
Vermont	30,000
Virginia	58,000
Washington	51,000
West Virginia	30,000
Wisconsin	76,000
Wyoming	30,000
District of Columbia	30,000
American Samoa	10,000
Guam	10,000
Puerto Rico	30,000
Virgin Islands	10,000
Subtotal	2,878,000
Reserve	122,000
Grand total	3,000,000

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–210, PT. A)

A changing economy and the shrinking market for unskilled labor have given new urgency to the need to provide vocational education for people of all ages. When Congress passed the Vocational Education Act of 1963, it was responding not only to present needs but also to future portents. By 1970, 58 million people who are working today will need training to keep pace with new methods, new materials, and new opportunity. As for the young, many of the 26 million who will have entered the labor market by 1970 will find that their high school studies, however worthwhile, have not supplied the special skills required for employment. The nature of work changes fast.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, which consolidates previous legislation in this field, assures the improvement of existing programs and the development of new ones to support the part-time employment that will enable many young people to continue their vocational training on a full-time

basis. Under the legislation, people in all communities can be given ready access to training or retraining which is keyed to job opportunities—present and future—and is suited to individual needs, interests, and ability. The act is directed both to youth and to adult workers: to high school students, unemployed high school dropouts, high school graduates who need additional training, adult employees who can profit from upgrading in learning or skills, and jobless or underemployed adults who need specialized training to become fully employable.

Research for improving quality

The legislation was written, moreover, with an eye to improving the quality of vocational education. The emphasis on quality is such, in fact, that the Commissioner of Education is authorized to channel 10 percent of funds authorized by the act into grants for research, experimentation in the curriculum, the development of instructional materials, teacher training, and other projects of a related nature.

The act will substantially expand the Nation's facilities for offering vocational instruction. It will help to fund classroom construction at area vocational technical schools and certain other schools offering comprehensive vocational courses and will provide initial equipment for them. One totally new feature of the bill is the authority to establish pilot residential vocational schools serving large urban areas, where youth between the ages of 15 and 21—youth who are unemployed and out of school—will live and learn a useful occupation. (This feature will be implemented upon appropriation of the necessary funds. They were not included in the fiscal year 1965 appropriation for the Office of Education.)

The following are some of the specific highlights of the act:

1. It continues grants to the States authorized under the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act (Public Law 347) and the 1946 George-Barden Act) (Public Law 79–586). It makes permanent the practical nurse training program (Title II, George-Barden Act) and the area technical education programs (Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act).

2. It allows the transfer of funds under these acts from one category of training to another, and for new purposes specified in the new act to help meet actual manpower needs and job opportunities.

3. It provides for special training for persons with academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

4. It stipulates that there must be periodic evaluation of State and local programs by officials of the States so that offerings keep pace with known and anticipated labor needs.

5. It instructs public employment offices to supply occupational information to schools for use in the vocational guidance and counseling of students. By the same token, it calls for information about students' occupational qualifications to be supplied to public employment offices. The aim is to relate vocational programs more directly to the realities of the labor market.

6. Under the bill, construction and equipment funds may be used for the vocational education quarters of high schools and colleges meeting certain conditions of instruction, as well as for area vocational centers.

7. Special funds may be used to support locally administered work-study programs authorized as a 4-year experiment; the programs, to be operated by schools and other institutions, would provide part-time employment for students of ages 15 to 21.

8. Grants for the operation of residential vocational schools are made available on a 4-year experimental basis (upon appropriation of funds) to State boards for vocational education, to colleges and universities, or, with State board approval, to local public education institutions.

9. If an existing State board does not meet certain criteria in its makeup, a State advisory council must be named to serve in a consultative capacity to the board in carrying out the State plan. The criteria call for junior colleges, technical institutes, and other institutions offering vocational training to be represented on the board, along with persons familiar with the vocational education needs of labor and management in the State.

The 1963 act authorizes the following appropriations:

Fiscal year 1964	$60,000,000
Fiscal year 1965	118,500,000
Fiscal year 1966	177,500,000
Fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter	225,000,000
For work-study programs (4 years):	
Fiscal year 1965	30,000,000
Fiscal year 1966	50,000,000
Fiscal year 1967	35,000,000
Fiscal year 1968	35,000,000

As the result of 1964 appropriations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and under earlier legislation, the following Federal funds are available for vocational education in fiscal 1965: $15 million through National Defense Education Act title VIII appropriations; $7,161,455 through Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917; $158,296,000 through George-Barden Act of 1946 and the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Allotment of Federal funds to States and possessions for vocational education authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–210), fiscal year 1965 [1]

Alabama	$2,444,832
Alaska	128,189
Arizona	978,265
Arkansas	1,348,007
California	7,651,248
Colorado	1,068,905
Connecticut	1,123,756
Delaware	204,805
Florida	3,347,839
Georgia	3,044,016
Hawaii	472,634
Idaho	502,829
Illinois	4,251,204
Indiana	2,589,590
Iowa	1,620,842
Kansas	1,306,482
Kentucky	2,245,932
Louisiana	2,395,272
Maine	659,252
Maryland	1,645,385
Massachusetts	2,348,897
Michigan	4,277,948
Minnesota	1,977,118
Mississippi	1,716,098
Missouri	2,311,645
Montana	436,321
Nebraska	826,226
Nevada	163,524
New Hampshire	366,271
New Jersey	2,716,801
New Mexico	712,867
New York	7,434,613
North Carolina	3,638,471
North Dakota	443,707
Ohio	5,269,589
Oklahoma	1,714,985
Oregon	1,013,770
Pennsylvania	6,078,813
Rhode Island	499,902
South Carolina	1,961,818
South Dakota	472,478
Tennessee	2,650,260
Texas	6,786,269
Utah	656,822
Vermont	$250,755
Virginia	3,079,742
Washington	1,671,148
West Virginia	1,281,164
Wisconsin	2,237,815
Wyoming	190,786
American Samoa	16,090
District of Columbia	323,488
Guam	49,147
Puerto Rico	2,021,876
Virgin Islands	23,492
Total	106,650,000

[1] Based upon an authorization of $118.5 million appropriated, 10 percent reserved for grants by the Commissioner of Education.

Allotment of Federal funds to States and possessions for work-study programs authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (sec. 13, Public Law 88–210), fiscal year 1965 [1]

Alabama	$99,072
Alaska	16,542
Arizona	46,988
Arkansas	59,820
California	396,986
Colorado	55,039
Connecticut	67,620
Delaware	20,568
Florida	129,769
Georgia	119,453
Hawaii	31,136
Idaho	28,368
Illinois	226,642
Indiana	117,189
Iowa	73,659
Kansas	61,330
Kentucky	91,524
Louisiana	96,053
Maine	34,155
Maryland	87,498
Massachusetts	124,989
Michigan	193,932
Minnesota	89,511
Mississippi	74,414
Missouri	106,117
Montana	26,858
Nebraska	42,710
Nevada	17,800
New Hampshire	24,342
New Jersey	148,641
New Mexico	35,916
New York	380,128
North Carolina	141,847
North Dakota	26,355
Ohio	232,429
Oklahoma	71,143
Oregon	52,523
Pennsylvania	263,126
Rhode Island	30,633
South Carolina	83,472
South Dakota	27,362
Tennessee	104,356
Texas	260,358
Utah	34,910
Vermont	19,310
Virginia	121,466
Washington	83,724
West Virginia	57,556
Wisconsin	101,337
Wyoming	17,800
American Samoa	10,634
District of Columbia	24,342
Guam	11,684
Puerto Rico	88,001
Virgin Islands	10,863
Total	5,000,000

[1] No more than 1 percent of such allotment or $10,000 (whichever is the greater) may be expended for the development of the State plan provisions for work-study programs or for the administration of such programs.

Allotments to States and territories, George-Barden and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1965 [1]

State or territory	Grand total	Title I						Title II—Practical nurse training	Title III [2]—Technical education
		Total	Agriculture	Distributive occupations	Home economics	Trades and industry	Fishery trades and industry		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Grand total, including supplemental acts	$49,795,823								
Grand total	49,490,823	$29,490,823	$10,309,997	$2,602,298	$8,182,825	$8,215,703	$180,000	$5,000,000	$15,000,000
Alabama	1,138,512	679,535	283,349	44,954	213,135	136,819	1,278	114,744	344,233
Alaska	253,204	151,128	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	16,128	25,519	76,557
Arizona	277,575	165,674	40,000	17,919	47,907	59,848		27,975	83,926
Arkansas	796,383	475,331	233,263	24,581	147,526	69,493	468	80,263	240,789
California	2,555,956	1,525,553	235,107	216,285	309,808	734,905	29,448	257,601	772,802
Colorado	432,580	258,191	89,720	24,136	66,636	77,699		43,597	130,792
Connecticut	460,436	274,817	40,000	34,887	79,425	119,947	558	46,405	139,214
Delaware	233,571	139,410	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	4,410	23,540	70,621
Florida	953,556	569,141	74,147	68,138	186,426	231,520	8,910	96,104	288,311
Georgia	1,285,476	767,252	286,460	54,261	254,730	168,921	2,880	129,556	388,668
Hawaii	228,355	136,296	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	1,296	23,015	69,044
Idaho	333,375	198,979	93,392	15,000	50,587	40,000		33,599	100,797
Illinois	2,129,233	1,270,858	395,878	138,727	280,445	454,728	1,080	214,594	643,781
Indiana	1,438,156	858,381	341,459	64,161	253,208	199,553		144,944	434,831
Iowa	1,327,191	792,150	465,787	37,947	187,127	100,101	1,188	133,760	401,281
Kansas	782,395	466,982	225,430	29,980	122,803	88,769		78,853	236,560
Kentucky	1,322,853	789,561	385,312	41,808	243,468	118,973		133,323	399,969
Louisiana	901,502	538,073	163,978	44,820	172,878	144,463	11,934	90,857	272,572
Maine	299,300	178,641	40,000	15,000	68,224	44,005	11,412	30,165	90,494
Maryland	657,931	392,694	77,479	42,669	122,368	142,870	7,308	66,309	198,928
Massachusetts	826,609	493,372	40,000	70,850	122,251	244,251	16,020	83,309	249,928
Michigan	1,797,787	1,073,031	310,134	107,655	301,140	352,680	1,422	181,189	543,567
Minnesota	1,311,008	782,491	413,253	46,978	186,588	135,024	648	132,129	396,388
Mississippi	1,155,193	689,491	381,807	29,973	196,130	78,125	3,456	116,425	349,277
Missouri	1,388,763	828,900	380,371	59,445	208,545	180,539		139,966	419,897
Montana	298,006	177,869	74,273	15,000	48,596	40,000		30,034	90,103
Nebraska	640,853	382,501	217,166	19,421	93,240	52,674		64,588	193,764
Nevada	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000		22,796	68,387
New Hampshire	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000		22,796	68,387
New Jersey	869,516	518,981	40,000	83,485	100,051	287,381	8,064	87,634	262,901
New Mexico	243,818	145,526	40,980	15,000	46,895	42,651		24,573	73,719
New York	2,690,653	1,605,949	228,411	230,941	354,071	786,244	6,282	271,176	813,528
North Carolina	2,032,856	1,213,335	568,575	62,697	397,977	179,046	5,040	204,880	614,641
North Dakota	432,210	257,970	143,764	15,000	59,206	40,000		43,560	130,680
Ohio	2,198,609	1,312,266	365,400	133,570	373,268	438,894	1,134	221,586	664,757
Oklahoma	733,509	437,804	182,132	32,040	124,772	98,860		73,926	221,779
Oregon	501,661	299,422	97,276	24,339	96,605	77,890	3,312	50,560	151,679
Pennsylvania	2,339,171	1,396,163	250,585	155,766	464,891	523,751	1,170	235,752	707,256
Rhode Island	230,931	137,834	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,872	1,962	23,274	69,823
South Carolina	972,703	580,570	246,985	32,787	202,470	97,050	1,278	98,033	294,100
South Dakota	434,600	259,396	144,671	15,000	59,725	40,000		43,801	131,403
Tennessee	1,425,296	850,705	412,688	49,087	245,971	142,383	576	143,648	430,943
Texas	2,342,819	1,398,340	488,465	131,826	345,666	424,481	7,902	236,120	708,359
Utah	226,979	135,475	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,475		22,876	68,628
Vermont	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000		22,796	68,387
Virginia	1,289,118	769,426	279,355	54,589	254,608	170,542	10,332	129,923	389,769
Washington	711,763	424,824	114,817	39,263	131,487	128,511	10,746	71,735	215,204
West Virginia	602,883	359,838	85,062	25,601	166,073	83,102		60,761	182,284
Wisconsin	1,363,794	813,997	389,561	54,380	206,572	162,332	1,152	137,449	412,348
Wyoming	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000		22,796	68,387
District of Columbia	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000		22,796	68,387
Guam	54,035							13,509	40,526
Puerto Rico	1,410,208	841,700	543,505	32,332	189,326	75,331	1,206	142,127	426,381
Virgin Islands	27,017							6,754	20,263
Total, supplemental acts	305,000								
Guam	80,000								
Puerto Rico	105,000								
Virgin Islands	40,000								
American Samoa	80,000								

[1] Based upon U.S. Census of Population, 1960.

[2] National Defense Education Act, title VIII.

Allotments to States, Smith-Hughes funds, fiscal year 1965 [1]

State	Total	Agriculture	Trades and industry and home economics	Teacher training	State	Total	Agriculture	Trades and industry and home economics	Teacher training
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Total	$7,161,455	$3,016,355	$3,041,787	$1,103,313	Missouri	$173,605	$80,100	$69,312	$24,193
					Montana	38,665	18,665	10,000	10,000
Alabama	143,330	81,863	43,172	18,295	Nebraska	64,271	35,813	18,458	10,000
Alaska	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	Nevada	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Arizona	51,789	18,401	23,388	10,000	New Hampshire	34,050	14,050	10,000	10,000
Arkansas	85,107	56,663	18,440	10,004	New Jersey	201,903	38,429	192,498	33,976
California	534,067	118,994	327,051	88,022	New Mexico	43,107	18,012	15,095	10,000
Colorado	66,744	25,594	31,150	10,000	New York	575,316	135,995	345,334	93,987
Connecticut	92,547	30,506	47,843	14,198	North Carolina	221,793	152,859	43,418	25,516
Delaware	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	North Dakota	42,740	22,740	10,000	10,000
Florida	187,558	71,604	88,223	27,731	Ohio	369,365	143,369	171,636	54,360
Georgia	172,456	97,839	52,534	22,083	Oklahoma	96,258	47,924	35,295	13,039
Hawaii	31,661	10,000	11,661	10,000	Oregon	73,613	37,105	26,508	10,000
Idaho	39,430	19,430	10,000	10,000	Pennsylvania	437,176	178,560	195,223	63,393
Illinois	360,319	107,716	196,145	56,458	Rhode Island	37,901	10,000	17,901	10,000
Indiana	193,488	97,255	70,121	26,112	South Carolina	114,757	77,766	23,647	13,344
Iowa	122,556	71,873	35,240	15,443	South Dakota	42,940	22,940	10,000	10,000
Kansas	91,385	47,167	32,017	12,201	Tennessee	159,386	94,475	44,934	19,977
Kentucky	143,135	93,514	32,606	17,015	Texas	359,602	132,767	173,185	53,650
Louisiana	134,293	66,401	49,651	18,241	Utah	38,478	12,402	16,076	10,000
Maine	48,182	26,204	11,978	10,000	Vermont	33,318	13,318	10,000	10,000
Maryland	118,672	47,000	54,307	17,365	Virginia	173,136	97,792	53,128	22,216
Massachusetts	179,461	46,955	103,672	28,834	Washington	113,306	50,503	46,824	15,979
Michigan	297,765	115,665	138,287	43,813	West Virginia	91,340	63,787	17,134	10,419
Minnesota	141,929	71,666	51,144	19,119	Wisconsin	162,247	79,342	60,773	22,132
Mississippi	107,308	75,332	19,778	12,198	Wyoming	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000

[1] Based upon U.S. Census of Population: 1960.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT, AMENDMENTS OF 1963 AND 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–210, PT. B) (PUBLIC LAW 88–665)

Virtually every school and college in the United States has felt the impact of the National Defense Education Act. National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, and has since been extended through fiscal year 1968.

In the 6 years since National Defense Education Act's enactment, the Federal Government has disbursed nearly $1 billion in program funds. The money went into the training of teachers in modern teaching methods using up-to-date subject matter. Money was translated into new equipment for science, mathematics, and language classrooms; for upgrading technical education—especially in those skill areas directly related to national defense industries—and technical equipment; and for loans and fellowships for able and needy students. The 1958 act was sweepingly original, and subsequent revisions and extensions have represented even further progress.

National Defense Education Act is a historic piece of education legislation because it represents a new emphasis in congressional approach to American education. The act reinforces "local education agencies" as the real source of teaching. An "agency" may be an elementary school, a high school, a college, junior college, or university. It may be a State-supported school for the handicapped. It may be a private nonprofit institution duly chartered for education by State authority. Thus, this law is neither an elementary nor secondary school act nor a higher education act: it is an act for the entire American education system.

Loans to college students

The original authors of National Defense Education Act—Congressmen and educators, lay leaders and professionals—believed that young men and women are the Nation's greatest natural resource and that this Act should work for them. Their wishes have materialized. The provisions for loans to college students (title II) have been the most frequently used of all. More than 600,000 undergraduates in more than 1,500 colleges and universities have taken advantage of the loan provisions. They have borrowed an average of $490 each, for a grand total of $453 million over 6 years.

The Federal Government deposited about 90 percent of this money in student loan funds established on the 1,500-plus campuses. The participating institutions made up the remaining 10 percent, a National Defense Education Act requirement that still stands.

National Defense Education Act student loans may be partially forgiven if the student goes on to be an elementary or secondary school teacher or instructor in an institution of higher education. To date, 45,000 young men and women have done this.

National Defense Education Act became law in that hectic period of 1957–59 when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I, the first manmade earth satellite in history, and the United States raced to match the feat. Suddenly the Nation realized that it was short of well-trained scientists, of translators and foreign language scholars, of mathematicians, and of specialists in a variety of critical subjects. The gap had to be closed, and the Congress set about to close it with National Defense Education Act.

Original categories are broadened

Title III of the original 1958 version of National Defense Education Act authorized the Federal Government to provide grants on a 50–50 matching basis to the States for the strengthening of instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools. In the course of writing the 1963 and 1964 amendments, Congress added English, reading, history, geography, and civics to the original subjects and broadened the eligible categories of audiovisual supplies and equipment that could be purchased with National Defense Education Act help.

Before the act was passed in 1958, only 33 subject-matter specialists were employed as supervisors in State departments of education, hardly enough to give local schools the help they needed to upgrade instruction. Today, as a result of this legislation, the States employ 227 subject-matter specialists who are busy year-round working with local school curriculum planners.

The Federal Government has disbursed about $237.6 million to the States under title III during the act's 6-year existence, as grants to States (on the 50–50 matching basis) or as loans to private elementary and secondary schools. About three-fourths of the money has gone into strengthening science. As the 1964 amendments begin to take effect, a new balance will doubtless be struck between the sciences and the other basic subjects.

Still, the Congress reasoned, there are bound to be imbalances of other kinds. If National Defense Education Act, through its undergraduate loan program, is encouraging young people to pursue excellence in critical subject areas, is it reasonable to leave the top students who want to become college teachers hanging in midair for lack of funds? The answer was built into title IV, the graduate fellowship program administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education with the advice and counsel of a committee of experts.

More graduate fellowships available

Since 1958, the Commissioner has expended $101 million under title IV. Only 1,500 graduate fellowships were authorized in the 1958 version of the act, but the 1964 amendments increased the number to 3,000 fellowships authorized for fiscal year 1965; to 6,000 for 1966; and 7,500 each for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Half of the $101 million already spent under title IV went to the individual students as annual stipends (from $2,000 to $2,400) and allowances ($400 for each dependent). The other half went to the institutions at which they pursued their studies. The Commissioner of Education awards each such institution $2,500 per year for every title IV fellow (less the amount charged for annual tuition). This is in recognition of the additional costs of instructional staff, library books, equipment, and space (laboratory, study, office) the institution must bear if it wishes to accommodate a graduate student.

Gifted students identified and counseled

Early identification of talented young people is one of the major goals of the National Defense Education Act. The tools of identification are guidance, counseling, and testing, which are supported under title V. So far in the 6-year history of title V, disbursements have reached a total of $80 million. Within that time, the number of full-time public school guidance counselors has risen 150 percent: from 12,000 in 1958 to 30,000 in 1964. With money available under part A of title V, more than 109 million scholastic aptitude and achievement tests have been given, in both public and private secondary schools.

When the act was passed in 1958, the pressing concern was to salvage the talented students who were then moving through secondary school but failing to go on to higher education. That initial emergency having been faced, the provisions of title V have been extended downward to meet the needs of elementary education, and upward to help students in public junior colleges and technical institutes.

Under part B of title V, guidance counselors or persons planning to become counselors in elementary, secondary, or higher education may attend training institutes set up by colleges and universities with Federal help. By the end of fiscal 1965, the Federal Government will have spent nearly $37 million for 480 counselor-training institutes. Forty percent of this total will have covered the colleges' operating costs; the remaining 60 percent will have been paid out to 15,700 enrollees as stipends and living allowances.

New thrust for language study

In 1958, jet flight suddenly became a reality. Every nation was at once the neighbor of every other nation on earth, yet the languages spoken by more than three-fourths of the world's people were barely noticed in American colleges and universities. The emphasis was on the "big four"—English, Spanish, French, and German—although these were the native tongue of only 22 percent of mankind. Nearly a third of the world's population spoke such languages as Chinese, Hindi, Russian, Japanese, Indonesian, Portuguese, Arabic, and Bengali. If the United States were to get along with its new neighbors, if it was to negotiate with them in the realms of trade, arms control, cultural exchanges, and so on, it desperately needed thousands of linguists.

Under title VI of the National Defense Education Act, about $11 million of Federal funds have so far gone to establish 55 language and area centers on the campuses of 34 colleges and universities. These centers offer instruction in some 90 previously neglected languages, each of which is spoken by millions of people. These centers teach more than the languages, however; they carry on studies of problems—political, social, economic—peculiar to the area in which each language is spoken.

An additional $16 million has gone into fellowships for approximately 2,600 students. In 1964, the first postdoctoral fellowships were awarded to 13 teachers from liberal arts colleges to help them become prepared to administer or teach new undergraduate programs of nonwestern studies.

Nearly as much money—$14 million—has been spent by the Federal Government over the past 6 years for 271 language research projects. These projects help America's schools and colleges determine which of the neglected foreign languages need special attention; what some of the successful teaching methods seem to be in this field; and how such teaching tools as foreign-language textbooks, dictionaries, and recordings may be better produced.

Teacher training is expanded

Title VI has produced a profound change in the conduct of language training in elementary and secondary schools through another of its provisions, one under which teacher-training institutes are set up by colleges and universities. More than 17,400 teachers will have attended 386 institutes by the end of the 1964–65 academic year. Two new institutes added in the summer of 1964 indicate the kind of fresh thinking the National Defense Education Act activity inspires. These were institutes for persons engaged in teaching English as a second language.

The language institute program has produced so much interest and activity that the

88th Congress in 1964 separated it from title VI and incorporated it into a new and separate title XI which will not only continue to support foreign language institutes but will establish institutes for school librarians, for educational media specialists, for teachers of history, geography, English, and reading, and for those teachers who work with disadvantaged youth. A total of $32.75 million for all title XI teacher-training institutes has been authorized by the Congress for each fiscal year from 1965 to 1968.

Communications technology is tested, exploited

The development of new technology for education received its most important thrust forward with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act title VII, which is concerned with new educational media, among them television, radio, motion pictures, tape recordings, teaching machines, and other devices.

Under title VII, more than $24 million had been obligated through September 1964 for research into communications media. This is a two-part program: First, the research projects are approved and carried out (262 of them since the start of the program in 122 institutions and education agencies), second, research findings are disseminated throughout the educational system (1,974 contracts to 105 institutions, agencies and individuals). American industry, informed of research results, has been able to provide schools and colleges with better equipment at moderate prices.

Aid to technical and vocational education

Title VIII of National Defense Education Act, dealing with technical education, has been of primary significance not only for education but for the American economy as a whole. Title VIII was written to help meet the space-age demand for highly skilled technicians in such fields as electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, and industrial chemistry.

Approximately 42,000 new technicians have completed training under the Area Vocational School Program authorized under title VIII. The Federal contribution has been $62 million, largely for salaries, instructional supplies, and equipment. In the 1963–64 academic year, about 210,000 youths and adults were enrolled in area vocational programs. About 90,000 of these were in preparatory programs of 2 or 3 years; the rest were adult workers in refresher or retraining courses.

States and individual communities participating in this broad-scale technical program have actually overmatched by two to one the amount of money contributed by the Federal Government.

Spreading scientific knowledge

The problem that motivated National Defense Education Act title IX is a technical one: Scientists are piling up knowledge at such breakneck speed that the conventional means for storing and disseminating it have bogged down. Title IX set up a Science Information Service in the National Science Foundation, together with an Advisory Council for it composed of leaders in the fundamental science and librarianship. The objective: a speedier, more efficient flow of information through indexing, abstracting, and translating of relevant materials and through the development of new technology for making research data accessible. The title is administered by the National Science Foundation.

State statistical services improved

In the course of writing National Defense Education Act and in listening to testimony, the 85th Congress became convinced that major improvements had to be made in the methods of collecting, processing, and disseminating educational statistics. Under title X, the U.S. Office of Education was authorized to make grants to State education agencies so that they might improve and expand their statistical services. Thus far the Office of Education has disbursed $7,768,000 under title X. With the help of this program, 37 States have installed new electronic data processing systems.

The 1964 amendments extended National Defense Education Act through June 30, 1968. Congress authorized the following funds:

	Fiscal 1965	Fiscal 1966	Fiscal 1967	Fiscal 1968
Title II	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
Title III	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Title IV	34,367,000	60,747,000	95,657,000	123,937,000
Title V–A	24,000,000	24,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Title V–B	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000
Title VI	13,000,000	14,000,000	16,000,000	18,000,000
Title VII	5,000,000	7,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Title VIII	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Title IX	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Title X	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
Title XI	32,750,000	32,750,000	23,750,000	32,750,000

[1] Program funded by National Science Foundation.

Aggregate authorizations for the National Defense Education Act will increase during this period from $382,417,000 for fiscal 1965 to $514,688,000 for fiscal 1968. To carry out the provisions of the act during the first of these years, Congress has appropriated $348,603,000.

When the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, the Senate majority leader was Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas. "There must be an awakening," Senator Johnson said, "not only in Congress, but throughout the country, and first things come first." In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson, speaking to a group of educators at the White House, noted that "the first work of these times and the first work of our society is education." He went on to say, "We must rest our faith and hopes for America on education—not for some, but education for all."

If there are any words anywhere which characterize the purpose and achievement of the National Defense Education Act, then these words of President Johnson can stand.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title II, sec. 202(a), as amended by amendments of 1964

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	162,176,927	178,066,889	188,693,302	193,658,914
Alabama	2,245,349	2,465,346	2,612,470	2,681,219
Alaska	65,807	72,255	76,567	78,581
Arizona	1,660,469	1,823,161	1,931,961	1,982,802
Arkansas	1,453,648	1,596,075	1,691,323	1,735,832
California	16,936,492	18,595,915	19,705,653	20,224,225
Colorado	2,270,206	2,492,639	2,641,391	2,710,901
Connecticut	2,071,351	2,274,300	2,410,023	2,473,444
Delaware	318,837	350,076	370,968	380,730
Florida	3,709,141	4,072,560	4,315,596	4,429,164
Georgia	2,704,085	2,969,029	3,146,211	3,229,006
Hawaii	568,096	623,757	660,981	678,375
Idaho	641,498	704,351	746,385	766,026
Illinois	8,082,566	8,874,490	9,404,088	9,651,564
Indiana	4,678,718	5,137,135	5,443,701	5,586,956
Iowa	3,103,388	3,407,456	3,610,801	3,705,822
Kansas	2,659,417	2,919,985	3,094,240	3,175,667
Kentucky	2,307,863	2,533,985	2,685,205	2,755,868
Louisiana	2,969,172	3,260,089	3,454,640	3,545,551
Maine	672,622	738,525	782,598	803,192
Maryland	2,298,143	2,523,313	2,673,896	2,744,262
Massachusetts	6,283,631	6,899,296	7,311,022	7,503,418
Michigan	7,057,009	7,748,449	8,210,849	8,426,924
Minnesota	3,954,895	4,342,392	4,601,531	4,722,624
Mississippi	1,931,505	2,120,752	2,247,311	2,306,451
Missouri	4,036,476	4,431,967	4,696,451	4,820,042
Montana	744,378	817,311	866,085	888,877
Nebraska	$1,546,967	$1,698,538	$1,799,901	$1,847,226
Nevada	176,388	193,670	205,228	210,629
New Hampshire	660,512	725,229	768,508	788,736
New Jersey	3,140,674	3,448,394	3,654,182	3,750,345
New Mexico	832,864	914,467	969,039	994,540
New York	13,144,547	14,432,439	15,293,716	15,696,183
North Carolina	4,104,514	4,506,671	4,775,613	4,901,287
North Dakota	786,815	863,906	915,461	939,552
Ohio	7,977,456	8,759,081	9,281,792	9,526,050
Oklahoma	2,636,526	2,894,850	3,067,605	3,148,331
Oregon	2,221,926	2,439,629	2,585,217	2,653,249
Pennsylvania	8,563,875	9,402,957	9,964,093	10,226,306
Rhode Island	861,757	946,192	1,002,657	1,029,043
South Carolina	1,640,605	1,801,350	1,908,849	1,959,082
South Dakota	758,931	833,290	883,018	906,255
Tennessee	3,205,418	3,519,483	3,729,513	3,827,658
Texas	8,943,740	9,820,040	10,406,065	10,679,909
Utah	1,844,824	2,025,579	2,146,458	2,202,944
Vermont	563,741	618,975	655,914	673,175
Virginia	2,706,635	2,971,829	3,149,177	3,232,050
Washington	3,265,223	3,585,147	3,799,097	3,899,073
West Virginia	1,424,223	1,563,767	1,657,088	1,700,695
Wisconsin	3,981,929	4,372,076	4,632,986	4,754,906
Wyoming	339,392	372,645	394,883	405,275
District of Columbia	1,422,683	1,562,076	1,655,295	1,698,856
American Samoa				
Canal Zone	23,157	25,426	26,944	27,653
Guam	16,890	18,545	19,651	20,169
Puerto Rico	1,081,698	1,187,682	1,258,558	1,291,678
Virgin Islands	1,328	1,458	1,545	1,586

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment (excluding U.S. service schools), fall 1963.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, as amended by amendments of 1964, for each of fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968

State	Acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects		State administration and supervision
	Grants for public schools	Loans for nonpublic schools	
United States and outlying parts	$79,200,000	$10,800,000	$10,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	77,769,460	10,672,056	9,837,327
Alabama	2,089,073	53,059	188,955
Alaska	95,345	3,727	50,000
Arizona	825,045	56,075	82,976
Arkansas	1,096,763	21,472	99,201
California	4,692,986	693,843	849,066
Colorado	866,393	76,660	100,434
Connecticut	707,227	194,312	127,955
Delaware	133,952	33,894	50,000
Florida	2,256,586	154,385	264,126
Georgia	2,513,700	46,138	227,362
Hawaii	274,115	53,946	50,000
Idaho	430,778	15,971	50,000
Illinois	2,836,888	929,856	494,570
Indiana	2,028,256	227,141	245,847
Iowa	1,361,199	171,598	144,386
Kansas	1,025,334	91,211	113,784
Kentucky	1,852,916	155,272	167,595
Louisiana	2,141,299	250,387	193,679
Maine	494,084	62,641	50,525
Maryland	1,306,554	242,402	170,060
Massachusetts	1,528,454	461,379	247,901
Michigan	3,281,426	594,469	436,240
Minnesota	1,730,299	297,944	186,490
Mississippi	1,482,787	33,716	134,117
Missouri	1,684,094	294,573	210,521
Montana	353,453	36,733	50,000
Nebraska	$687,541	$100,261	$73,734
Nevada	96,991	7,098	50,000
New Hampshire	271,085	61,931	50,000
New Jersey	1,681,223	525,262	304,177
New Mexico	667,596	48,090	60,383
New York	4,443,154	1,486,173	803,881
North Carolina	2,915,620	34,426	263,716
North Dakota	397,376	36,378	50,000
Ohio	3,755,845	674,145	524,761
Oklahoma	1,266,671	37,798	124,464
Oregon	799,514	62,109	94,888
Pennsylvania	4,186,466	1,082,466	557,418
Rhode Island	297,661	93,518	50,000
South Carolina	1,621,303	28,038	146,646
South Dakota	441,994	41,347	50,000
Tennessee	2,159,466	55,011	195,322
Texas	5,374,317	266,180	550,229
Utah	616,541	10,825	57,713
Vermont	203,123	31,232	50,000
Virginia	2,262,271	98,487	224,487
Washington	1,235,333	102,213	157,326
West Virginia	1,105,846	30,699	100,023
Wisconsin	1,852,429	454,281	212,369
Wyoming	165,221	6,921	50,000
District of Columbia	175,957	44,363	50,000
American Samoa	50,000	2,307	10,000
Canal Zone	50,000	1,242	10,000
Guam	50,000	8,695	10,000
Puerto Rico	1,230,540	110,199	122,673
Virgin Islands	50,000	5,501	10,000

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title V, pt. A, sec. 501, as amended by amendments of 1964

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$24,000,000	$24,500,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	23,616,000	24,108,000	29,520,000	29,520,000
Alabama	465,334	475,091	582,223	582,223
Alaska	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arizona	204,342	208,627	255,672	255,672
Arkansas	244,301	249,423	305,667	305,667
California	2,090,971	2,134,810	2,616,209	2,616,209
Colorado	247,335	252,521	309,464	309,464
Connecticut	315,112	321,719	394,267	394,267
Delaware	59,684	60,936	74,676	74,676
Florida	650,456	664,094	813,847	813,847
Georgia	559,919	571,658	700,567	700,567
Hawaii	93,067	95,018	116,445	116,445
Idaho	99,136	101,215	124,039	124,039
Illinois	1,217,962	1,243,498	1,523,907	1,523,907
Indiana	605,440	618,134	757,523	757,523
Iowa	355,576	363,031	444,895	444,895
Kansas	280,212	286,087	350,600	350,600
Kentucky	412,731	421,385	516,407	516,407
Louisiana	476,968	486,968	596,779	596,779
Maine	124,426	127,035	155,681	155,681
Maryland	418,801	427,582	524,001	524,001
Massachusetts	610,498	623,298	763,852	763,852
Michigan	1,074,315	1,096,840	1,344,177	1,344,177
Minnesota	459,265	468,894	574,629	574,629
Mississippi	330,286	337,211	413,252	413,252
Missouri	518,443	529,313	648,673	648,673
Montana	95,090	97,084	118,976	118,976
Nebraska	181,582	185,389	227,194	227,194
Nevada	$50,000	$50,000	$52,527	$52,527
New Hampshire	76,376	77,977	95,561	95,561
New Jersey	749,087	764,793	937,253	937,253
New Mexico	148,705	151,822	186,058	186,058
New York	1,979,695	2,021,201	2,476,982	2,476,982
North Carolina	649,445	663,061	812,581	812,581
North Dakota	88,515	90,371	110,749	110,749
Ohio	1,292,314	1,319,410	1,616,936	1,616,936
Oklahoma	306,514	312,940	383,508	383,508
Oregon	233,679	238,578	292,377	292,377
Pennsylvania	1,372,736	1,401,518	1,717,559	1,717,559
Rhode Island	101,665	103,797	127,203	127,203
South Carolina	361,140	368,712	451,856	451,856
South Dakota	98,631	100,699	123,406	123,406
Tennessee	481,014	491,099	601,842	601,842
Texas	1,355,033	1,383,444	1,695,409	1,695,409
Utah	142,129	145,109	177,831	177,831
Vermont	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652
Virginia	552,837	564,428	691,707	691,707
Washington	387,441	395,565	484,764	484,764
West Virginia	246,324	251,488	308,199	308,199
Wisconsin	522,995	533,961	654,369	654,369
Wyoming	50,000	50,000	56,957	56,957
District of Columbia	78,399	80,042	98,092	98,092
Outlying parts	384,000	392,000	480,000	480,000
American Samoa	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Canal Zone	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Guam	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Puerto Rico	304,000	312,000	400,000	400,000
Virgin Islands	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of school-age (5 to 17) population as of July 1, 1962, for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and as of Apr. 1, 1960, for the other outlying parts.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE TO FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS, AMENDMENTS OF 1963 AND 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88-210, PT. C) (PUBLIC LAW 88-665)

In many communities, especially those near military bases, the influx of new families generated by the growth of Federal operations has severely strained school facilities. Moreover, some school districts have borne an additional burden in that property acquired by the Federal Government has passed into tax-free status and been lost to the community as a source of revenue.

For these reasons, Congress, since 1950, has compensated local school districts for the expense of educating federally connected children. In some cases the Federal Government has constructed schools on Federal property to accommodate these children. In all, appropriations between 1950 and 1964 totaled $3.2 billions.

Legislation passed in 1963 and 1964 extend through fiscal 1965 and 1966, respectively, the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, which were originally enacted in 1950.

Public Law 815 grants school districts the funds to construct the minimum school facilities they need to house the overflow occasioned by federally connected children. Public Law 874 grants operating funds to school districts to relieve the day-to-day expenses stemming from the same cause. The 1964 amendment, which embodies the latest extension of these laws, makes the District of Columbia eligible for such help for the first time.

The funds are made available to local educational agencies which provide free public schooling to substantial numbers of children in the following categories: those whose parents work or live (or both) on Federal property in the vicinity; and those whose attendance in a school district is due to Federal contract activities.

To carry out Public Laws 815 and 874, the Congress has appropriated $390,400,000 for fiscal 1965.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT, AMENDMENTS OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–214)

The prosperity shared today by millions of Americans has a paradoxical, dark underside, the phenomenon of growing permanent unemployment. Poverty has become the way of life and hopelessness the outlook for millions of Americans concentrated primarily in mining, industrial, and farm communities.

The ranks of these hard-core jobless are being swelled not only by automation, shifts in market demands, and other economic and technological changes which are beyond any one man's power to control. They are also being fed afresh each year by the undereducated young and especially by high school dropouts. Dropouts will account for almost a third of the 26 million young workers expected to enter the labor force during the 1960's.

The disadvantage all these people share is lack of sufficient education. Many in the older group have never learned to write or do simple arithmetic. They are, therefore, the poorest candidates for the training programs of private industry.

Programs are extended and more accessible

Congress addressed itself to this problem by passing the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and amending it the following year.

Under the original act (Public Law 87–415), responsibilities are shared by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The former surveys employment opportunities in the States, selects people needing training, pays them training allowances, and helps place them in jobs. The latter, through the Office of Education's Division of Vocational and Technical Education, organizes the training.

Reflecting new information and experience, the 1963 amendments improve the program in several ways. They increase the original authorization and extend the life of several provisions, and they postpone State contributions until 1966 (at the same time lowering them temporarily). The most important changes, however, have the effect of making the program's benefits more accessible, particularly to the out-of-school young.

The amended act calls for special programs to test, counsel, select, and refer youths 16 and older for occupational training. The age of eligibility for allowances to accompany the training has now been lowered from 19 to 17, and trainees are permitted to work as much as 20 hours a week without endangering their allowances. Many of the disadvantaged young could not take advantage of training without some funds for necessities like transportation and clothing.

To be eligible for allowances, 17-year-olds must either be high school graduates or, if they have not completed high school, must have been out of a school a year and be considered beyond the reach of traditional schooling. The reason is to encourage dropouts to return to school.

Under the amendments, training for these young people may be provided by public agencies or in certain instances by private agencies designated by the State vocational education agencies.

Adult workers aided

In the stipulations of the act which affect older workers, the amount of work experience required for eligibility to receive allowances has been lowered from 3 years to 2, and the ceiling on the weekly allowance has been raised to $10 above the average State unemployment compensation payment. An unemployed member of a family or household may substitute for the unemployed head of the family as long as only one member of the family is receiving a training allowance at any one time.

For older workers an important new feature is the opportunity to learn skills in language and arithmetic. They may receive 20 weeks of additional allowances for training programs that include this kind of teaching.

Some hard-core unemployed are the victims of such changes in the economic climate as the departure of a factory from their home community. The act experiments with a new way to help them—with loans and grants to enable them to relocate where there are jobs.

The 1963 amendments authorize the following Federal support:

	Fiscal 1965	Fiscal 1966
For training and skills development.	$407,000,000 (increased from $161,000,000).	[1] $281,000,000
For information, evaluation, and research programs.	$3,000,000	3,000,000

[1] State matching (1/3 of cost) begins this year.

Funds to organize the training programs are transferred to the Office of Education each year from appropriations made to the Department of Labor.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–629)

President Johnson has called libraries "the best training ground for enlightenment that rational man has ever conceived." That statement underscores the impact of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964 on the intellectual, scientific, social, economic, and spiritual aspects of American life.

By passing the act, Congress sought to arrest the progressive deterioration of the Nation's libraries and to give hundreds of communities (in which more than 18 million Americans live) the first public libraries they have ever had.

Rural and urban communities benefit

The act amends the Library Services Act of 1956, passed originally to help States develop library services for rural readers. It does two main things: (1) It provides, for the first time, for Federal assistance in the construction of libraries as well as in library services, and (2) it extends Federal assistance, in both construction and services, to urban as well as rural areas. More than 100 million readers of all ages and interests are expected to benefit.

Under title I, dealing with services, the States may apply grant funds to salaries, books and other materials, equipment, and various operating expenses. Under title II, devoted to construction, States may apply for funds to build new public libraries and to expand and remodel old ones. The act allots funds to the States in proportion to their population, and each State matches the Federal share in proportion to its per capita income. The maximum Federal contribution is set at 66 percent; the minimum, 33 percent. The act requires that each State's plan for developing its network of library services be submitted to the Commissioner of Education by its library administrative agency.

The 1964 amendments authorized the following Federal funds:

For services: fiscal year 1964, $25 million; fiscal years 1965 and 1966, sums to be determined by Congress.

For construction: fiscal year 1964, $20 million; fiscal years 1965 and 1966, sums to be determined by Congress.

Grants for public libraries, fiscal year 1965

States and outlying parts	1964 allotment	1965 allotment library services	1965 allotment library construction	1965 total allotment
Total	$7,500,000	$25,000,000	$30,000,000	$55,000,000
Alabama	184,438	454,452	543,258	997,710
Alaska	53,748	124,540	112,073	236,613
Arizona	72,466	241,289	264,660	505,949
Arkansas	139,976	293,816	333,312	627,128
California	249,951	1,805,367	2,308,865	4,114,232
Colorado	85,158	290,309	328,728	619,037
Connecticut	93,825	375,081	439,523	814,604
Delaware	55,032	148,424	143,289	291,713
Florida	166,338	637,260	782,183	1,419,443
Georgia	212,626	527,841	639,175	1,167,016
Hawaii	54,572	168,658	169,743	238,392
Idaho	74,282	172,392	174,615	347,007
Illinois	230,053	1,193,838	1,509,614	2,703,452
Indiana	211,595	605,896	741,191	1,347,087
Iowa	166,813	399,202	471,048	870,250
Kansas	123,222	336,386	388,950	725,336
Kentucky	204,994	429,650	510,842	940,492
Louisiana	157,157	453,397	541,880	995,277
Maine	86,234	205,168	217,452	422,620
Maryland	122,927	436,435	519,710	956,145
Massachusetts	122,847	658,637	810,122	1,468,759
Michigan	244,077	948,841	1,189,411	2,138,252
Minnesota	166,448	470,415	564,122	1,034,537
Mississippi	172,914	336,335	388,883	725,218
Missouri	181,328	568,713	692,595	1,261,308
Montana	72,932	173,214	175,689	348,903
Nebraska	103,187	253,134	280,141	533,275
Nevada	$48,282	$130,954	$120,455	$251,409
New Hampshire	64,790	165,853	166,068	331,921
New Jersey	107,803	758,265	940,333	1,698,598
New Mexico	71,780	203,189	214,865	418,054
New York	279,948	1,920,933	2,459,907	4,380,840
North Carolina	309,703	594,357	726,111	1,320,468
North Dakota	80,123	168,622	169,687	338,309
Ohio	292,958	1,153,175	1,456,469	2,609,644
Oklahoma	124,556	352,626	410,175	762,801
Oregon	105,468	291,908	330,818	622,726
Pennsylvania	355,049	1,328,187	1,685,205	3,013,392
Rhode Island	51,417	193,257	201,884	395,141
South Carolina	177,210	358,519	417,877	776,396
South Dakota	80,475	173,838	176,504	350,342
Tennessee	206,690	487,040	585,851	1,072,891
Texas	274,252	1,139,425	1,438,499	2,577,924
Utah	61,883	196,636	206,300	402,936
Vermont	63,498	142,303	135,289	277,592
Virginia	212,544	530,427	642,555	1,172,982
Washington	129,106	409,583	484,616	894,199
West Virginia	152,545	301,862	343,827	645,689
Wisconsin	179,990	528,780	640,403	1,169,183
Wyoming	53,955	135,813	126,807	262,620
District of Columbia		182,892	188,337	371,229
American Samoa	11,963	27,176	22,843	50,019
Guam	15,190	32,274	29,508	61,782
Puerto Rico	168,303	354,933	413,190	768,123
Virgin Islands	11,379	28,483	24,552	53,035

The amendments also increased the basic allotments for public library services to each State from $40,000 to $100,000 and to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands from $10,000 to $25,000. The District of Columbia also is brought within coverage of the act as applied to States.

Appropriations totaling $55 million were made for library services and construction during fiscal 1965.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964: TITLES IV AND VI (PUBLIC LAW 88–352)

Congress included in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 two titles (IV and VI) that bear directly on the schools. These titles give the Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General new powers—within specified limitations—to take significant new steps on behalf of equal educational opportunity.

Title IV requires the Commissioner to conduct a survey for the President and the Congress on the lack of availability of equal opportunity in education because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The Commissioner is to make his report within 2 years, and it is to cover public education at all levels in all sections of the Nation.

The same title authorizes the Commissioner to respond to requests of local officials for technical assistance in the form of materials and advice to help achieve desegregation and prepare teaching staffs and communities for the transition.

Broad technical assistance is possible

Congress recognizes in title IV that, as more Negro children are taken into the regular school system, many communities will face educational problems they had never confronted before. Many of the children will come from neglected schools and from backgrounds which have isolated them from the rest of society. Title IV gives the Commissioner the means to help communities deal not only with the desegregation process itself but with the educational challenge issuing from it. He can arrange with colleges, universities, and school districts for special training institutes for teachers and administrators. He is authorized to grant school districts additional funds to hire specialists in the education of disadvantaged children. On request of a school district, the Office of Education can send consultants—either from the Office staff or from a university or neighboring school district—to help plan and execute improvements in the educational program for children involved in desegregation.

Under title IV the Attorney General also is endowed with new authority which bears directly on education. He has the power for the first time to initiate civil suits against school boards which deny a child equal protection under the law, and against authorities of public colleges which deny any person's enrollment for reasons of race, religion, color, or national origin. Strict boundaries are drawn, however, on the Attorney General's powers. Among the most important are these: The complaint of discrimination must originate with those affected; the Attorney General must deem the complaint justified; and the individual or parents involved must be deemed unable to initiate or maintain legal proceedings themselves for such reasons as expense or jeopardy to their personal welfare.

In title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Congress outlawed discrimination in federally assisted programs. Title VI imposes the responsibility on each agency of the Government to insure that such discrimination is ended—by voluntary compliance if possible but if necessary by discontinuing Federal assistance. The legislation stipulates a 30-day waiting period before funds can be withheld, provides an opportunity for a hearing, and sets forth provisions for judicial review.

Appropriations of $8 million were made for fiscal 1965 to enable the Office of Education to carry out its responsibilities under the Civil Rights Act.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT, AMENDMENTS OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 87–274)

There is convincing documentation that there is no single cause of juvenile delinquency but rather that it springs from a combination of forces—some social and economic, some personal. Among them are lack of education, joblessness, slum housing, racial discrimination and an array of other problems that transcend individual responsibility and the resources of most communities to deal with them. They are disorders of the society as a whole; and they make juvenile delinquency and youth crime a national as well as local concern.

Delinquency began receiving particularly intensive national attention in 1961 with appointment of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, composed of the Attorney General and the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Further concern was focused on delinquency with passage of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. Through this act and 1964 amendments to it, Congress has paved the way for new approaches to combat juvenile delinquency on many fronts.

The act gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the other two members of the President's Committee, the authority to make grants to Government agencies and to private nonprofit groups and institutions for three purposes.

Pilot projects are supported

The first is to generate demonstrations of experimental programs to counteract delinquency and hopefully to make lasting changes in the social patterns that give rise to it. These demonstrations may range from new techniques for training workers involved in youth problems to practices for encouraging cooperation among social workers, teachers, the police, the courts, and others concerned with the fate of young people. Many of the designs for these demonstrations have originated with schools of education and social work and represent the results of years of research.

The second purpose of the grants program directly involves education. Funds are made available to spur the training of manpower which a concerted attack on delinquency demands. One result is the establishment of 14 training centers at as many universities to prepare youth workers in a wide variety of fields. Curriculum development is continuing at universities and at agencies in the fields of health, welfare, correction, law enforcement, and the like. In addition, short-term workshops are being offered by sponsors ranging from schools of education to local courts.

The legislation also addresses itself to the shortage of trained professional and volunteer help by authorizing traineeships in connection with the training centers and workshops. These traineeships are designed to transmit new knowledge and techniques to social workers, teachers, probation officers, policemen, and guidance counselors.

More information is needed

The third purpose of the grants program is to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make studies of problems, trends, and projects related to youth crime and delinquency, and to encourage the free flow of information among all those in the Nation working toward prevention and control.

The 1964 amendments (Public Law 87–274) extend the original act through fiscal 1966 and supplement it with three new provisions. One of these will result in a special study of the impact on delinquency of compulsory school attendance and child labor laws. The others broaden the scope of the demonstration projects to include "techniques for the establishment of high ethical and community standards" and to establish in the District of Columbia a special demonstration of ways in which a community can mobilize to curb delinquency.

The amendments authorize the following funds:

For fiscal 1965: $10 million, plus a special $5 million grant (available over a period of several years until expended) for the District of Columbia project.

For fiscal 1966: Sum to be determined by subsequent legislation.

Congress made a fiscal 1965 appropriation of $10 million for demonstrations, training programs, and technical assistance and $1,500,000 for the 1965 cost of the District of Columbia project.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, EDUCATION PROVISIONS (PUBLIC LAW 88–452)

The education theme is woven securely into the pattern for social change laid out by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The act was passed to mobilize the Nation for the rescue of 30 million Americans from the brutalizing conditions which are spawned by poverty and perpetuated by joblessness, illness, dilapidated housing, and despair—but most of all by ignorance and illiteracy. The act recognizes education as an essential means of relieving the harassments which typically have paralyzed the poor, often for generations.

The legislation calls, for example, for a Job Corps which will enroll the unemployed youth of impoverished families and give them another chance for education and vocational training while they accumulate work experience in fields like conservation, where manpower is in short supply. Such schooling is believed likely to take with these young people because it will occur in a wholesome setting—in conservation camps and residential training centers now being established in rural and urban areas of the Nation.

Schools have important role

In this plan to salvage youth of 16 to 21 and make them more employable, public schools and private vocational and technical institutes have an important role to play. The new Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in the Executive Office of the President has been authorized to provide support for the contributions these institutions can make to the instruction of Job Corps members.

Some 140,000 young men and women are expected to enroll during the Corps' first 2

years of operation. The plan includes paying for the maintenance and living expenses of these young people and compensating them, albeit nominally, for each month of satisfactory work when they have completed their 6 months to 2 years of service.

The focus of another section of the bill is on teenagers who are headed toward dropping out of school and those who have already left but might be induced to return. The cooperation of guidance counselors and teachers will be needed to identify such youngsters. Envisioned for them is a half-time job and half-time school arrangement, with State and local governments and institutions of a public character (such as hospitals and settlement houses) putting the teenagers to work at useful tasks with the aid of Federal funds. Hopefully, the arrangement will sufficiently change the outlook of young people headed for trouble to encourage them to continue their schooling. Their work will at the same time benefit their communities and give them experience as a nurse's aid, laboratory assistant, or landscape gardener—to name a few of the possibilities. The Department of Labor will administer this work-training program.

Since illiteracy tends almost inevitability to perpetuate a life of poverty, the new legislation contains a provision authorizing adult basic literacy programs for people of 18 or over. Grants to the States to help establish programs to teach reading, writing, and other basic skills are being administered by the Office of Education. Each State is entitled to a basic allotment of $50,000, and a formula based on the number of adults with less than a sixth grade education is provided in the act for the distribution of additional sums. The Federal share during the first 2 years may range up to 90 percent of costs, but in the third year may not exceed 50 percent.

Complements area redevelopment

This activity complements that conducted by the Office of Education under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. This act provides occupational training for underemployed and unemployed persons in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as suffering persistent or chronic unemployment. Funds for training projects are provided by the Department of Labor, $3,335,000 in the 1965 fiscal year. In fiscal 1964 a total of 11,603 persons received training in 38 States.

Another program in the antipoverty bill will help many students of low-income families achieve their aspirations for a college education. Here, funds administered by the Office of Education go directly to the colleges and universities to enable them to offer such students useful part-time work. The work may be on campus or may originate in the community through arrangements made by the college. When the latter is the case, however, the job must serve some public interest—recreation, social service, or the like—and must be work that would not otherwise be accomplished. Under this work-study plan, some of the estimated 150,000 students who will benefit initially are likely to be working part time in activities which will spring from other sections of the new legislation—such as tutoring in the community action programs.

These community action programs often have been characterized as the heart of the new act. Their spirit is one of democratic self-help, their intent to marshal all the resources and motivation which communities can tap within themselves to strike at the causes of poverty.

The community draws its own plan

Each community is to be the architect of its own total design for attacking poverty at its sources, but it is required that designs be founded on the maximum feasible participation of people within the area. Communities submitting plans which meet with OEO approval become eligible for Federal support ranging up to 90 percent of the cost. Technical help will be given to local communities during both the planning and action phases by the OEO field staff and, where appropriate, by the staffs of other Federal agencies as well—for example, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. State agencies in education and other fields will receive Federal support to enable them to serve as further sources of technical aid to communities. Local nonprofit agencies and institutions, as well as agencies of local government, may take the initiative in designing community action programs and still be eligible for Federal help.

No blueprints for these programs appear in the legislation, since they must evolve from each community's self-analysis. In general, however, they are expected to include projects geared to the problems of the poor in numerous fields—among them, employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, and of course education. Hopefully, the entire education potential of communities will be engaged to mesh with the larger plan. For, while the legislation prohibits Federal support for general education purposes (thus no schools can be built, for example, or teachers' salaries supplemented), the enabling phrase "special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance" which appears in the law was designed to stimulate a variety of education projects to offset the effects of poverty.

Support the extra effort

The phrase qualifies for Federal support many educational activities which are carried on before, after, in addition to, or alongside the regular school program (i.e., the program a school district had in operation when it applied for the support). These activities might include:

Preschool activities to help cancel out educational disabilities that take root early in life and predispose children to school failure.

The lighted schoolhouse serving the community's needs by night as well as during the day and offering remedial reading and arithmetic after school, specialized night classes for parents, or a place for the children of the poor to study.

Backup services to teachers to give them a better chance for succeeding in slum schools—for example, Federal funds to cover the salary of a specialist in speech and hearing.

Projects to bring art and music within reach of the deprived child and expand his view of the world.

Since its interests run parallel to such undertakings, the Office of Education's Task Force on the Education of Disadvantaged Youth is making available to the OEO the results of its own research projects and the insights which have flowed from them. But how imaginatively the Nation carried out the educational mandate which is implicit in the community action section of the new law will depend in great part on the ability of the Nation's schoolpeople to come up with creative ideas.

Education will receive support in another section of the act as well—for instance, through the programs to aid migrant workers and to train the parents of dependent children. The programs in which education plays a prime part are authorized to receive the following funds:

Fiscal 1965:	
Youth programs (Job Corps, work-training, work-study)	$412,500,000
Urban and rural community action programs	315,000,000
Adult basic education programs	25,000,000

Sums for fiscal 1966 and 1967 will be determined by subsequent authorizations.

The total authorization for the Economic Opportunity Act, including the above educational activities as well as others, is $947,500,000 for fiscal year 1965. Sums appropriated amount to $800 million.

Work-study program fund distribution by States

Alabama	$1,716,951
Alaska	53,775
Arizona	611,507
Arkansas	1,055,469
California	5,809,750
Colorado	737,359
Connecticut	748,034
Delaware	143,963
Florida	1,873,202
Georgia	1,926,678
Hawaii	247,874
Idaho	272,011
Illinois	3,169,810
Indiana	1,682,425
Iowa	1,203,831
Kansas	933,763
Kentucky	1,464,578
Louisiana	1,732,678
Maine	342,086
Maryland	1,025,401
Massachusetts	1,870,943
Michigan	2,733,109
Minnesota	1,465,634
Mississippi	1,475,646
Missouri	1,728,984
Montana	283,175
Nebraska	616,509
Nevada	80,431
New Hampshire	212,367
New Jersey	1,553,989
New Mexico	415,312
New York	5,085,160
North Carolina	2,536,967
North Dakota	336,631
Ohio	3,149,790
Oklahoma	1,118,484
Oregon	714,246
Pennsylvania	3,705,820
Rhode Island	296,218
South Carolina	1,360,279
South Dakota	355,295
Tennessee	1,858,717
Texas	4,317,727
Utah	479,008
Vermont	184,663
Virginia	1,636,483
Washington	1,088,613
West Virginia	878,882
Wisconsin	1,493,608
Wyoming	125,246
District of Columbia	356,919
Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands	1,434,000
Total	70,266,000

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—FUND DISTRIBUTION BY STATES

Estimated distribution of $228,900,000 [1] with ⅓ on the basis of public assistance recipients; ⅓ on the basis of unemployment; and ⅓ on the basis of the number of children under 18 in families with income of less than $1,000

	Total estimated State amounts	Estimated State amounts on basis of		
		Public assistance recipients [2]	Unemployment [3]	Children under 18 in families with income less than $1,000 [4]
United States and outlying parts	$228,900,000	$76,300,000	$76,300,000	$76,300,000
50 States and District of Columbia	223,180,000	74,393,333	74,393,334	74,393,333
Alabama	6,820,544	2,115,677	1,141,377	3,563,490
Alaska	279,626	69,349	122,290	87,987
Arizona	1,802,985	633,862	487,221	681,902
Arkansas	3,485,062	978,643	636,687	1,869,732
California	20,026,577	8,245,714	7,997,405	3,783,458
Colorado	2,097,816	1,006,315	607,570	483,931
Connecticut	2,314,517	863,251	1,077,320	373,946
Delaware	424,014	164,564	149,466	109,984
Florida	6,045,590	1,886,651	2,135,229	2,023,710
Georgia	6,198,027	1,841,865	1,232,610	3,123,552
Hawaii	586,487	179,519	230,993	175,975
Idaho	672,868	193,434	281,462	197,972
Illinois	10,473,529	4,159,357	3,806,532	2,507,640
Indiana	3,413,240	716,517	1,486,896	1,209,827
Iowa	2,666,764	854,547	580,394	1,231,823
Kansas	1,896,069	695,881	584,276	615,912
Kentucky	5,380,845	1,487,929	1,077,320	2,815,596
Louisiana	6,393,796	2,562,965	1,279,197	2,551,634
Maine	1,118,624	452,851	401,811	263,962
Maryland	2,893,312	997,582	1,059,850	835,880
Massachusetts	5,316,684	1,921,115	2,581,686	813,883
Michigan	7,924,188	2,897,569	3,002,909	2,023,710
Minnesota	3,950,395	1,258,844	1,525,718	1,165,833
Mississippi	6,330,546	1,738,946	720,155	3,871,445
Missouri	5,846,371	2,379,736	1,684,890	1,781,745
Montana	694,720	219,821	232,934	241,965
Nebraska	1,174,455	295,833	372,695	505,927
Nevada	284,114	80,948	159,172	43,994
New Hampshire	467,301	147,676	209,641	109,984
New Jersey	6,000,110	1,626,891	3,317,370	1,055,849
New Mexico	1,346,786	451,998	300,873	593,915
New York	18,559,853	6,874,697	8,385,629	3,299,527
North Carolina	8,152,018	1,892,451	1,508,248	4,751,319
North Dakota	734,861	175,211	207,700	351,950
Ohio	9,753,590	3,798,502	3,645,419	2,309,669
Oklahoma	3,623,579	1,679,351	844,386	1,099,842
Oregon	1,568,612	507,510	687,156	373,946
Pennsylvania	13,843,764	4,692,989	6,489,157	2,661,618
Rhode Island	1,130,101	395,092	493,044	241,965
South Carolina	4,662,941	705,360	790,035	3,167,546
South Dakota	896,035	199,234	168,877	527,924
Tennessee	6,079,477	1,469,029	1,486,896	3,123,552
Texas	12,219,350	3,242,300	3,499,835	5,477,215
Utah	917,502	381,776	337,754	197,972
Vermont	414,439	116,167	188,288	109,984
Virginia	4,382,525	719,942	956,971	2,705,612
Washington	3,325,239	1,466,360	1,286,961	571,918
West Virginia	4,163,690	1,543,353	1,102,555	1,517,782
Wisconsin	3,162,960	1,070,532	1,234,551	857,877
Wyoming	326,477	89,024	149,466	87,987
District of Columbia	937,025	248,603	446,457	241,965
Outlying parts [5]	5,720,000	1,906,667	1,906,666	1,906,667

[1] $315,000,000 minus $20,000,000 for research and training (sec. 207), minus $9,000,000 for technical assistance and training (secs. 206 and 209), minus 2 percent of the balance ($5,720,000) for distribution to the territories, and minus $57,100,000 reserved for distribution by Director, Office of Economic Opportunity (sec. 203).

[2] Public assistance recipients, January 1964.

[3] Total unemployment, average 1963 (preliminary 11-month average). Data for Tennessee are for 1962.

[4] Estimate based on the assumption that there are an average of 5 children in families with 4 or more children as shown in PC–1–D series, 1960 census.

[5] Includes American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Estimated distribution by States of $24,460,000 for the adult basic education program

State	Population [1]	Distribution
Alabama	369,538	$766,796
Alaska	12,123	50,000
Arizona	93,587	194,194
Arkansas	202,170	419,505
California	687,376	1,426,315
Colorado	59,262	122,969
Connecticut	136,029	282,262
Delaware	21,229	50,000
Florida	357,352	741,510
Georgia	476,075	987,862
Hawaii	51,426	106,710
Idaho	17,745	50,000
Illinois	517,183	1,073,162
Indiana	178,192	369,751
Iowa	70,074	145,405
Kansas	61,058	126,696
Kentucky	308,090	639,291
Louisiana	443,389	920,038
Maine	35,010	72,646
Maryland	196,031	406,767
Massachusetts	247,132	512,802
Michigan	339,026	703,484
Minnesota	98,952	205,327
Mississippi	278,065	576,989
Missouri	244,266	506,855
Montana	21,563	50,000
Nebraska	41,022	85,121
Nevada	8,012	50,000
New Hampshire	20,160	50,000
New Jersey	363,811	754,913
New Mexico	71,915	149,225
New York	1,081,984	2,245,131
North Carolina	530,639	1,101,083
North Dakota	26,136	54,233
Ohio	421,276	874,153
Oklahoma	145,550	302,018
Oregon	47,761	99,105
Pennsylvania	630,417	1,308,124
Rhode Island	48,727	101,109
South Carolina	318,568	661,033
South Dakota	21,947	50,000
Tennessee	384,621	798,094
Texas	914,439	$1,897,473
Utah	17,551	50,000
Vermont	11,886	50,000
Virginia	392,678	814,812
Washington	78,304	162,482
West Virginia	151,204	313,750
Wisconsin	168,461	349,559
Wyoming	9,361	50,000
District of Columbia	44,359	92,046
Outlying parts (Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands)		489,200

Estimated distribution by States of $24,460,000 for the adult basic education program—Continued

[1] Estimated population 18 and over with less than 6 grades of school completed.

NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–579)

Historically, encouragement for the arts has depended in the United States on private philanthropy, civic endeavor, and commercial sponsorship. It has not been seen as a national concern.

The National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, however, opens the way for a significant departure from this pattern. It establishes a National Council on the Arts in the Executive Office of the President, with a membership composed of practicing artists, cultural leaders, authorities in the various arts, and, ex officio, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The act invests this group with a number of responsibilities—among them to recommend means of increasing the Nation's cultural resources, to foster artistic endeavors both nationally and internationally, and to build a greater appreciation of the arts.

These undertakings will reinforce the efforts of schools to give students experience with artistic achievement. They will also complement Office of Education programs to foster research and teaching in the arts and humanities.

To enable the Council to carry out its work, the act authorizes appropriations of $150,000. Congress appropriated $50,000 for the Council's use in fiscal 1965.

NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–581)

Like schools in the other health professions, schools of nursing have been struggling with overstrained facilities, underpowered teaching staffs, and overburdened budgets. Moreover, the scarcity of student aid funds discourages many young women from entering a profession so short of personnel that 1 in 20 professional nursing posts in hospitals goes unfilled. Enrollment is rising; but the gains are offset by two recent developments. One is the tendency to delegate greater responsibility for medical procedures to nurses, thereby reducing the number of patients each nurse can care for. The second is the growth of the Nation's older-aged population, a trend that has enormously increased the need for long-term care. As a result of all these developments, the shortage of nursing talent has become critical.

Critical shortage of nurses predicted

The 1962 report of the Public Health Service's Consultant Group on Nursing pointed out that the Nation would require 300,000 new nurses by 1970 but that under existing circumstances it stood no chance of reaching that goal. Congress answered with the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

The new act authorizes construction grants to boost the enrollment capacity of colleges, universities, junior colleges, and hospitals.

It allows Federal contribtuions of as much as two-thirds of the cost of new buildings and half the cost of improving existing facilities. Schools are prohibited, however, from using these funds for living quarters, offsite improvements, facilities for patient care, or buildings used for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

Federal support also is authorized for a wide range of teaching improvement projects, among them efforts to develop the curriculum, experiment with new teaching methods, upgrade faculties, and improve supervision in clinical practice. Proposed projects will be judged according to their potential adaptability to the needs of nursing schools in general and their ability to contribute to a better geographic distribution of first-class nursing education across the country.

The act singles out for special support the accredited diploma schools operated by hospitals, many of which have been curtailing their programs or closing their doors because of spiraling costs. A grant formula for these schools is related to the increased enrollment they can expect as the result of the student loan funds authorized in another section of the act.

The bill launches a major student loan program to attract new recruits to nursing. Further, it enlarges the existing program of graduate traineeships in order to propagate the supervisory, administrative, and teaching talents, and clinical specialties.

All three major types of nursing schools (those of colleges and universities, those of junior colleges, and those of hospitals) are eligible to participate in the student loan program as long as they are public or nonprofit and meet accreditation requirements. The loans are earmarked for students who qualify both by need and academic standing. They are limited to $1,000 per student per year and may not run concurrently with a National Defense Education Act loan; and they are accompanied by a "forgiveness" clause allowing as much as 50 percent of the loan to be canceled over the years in return for full-time service as a nurse in a public or nonprofit setting.

A program for leadership

The traineeships are intended to qualify graduate nurses for leadership roles. They may be used either for full-time university study (maximum, 24 months) or for short-term training organized by health agencies and other nonprofit sponsors. The funds go to the institutions, which select trainees according to their own policies but in keeping with criteria spelled out in the act. For example, in the awarding of university traineeships, need as well as ability must be a factor. In the case of short-term awards, the trainee must be employed in (or committed to) a clinical specialty or an administrative, supervisory, or teaching post from which the individual's employer agrees to a temporary release.

Various divisions of the Public Health Service are responsible for administering the Nurse Training Act. To assist in policy matters, the legislation sets up a National Advisory Council on Nurse Training with the Surgeon General as Chairman and the Commissioner of Education (ex officio) among the 17 members.

The following funds were authorized for the Nurse Training Act:

	Fiscal 1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Construction grants	(1)	$15,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000
Teaching improvement grants	$2,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Reimbursement, diploma schools	4,000,000	7,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Student loans	3,100,000	8,900,000	16,800,000	25,300,000	30,900,000
Traineeships	8,000,000	9,000,000	10,000,000	11,000,000	12,000,000

[1] Program to begin in fiscal 1966.

NOTE.—To carry out the provisions of the Nurse Training Act in fiscal 1965 Congress appropriated $17,000,000.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Inquiries about the legislation discussed in this booklet should be directed to the Federal agencies indicated below. Where the source given is the Office of Education, please complete the address by adding: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20202.

Health Professions Educational Assistance Act: Bureau of State Services (Community Health), Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act: Education provisions: Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, Office of Education.

Higher Education Facilities Act: Bureau of Higher Education Facilities, Office of Education.

Vocational Education Act: Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education.

National Defense Education Act

Title II, student loans: Student Financial Aid Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title III, instruction in critical subjects: Instructional Resources Branch, Division of State Grants, Office of Education.

Title IV, graduate fellowships: Graduate Fellowship Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title V–A, guidance, counseling, and testing services: Guidance and Counseling Program Branch, Division of State Grants, Office of Education.

Title V–B, guidance and counseling training institutes: Counseling and Guidance Institutes Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title VI, language development: Language Development Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title VII, communications media: Media Research and Dissemination Program, Division of Educational Research, Office of Education.

Title VIII, technical education: Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education.

Title IX, science information: National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., 20550.

Title X, State statistical services: Field Programs Branch, Division of Education Statistics, Office of Education.

Title XI, training institutes, critical subjects: Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

School assistance to federally affected areas: Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Office of Education.

Manpower Development and Training Act: Training provisions: Manpower Development and Training Program, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education. All other provisions: Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 20210.

Library Services and Construction Act: Division of Library Services, Office of Education.

Civil Rights Act of 1964: Education assistance programs: Office of the Commissioner, Office of Education.

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

Economic Opportunity Act (education provisions)

Job Corps: Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 20506.

Work-training programs: Neighborhood Youth Corps, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 20210.

College work-study programs: Student Financial Aid Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Adult basic education program: Adult Education Branch, Division of Library Services, Office of Education.

Community action program: Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 20506.

National Arts and Cultural Development Act: National Council on the Arts, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 20506.

Nurse Training Act: Bureau of State Services (Community Health), Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

CHRONOLOGY OF LEGISLATION

Public Law No. 88–129: Health Professions Educational Asisstance Act of 1963, date signed by President, September 24, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–164: Education Provisions (title III), Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, date signed by President, October 31, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–204: Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, date signed by President, December 16, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–210, part A: Vocational Education Act of 1963, date signed by President, December 18, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–210, part B: National Defense Education Act, Amendments of 1963,[2] date signed by President, December 18, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–210, part C: School Assistance to Federally Affected Areas Amendments of 1963,[2] date signed by President, December 18, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–214: Manpower Development and Training Act Amendments of 1963, date signed by President, December 19, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–269: Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, date signed by President, February 11, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–352: Civil Rights Act of 1964: titles IV and VI, date signed by President, July 2, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–368: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Contract Act, Amendments of 1964, date signed by President, July 9, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–452: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, date signed by President, August 20, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–579: National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, date signed by President, September 3, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–581: Nurse Training Act of 1964, date signed by President, September 4, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–665: National Defense Education Act, Amendments of 1964; and School Assistance to Federally Affected Areas Amendments of 1964,[2] date signed by President, October 16, 1964.

[2] The National Defense Education Act and federally affected areas laws were amended twice by the 88th Congress.

Office of Education—fiscal 1965 appropriations	
Higher education facilities construction (Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Public Law 88–204)	[1] $463,150,000
Morrill Land-Grant College Act (Aug. 30, 1890, as amended)	2,550,000
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanical arts (Bankhead-Jones Act, Public Law 74–184, as amended)	11,950,000
Assistance for school construction in federally affected areas (Public Law 81–815, as amended)	58,400,000
Payments to school districts (maintenance and operations) (Public Law 81–874 as amended)	332,000,000
National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864, as amended, including 1963 and 1964 amendments)	[1] $348,603,000
Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act (Public Law 64–347, as amended)	7,161,455
Expansion and improvement of vocational education (Public Law 79–586, as amended, and including Public Law 88–210)	158,296,000
Assistance for public library services and construction (Public Law 84–597, as amended, including Public Law 88–269)	55,000,000
Educational improvement for the handicapped (Public Law 85–926, as amended, and including Public Law 88–164)	16,500,000
Cooperative Research Act (Public Law 83–531)	$15,840,000
Educational research—special foreign currency program (Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 83–480, as amended)	500,000
Foreign language training and area studies (Fulbright-Hays Act, Public Law 87–256)	1,500,000
Civil rights educational activities (Public Law 88–352)	8,000,000
Salaries and expenses	[2] 19,699,000
Total	1,499,149,455

[1] Includes loans as well as grants.

[2] Total administrative expense of Office of Education and authorized programs.

Legislative progress, National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (H.R. 3000, S. 580)

(Following is a description of the progress of the 24 parts of the omnibus education bill sent to the Congress by President Kennedy on Jan. 29, 1963. Public law numbers are indicated.)

24 parts	Committee or 1-House action	Extended without amendment	Substantially or totally enacted
1. Student loans (title II, National Defense Education Act)			
2. Student loan insurance			Public Law 88–210, 665.
3. College work-study program (title I–C of Economic Opportunity Act)			
4. Graduate fellowships (title IV, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88–452.
5. Higher education facilities, loans for			Public Law 88–210, 665.
6. Public community college academic facilities			Public Law 88–204.
7. College-level technical education			Public Law 88–204.
8. College and university libraries			Public Law 88–204.
9. Graduate schools			Public Law 88–204.
10. Modern foreign language training and research (title VI–A, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88–204.
11. Institutes for advanced study for teachers (includes title V–B of National Defense Education Act and new title XI)			Public Law 88–210, 665.
12. Teacher preparation programs			Public Law 88–210, 665.
13. Specialized training for teachers and related educational personnel			
14. Educational research and demonstration: A. Cooperative research; B. National Defense Education Act title VII, extension of			Public Law 88–665.
15. State statistical services (title X, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88–210, 665.
16. Public elementary and secondary education		Public Law 88–210, 665	
17. Science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction (title III, National Defense Education Act)			
18. Guidance, counseling, and testing (title V–A, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88–210, 665.
19. Federally affected areas (Public Laws 815, 874)			Public Law 88–210, 665.
20. Vocational education		Public Law 88–210, 665	
21. Education of handicapped children			Public Law 88–210.
22. General university extension education			Public Law 88–164.
23. Adult basic education (title II–B of Economic Opportunity Act)			Public Law 88–452.
24. Public community libraries			Public Law 88–269.

EXHIBIT 2

S. —

A bill to amend Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "SECTION 1." and (2) by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) It is further declared that in recognition of the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote full employment throughout the Nation and to encourage education necessary to such employment, it is also the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents."

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"CHILDREN OF NEEDY FAMILIES AND CHILDREN RESIDING IN AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT WITH UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

"Authorization

"SEC. 4A. (a) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children who were in average daily attendance at the schools of such agency, and for whom such agency provided free public education, during such fiscal year, and who, while in attendance at such schools—

"(1) were dependent children for the purposes of title IV of the Social Security Act, or

"(2) resided in an area, which during a major portion of such year was designated by the Secretary of Labor as an area of substantial unemployment, with one or more parents neither of whom was regularly employed and at least one of whom was drawing State unemployment compensation.

For the purposes of this section a child may not be counted under both clauses 1 and 2 of this subsection for the same period.

"DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT

"(b) The amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to (1) 25 per centum of the local contribution rate (determined under section 3(d)) multiplied by (2) the number of children determined under subsection (a).

"MINIMUM REQUIREMENT

"(c) No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a) unless the number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and to whom such subsection applies—

"(1) is ten or more; and

"(2) amounts to 3 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and for whom such agency provided free public education.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, the Commissioner may waive the 3 per centum condition of entitlement whenever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such condition inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this section.

"DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN

"(d) The determination whether a local educational agency has met the percentage requirement for eligibility under this section for any fiscal year shall be made on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner prior to the close of such year, except that an underestimate made by the Commissioner pursuant to this subsection shall not operate to deprive an agency of its entitlement to any payments under this section to which it would be entitled had the estimate been accurate."

SEC. 3. Sections 3(f) and 4(d) of such Act are each amended (1) by inserting after "such agency is otherwise entitled under this section for such year" the following: "and the two succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by striking out "current expenditures for such year" and inserting in lieu thereof "current expenditures for such years".

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such Act is amended (1) in subsection (a) by striking out "or 4" and inserting in lieu thereof "4, or 4A", and (2) in subsection (c) by striking out "and 4(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "4(a), and 4A".

SEC. 5. Section 9 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(11) The term 'State unemployment compensation' means unemployment compensation paid to an individual under State law or title XV of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965.

EXHIBIT 3

A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting, immediately after section 15 of that Act, the following new section:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 16. (a) If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe;

"(2) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of this major disaster;

"(3) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities; and

"(4) such agency does not have sufficient funds available to it from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance on such school facilities to provide the minimum school facilities needed for the restoration or replacement of the school facilities so destroyed or seriously damaged,

he may provide the additional assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide such facilities, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest; but such additional assistance, plus the amount which the Commissioner determines to be available from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance, may not exceed the cost of construction incident to the restoration or replacement of the school facilities destroyed or damaged as a result of the disaster.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(c) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and which meets the requirements of section 6(b)(1). In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications. No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Commissioner finds, after consultation with the State and local educational agencies, that the project or projects with respect to which it is made are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities. All determinations made by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(d) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"(e) None of the provisions of sections 1 to 10, both inclusive, other than section 6(b)(1), shall apply with respect to this section."

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting, immediately after section 9 of that Act, the following new section:

"ASSISTANCE FOR CURRENT SCHOOL EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 10. (a) If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe; and

"(2) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency,

he may provide to such agency the additional assistance necessary to provide free public education to the children attending the schools of such agency, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest. Such additional assistance may be provided for a period not greater than a five fiscal year period beginning with the fiscal year in which the President has determined that such area suffered a major disaster. The amount so provided for any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which the Commissioner determines to be necessary to enable such agency, with the State, local, and other Federal funds available to it for such purpose, to provide a level of education equivalent to that maintained in the schools of such agency during the last full fiscal year prior to the occurrence of such major disaster. The amount, if any, so provided for the second, third, and fourth fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the President determined that such area has suffered a major disaster shall not exceed 75 per centum, 50 per centum, and 25 per centum, respectively, of the amount so provided for the first fiscal year following such determination.

"(b) In addition to and apart from the funds provided under subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to provide to such agency an amount which he determines to be necessary to replace instructional and maintenance supplies, equipment, and materials (including textbooks) destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster, and to lease or otherwise provide (other than by acquisition of land or erection of facilities) school and cafeteria facilities needed to replace temporarily such facilities which have been made unavailable as a result of the major disaster.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act, such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(d) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications.

"(e) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under this section may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States."

PROCEDURES IN FEDERAL CRIMINAL CASES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in June of 1963, I introduced two bills dealing with procedures in Federal criminal cases. One of them, S. 1801, sought to spell out the "speedy trial" which is guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution.

The second was S. 1802. It sought to spell out some of the attributes of the "fair trial" also promised by the sixth amendment. There could have been no more dramatic display of the need for this legislation than the running television commentary on the weekend of November 22, 1963, when police authorities of Dallas, Tex., passed on to the Nation's television audience the evidence against Lee Harvey Oswald before the man ever saw a lawyer and before he was formally charged with any crime. The result was a second murder, a lynching, that was as shameful to the American system of government as was the murder of the President.

I appreciate that my bill would have no application to State or local authorities. It would, however, restrict the pretrial release of information to the press by either defense or prosecution in Federal cases. The establishment of some rules on this subject at the Federal level would contribute greatly to improvement at the State and local level.

Recently, the Judicial Conference has reported favorably on the principle of S. 1802. It suggested certain changes in the enforcement of the restriction which I have incorporated in a new bill. Its report reflects a growing concern about the release of evidence before it is ever heard by a judge or jury, making it difficult to find jurymen who have not formed some opinion of a case.

But it has another bad effect that is less appreciated. It conditions the public to expect a certain verdict that may not be forthcoming when the case is heard in full. Then there are outcries that justice is too lenient and that criminals are being set loose in the streets.

Restrictions on pretrial publicity applied to prosecution and defense are in the best interest both of accused persons and of public confidence in our judicial system.

I send both bills to the desk, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and ask that they lie on the table for 1 week to give any Senators who may wish to cosponsor them an opportunity to do so.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point sections of the report of the Judicial Conference on S. 1802 and on S. 1801.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received, appropriately referred and held at the desk, and, without objection, sections of the report of the Judicial Conference on S. 1802 and S. 1801 will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. COOPER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 290. A bill to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases; and

S. 291. A bill to effectuate the provision of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial.

The sections of the report presented by Mr. MORSE are as follows:

PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION IN CRIMINAL CASES

S. 1802, 88th Congress, would make it unlawful for an employee of the United States, or any defendant or his attorney or the agent of either, to publish information not already properly filed with the court, which might affect the outcome of any pending criminal litigation, except evidence that has already been admitted at the trial. The proposed legislation would make such publication a contempt of court, punishable summarily by the court on motion of any party to the litigation by a fine of not less than $500 for each such publication. It was the view of the committee that certain provisions in the bill (1) authorizing punishment summarily for misbehavior not committed in the presence of the court, (2) limiting the usual authority of the court by providing that the prosecution proceed only on motion of a party and (3) limiting the discretionary authority of the court to impose a penalty appropriate to the particular facts and circumstances by "a fine of not less than $500 for each publication", were objectionable. The committee therefore proposed that the bill be amended to read as follows:

"It shall constitute a contempt of court for any employee of the United States, or for any defendant or his attorney or the agent of either, to furnish or make available for publication information not already properly filed with the court which might affect the outcome of any pending criminal litigation, except evidence that has already been admitted at the trial. Such contempt shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000."

Upon recommendation of the committee, the conference approved the amended bill.

RIGHT OF TRIAL

S. 1801, 88th Congress, is a bill to effectuate a provision of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that a defendant in a criminal case be given the right to a speedy trial. The proposals contained in the bill were considered by the conference and referred to the Committee for further study and report at a later session.

REGULATION OF PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 292) to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 292

A bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Person" means an individual, firm, partnership, joint stock company, association, corporation, incorporated society, statutory or common-law trust, estate, executor, administrator, receiver, trustee, conservator, liquidator, committee, officer, employee, principal, or agent;

(2) "Fee" means anything of value, including any monetary or other valuable consideration, paid or contracted to be paid, directly or indirectly, for any service or act performed by an employment agency;

(3) "Employment" means any service performed for remuneration or with the expectation of remuneration, whether in the form of salary, wages, or other consideration, and regardless of whether such service be performed under any contract for hire, written or oral, express or implied;

(4) "Employment agency" means any person other than an organization operated by or under the exclusive control of a bona fide educational, religious, or charitable institution who, for a fee, (A) procures or offers or attempts to procure employees for persons seeking the service of employees or employment for persons seeking employment; or (B) in seeking to perform any of the foregoing, gives information by any means as to where employees, workers, or employment may be obtained; and

(5) "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of section 10 of this Act, no employment agency shall do business in the District of Columbia unless it holds a valid license issued by the Commissioners under this Act.

(b) A license may be issued or renewed under this Act only upon the determination of the Commissioners that—

(1) the premises in which the business will be conducted are suitable for use as an employment agency;

(2) the applicant for such license is of good moral character, trustworthy, and intends to operate a bona fide employment agency; and

(3) the applicant for such license intends to make his services available to any person without discrimination as to race, creed, color, or national origin.

(c) Such license shall contain the name of the licensee, the name under which the business is to be conducted, and the specific place of business of the employment agency so licensed. Such license shall be valid only as to the person and place named therein. Any license issued under this Act shall contain an effective date and shall be valid for one year following such date, unless suspended or revoked. An application for the renewal of such license shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Commissioners may by regulations prescribe. Pending administrative action by the Commissioners on such an application, such license may be continued in effect for a period not to exceed sixty days beyond its expiration date.

(d) The Commissioners shall fix the fee for such license at such amount as, in their judgment, will be commensurate with the cost of the District of Columbia of inspecting supervising, and regulating the licensed activity.

SEC. 3. (a) Each applicant for a license as an employment agency shall file with the Commissioners a bond in such form as may be prescribed and approved by the Commissioners, in the penal sum of $5,000 running to the District of Columbia, with corporate surety authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to title 6, United States Code, and by the Department of Insurance of the Government of the District of Columbia, to do business in the District of Columbia. In lieu of such bond, an applicant for a license as an employment agency may deposit with the Commissioners other security in a form and amount acceptable to them, but not exceeding the value of $7,500.

(b) Such bond shall be conditioned that—

(1) the licensee shall comply with the provisions of this Act, including applicable rules, regulations, or orders issued pursuant thereto, and shall pay any loss or damage occasioned to any person by reason of such failure to comply; and

(2) the suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration of a license to operate an employment agency shall not affect the coverage of such bond as to a claim arising out of acts which occurred prior to the date of such suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration.

(c) The Commissioners may at any time notify the licensee to file a new or supplementary bond, in a form and amount to conform with the provisions of this section, whenever they shall deem the surety of such bond to be unsatisfactory, or the amount of such bond to have become insufficient to satisfy all claims accrued or contingent against the licensee. In the event the bond is secured by cash, the cash shall not be released for a period of one year following the date of suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration of the license.

(d) Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation applicable to the licensee's conduct of the licensed activity shall have, in addition to his right of action against such licensee, a right to bring suit against the surety on a bond required by this section, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of such bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the licensee, or of any officer, agent, employee, or other person acting on behalf of said licensee, which is in violation of law or regulation in force in the District relating to the licensed activity. The provisions of the second, third, and the fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820; sec. 1–244(b), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be applicable to each bond required by this section as if it were the bond required by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b) of the first section of said Act approved December 20, 1944: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries.

SEC. 4. (a) No employment agency licensed under this Act shall—

(1) charge or receive a fee greater than that stated in the schedule established by the Commissioners pursuant to section 6(a) of this Act;

(2) engage or attempt to engage in the splitting or sharing of fees with any employer, any agent or other employee of an employer, or any other person to whom employment service has been furnished, or any other person not authorized to charge a fee under this Act;

(3) make, give, or cause to be made or given to any applicant for employees or employment any false promise, misrepresentation, or inaccurate or misleading statement or information if such agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such falsity, misrepresentation, or inaccurate or misleading statement or information;

(4) procure or attempt to procure the discharge of any person from his employment;

(5) knowingly induce or attempt to induce an employee to quit his employment for the purpose of obtaining other employment through such agency; except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as prohibiting any employment agency from assisting any employee in obtaining other employment if such agency has been so requested in writing by such employee;

(6) require applicants for employees or employment to subscribe to any publication or incidental service or contribute to the cost of advertising;

(7) refer any person to employment deleterious to health or morals if the agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such conditions;

(8) refer any employee, worker, or applicant for employment to a place where a strike or lockout exists without furnishing such employee, worker, or applicant with a written statement as to the existence of such strike or lockout, if the agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such facts or conditions, a copy of which statement signed by the employee, worker, or applicant shall be kept on file for one year after the date thereof;

(9) make any referral to an employment or occupation prohibited by law;

(10) refer any applicant for employment except upon order therefor and except upon furnishing such applicant with such statement in respect to the employment as the Commissioners may by rule or regulation prescribe;

(11) operate directly or indirectly in conjunction with the employment agency any lodging house, restaurant, small loan company, or any place where intoxicating liquors or beverages are sold or dispensed;

(12) except with the written consent of the Commissioners, conduct an employment agency business in a room or rooms used for eating, sleeping, or other living purposes;

(13) make or cause to be made or use any name, sign, or advertising device bearing a name which may be similar to or reasonably be confused with the name of a Government agency;

(14) receive or require any person to execute any paper or document relating to the liability of any applicant for employment except on such forms as shall have been approved by the Commissioners and every such paper or document made or executed contrary to the provisions of this Act shall be void and unenforcible both in law and in equity;

(15) use any contract form or other forms except as the Commissioners may by rule or regulation prescribe.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Commissioners, by regulation, from defining and prohibiting an activity or practice not set forth in such subsection.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to establish such rules and regulations; minimum professional requirements for employees and officers of employment agencies in the District of Columbia; prescribe such forms of applications, reports, contracts, entries, and other papers; issue such instructions; delegate such functions; and perform such other acts as they may determine necessary in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners shall establish a schedule of maximum fees which may be charged by employment agencies in the District of Columbia. Each employment agency shall issue a receipt acknowledging payment of any such fee received by it.

(b) Where any applicant for employees or employment who has paid a fee to any employment agency fails to secure or refuses to accept employees or employment, as the case may be, such fee shall be returned by the agency within three days after a written demand by the applicant. If, due to no fault of such applicant or because the employee or the employment is other than as represented by the employment agency, employment is discontinued within thirty days, all fees paid pursuant to subsection (a) of this section by such applicant in excess of the applicable maximum for the period worked shall be returned within three days, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, after a written demand by the applicant.

SEC. 7. Each employment agency shall (1) keep and maintain such accurate and comprehensive records of all information, reports, and transactions relating directly or indirectly to the business of such agency as the Commissioners may by regulation require; (2) post or display conspicuously at each place it conducts business the license required under section 2 of this Act, together with such other information as the Commissioners may by regulation require; (3) file a schedule of fees in duplicate with the Commissioners, who shall determine that the fees set in the schedule are not in excess of those established by the Commissioners pursuant to section 6(a) of this Act; and (4) post or display conspicuously a copy of such schedule of fees approved by the Commissioners at each place it conducts business.

SEC. 8. It shall be the duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this Act. In carrying out such duty the Commissioners shall be authorized—

(1) to make all necessary inspections and do all other things necessary to the proper effectuation and enforcement of this Act;

(2) to enter and inspect any premises where an employment agency carries on its business;

(3) to have access to, and the right to copy, information pertinent to the administration and enforcement of this Act from all records, documents, or other papers relating to the business of such agency;

(4) to hold hearings without being bound by the technical rules of evidence and prescribed rules of procedure therein;

(5) to take an assignment of any claim arising under this Act against any employment agency.

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioners may, after reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, refuse to issue a license to, or renew the license of, any applicant under this Act, if they determine that such applicant has failed to comply with any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(b) The Commissioners may, after reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, revoke or suspend for any period any license issued or renewal under this Act, if they determine that the holder of that license has failed to comply with any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(c) Any person aggrieved by any final order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, refusing to renew, revoking, or suspending a license of a private employment agency under subsection (a) or (b) may obtain a review of such order as provided under subsections (e) and (f) of

section 7 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 195).

(d) Paragraph 5 of subsection (e) of section 7 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 195), is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Any final order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, refusing to renew, revoking, or suspending a license of a private employment agency under the provisions of section 9 of the District of Columbia Private Employment Agency Act;".

SEC. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, paragraphs 42 through 42i, inclusive, of section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and three, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 628), as amended, and any provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring emploment or situations", approved June 19, 1906 (34 Stat. 304), which are in effect on the effective date of this Act are hereby repealed.

(b) The repeal of such paragraphs and provisions shall not affect any warrant, prosecution, action, suit, proceeding, or liability of any kind or nature, civil or criminal, brought or existing on the day immediately preceding the date of such repeal. Any such warrant, prosecution, action, suit, proceeding, or liability shall be heard and determined in accordance with such paragraphs and provisions in the same manner and to the same extent as if they had not been repealed.

(c) Any individual who, on the effective date of this Act, holds a valid license issued under such paragraph 42 shall be permited to continue to do business as authorized by that license for a period of not to exceed thirty days following the effective date of this Act; except that the holder of that license shall otherwise comply with the provisions of this Act. Any person holding such a license on such effective date shall receive a pro rata refund of the annual fee paid for such license based on the unexpired portion of such license remaining upon the expiration of such thirty-day period.

SEC. 11. Any person failing to comply with any provision of this Act or with any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or interfering with, impeding, or obstructing in any manner the Commissioners in the performance of their official duties under this Act, shall be guilty of a violation of this Act and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. All prosecutions for violations of this Act, or regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants. As used in this Act the term "Corporation Counsel" means the attorney for the District, by whatever title such attorney may be known, designated by the Commissioners to perform the functions prescribed for the Corporation Counsel in this Act.

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established an Employment Agency Advisory Board, which shall consist of three members appointed by the Commissioners as follows:

(1) one member to be appointed from the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections to represent the public;

(2) one member who shall be a person who owns and operates an employment agency in the District of Columbia to represent employment agencies in the District of Columbia;

(3) one member who shall be a personnel executive to represent employers in the District of Columbia.

(b) Members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of one year and may, in the discretion of the Commissioners, be reappointed for additional terms. The Commissioners shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Members of the Board shall serve without compensation as such. The Commissioners are authorized to pay reasonable expenses necessarily incurred by the Board in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Board, if requested by the Commissioners, to advise and make recommendations to the Commissioners with respect to all matters (including applications for licenses or complaints) relating to employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 13. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners may be delegated by them in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Private Employment Agency Act".

SEC. 15. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of its enactment.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND A PUBLIC COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia.

I shall discuss this bill later this afternoon under the general subject matter of education, before I finish my remarks today.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 293) to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 293

A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "public college of arts and sciences" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a four-year program in the liberal arts and sciences acceptable for a bachelor's degree, including, but not limited to, courses in teacher education, and such additional program of study as may be acceptable for a master's degree, and courses on an individual, noncredit basis to those desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(b) The term "public community college" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or for a degree of associate in arts, which program shall include, but shall not be limited to courses in business education, secretarial training, and business administration, and courses in engineering, mathematics, and the physical and biological sciences which are designed to prepare a student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, and other technological fields requiring the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and which college also provides courses on an individual, noncredit basis for persons desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(c) The terms "Board of Higher Education" and "Board" mean the Board of Higher Education established by section 3 of this Act.

(d) The term "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District of Columbia established by the Act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101 et seq.).

SEC. 3. (a) The control of the public college of arts and sciences and of the public community college is hereby vested in a Board of Higher Education, which shall consist of nine members of whom not less than five shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Board (including all members appointed to fill vacancies on such Board) shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia from a panel of nominees submitted to such judges pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Such members shall be appointed for terms of six years; except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the said judges at the time of appointment, three at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of six years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of that term. Members of the Board shall serve without compensation, and may be removed in the same manner as that provided for members of the Board of Education under section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101).

(b) There is hereby established a committee to be known as the Board of Higher Education Nominating Committee, which shall consist of seven members of whom not less than four shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Committee shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for terms of six years; except that the terms of office of three of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the said judges at the time of appointment, at the end of three years. Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, and shall be subject to removal in the same manner as that provided for members of the Board of Education. The Committee shall elect a Chairman and a Vice

Chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the Committee, as soon as practicable following the enactment of this Act, to submit to the said judges a panel of not less than twenty-seven nominees for consideration as initial appointees to the Board and to thereafter submit to the judges, in connection with any vacancy on the Board, a panel of not less than three nominees for consideration by such judges in filling that vacancy.

(c) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education may furnish to the Board of Higher Education, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings of the government of the District of Columbia, records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment as the Commissioners and the Board of Education determine are available to enable the Board of Higher Education properly to perform its functions.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board of Higher Education shall, at such time as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board and the Board of Education, merge the District of Columbia Teachers' College (established pursuant to the Act of February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1276; D.C. Code, sec. 31–118)) into the public college of arts and sciences. At the time of such merger, all personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available to, or to be made available to, such Teachers' College shall be transferred to, and shall be under the control of, the Board of Higher Education.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the laboratory schools in the District of Columbia shall remain under the control and management of, and the employees assigned to such schools shall remain subject to the supervision of, the Board of Education.

SEC. 5. (a) The Board of Higher Education is hereby vested with the following powers:

(1) To prepare plans for the establishment of a public college of arts and sciences (including the selection of a site), and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to establish, organize, and administer such college;

(2) To prepare plans for the establishment of a public community college (including the selection of a site), and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to establish, organize, and administer such college;

(3) To fix, from time to time, tuition and fees to be paid by residents and nonresidents attending any such college, which tuition and fees shall be deposited to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia. Tuition and fees charged nonresidents shall be fixed in such amounts as will, to the extent feasible, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of the services for which such charges are imposed;

(4) To appoint, for a term of four years, a president for the public college of arts and sciences and a president for the public community college;

(5) To appoint, promote, demote, transfer, suspend, or dismiss such administrative, educational, or noneducational employees of any college established pursuant to this Act as the president thereof may recommend in writing;

(6) To accredit junior colleges operating in the District of Columbia;

(7) To award appropriate degrees and certificates of completion of courses of study in the colleges established pursuant to this Act; and

(8) To make such rules and regulations as the Board deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) No action shall be taken with respect to the actual establishment of any college authorized under this Act prior to the expiration of ninety calendar days (which ninety days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after the plans for such college have been submitted to the Congress.

(c) The Board of Higher Education shall annually on the first day of October transmit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an estimate in detail of the amount of money required for the colleges established pursuant to this Act for the ensuing year, and the Commissioners shall transmit the same in their annual estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, with such recommendations as they may deem proper.

SEC. 6. All obligations and disbursements for the purposes of this Act shall be incurred, made, and accounted for in the same manner as other obligations and disbursements for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1280), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 29–401—29–419), is amended (1) by striking out "Board of Education" wherever it appears in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Higher Education", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 586g. As used in this subchapter, the term 'Board of Higher Education' means the Board of Higher Education established pursuant to the District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made by this section shall be construed as affecting the validity of any license issued by the Board of Education prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST PROJECT ACT OF 1965—WATER FOR PACIFIC SOUTHWEST

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on a number of occasions, my colleagues have heard me speak about the gloomy future facing a large segment of our people if an abundance of water is not assured for agriculture, industry, domestic uses, and other essential purposes. This threat of water shortages is real, is imminent, and is alarming in the Pacific Southwest.

The growth rate of States in a considerable section of this Nation—which has been and continues to be phenomenal—will be retarded and literally endangered because the Colorado River—the last waterhole of the Southwest—does not appear able to bring to the States of the region a supply they and their mushrooming populations will require.

Southern California especially has grown to greatness because it was able—through ingenuity and perseverance—to tap this source.

With the keenest regret, for about three decades, I have seen my State of California and neighboring Arizona at loggerheads over allocation and use of this precious, irreplaceable resource. I was, and so were great numbers of people, grieved a number of years ago when tensions even reached the point where the militia was called out to enforce claims on this waterhole.

The 89th Congress can go into the history books as saviors of Western America if it constructively tackles this problem. We can provide by law for a vast undertaking—surely in the context of the Great Society—for importing water into the lower basin which would guarantee the future of California, Arizona, and Nevada. Such a project would do more: it can be an enormous benefit to our sister States to the north, by easing the burden their own futures must bear.

Furthermore, this Nation has a solemn compact with its good neighbor, Mexico, to deliver to her Colorado River waters which may be used to advance the welfare of her people. The performance by the United States of this treaty obligation is a duty shared by the upper and lower basins alike. By importing needed quantities to the lower basin, this Congress can lessen the strain on the whole Colorado system and reassure the ability of the United States to discharge its responsibilities.

I am confident that the beneficial results of such an enactment will be many and historic. Not the least will be the expanded opportunity for the upper basin States to fill their own reservoirs which comprise the upper Colorado storage project, along with a firm foundation on which the lower basin States can plan their expanding future. Thus, both groups of signatories to the Colorado River compact will be able, with competence, to anticipate the mounting demands of growing populations, agriculture, and industry, thereby caring for their economic health in long years ahead.

On behalf of myself and my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY] I introduce a bill, the Pacific Southwest Project Act of 1965.

In the 88th Congress, I introduced S. 2760. Counterparts were introduced by 10 Members of the California delegation in the House, of both parties.

The present bill deals with the same subject, the water resources of the Colorado River, but it offers a new and broader approach prompted by the events of the last few months.

The bill is not partisan. It is written in the light of the proposals made in Secretary Udall's Pacific Southwest project plan, which was a courageous and constructive step; the hearings on that plan, which developed some critical weaknesses; the hearings and report of a joint committee of the California State Senate and Assembly, just released; correspondence, and conferences with scores of California executives and experts; and in the light of my own experiences in the Colorado River controversy over the past dozen years.

The text of this measure, like its predecessor, has been drafted in consultation with Northcutt Ely, counsel for the six California agencies that have water rights in the Colorado. These are the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the City of Los Angeles, San Diego County Water Authority, Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley County Water District, and Palo Verde Irrigation District. Their six-agency committee has approved the principles stated in this bill. I wish to emphasize here a fact that is too often overlooked. These six agencies, not the State of California, own the water rights in the Colorado River upon which 12 million Californians depend.

I. OBJECTIVES

The measure recognizes that both the upper basin and the lower basin of the Colorado River have a common interest in accomplishing three major objectives. The existing supply is inadequate to meet all three. These objectives are:

1. PROTECTION OF EXISTING PROJECTS

First, existing projects must not be destroyed to find water for new ones. The existing economy of the Pacific Southwest must be safeguarded, and assured the water that is required for its inevitable growth.

2. FILLING OF RESERVOIRS

Second, the upper basin reservoirs must be filled, and Lake Mead must be refilled. I understand that it would require 43 million acre-feet to do this. I am told that there is no likelihood that the upper basin reservoirs can ever be filled or that Lake Mead, now nearly two-thirds empty, can ever be refilled if the Central Arizona project is constructed without simultaneously constructing works to import water into the Colorado. I am told that all the reservoirs on the Colorado, in both upper and lower basins, now contain a margin of safety or cushion of only 1.9 million acre-feet above the minimum quantities that must be in those reservoirs if the powerplants are to continue to operate. The margin of safety against shutdown of the powerplants was reduced 600,000 acre-feet in 2 recent months.

3. WATER FOR CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Third, water must be found for the central Arizona project, if this can be done without wrecking existing economies in the lower basin or drying up the upper basin reservoirs that the Secretary is having such difficulty in filling.

II. INVESTIGATIONS OF WATER REQUIREMENTS AND SUPPLY

My bill directs the Secretary to carry out an investigation and to make a report to Congress within 18 months on the deficiencies that will have to be supplied, together with his recommendation of projects that ought to be constructed to furnish added water to remedy these shortages. The investigation is not restricted to any one type of supply or to any one watershed or to any one State. The surplus waters of any rivers, anywhere, which could feasibly be utilized, along with the possibilities of desalinization, and any other solutions, if any there be, would all be examined under the terms of my bill.

CRITERIA

The Secretary is directed to conform to certain criteria or guidelines. These, in addition to meeting the three objectives that I have identified, would include four important safeguards. These are:

1. "LAW OF THE RIVER" TO BE RESPECTED

The works that the Secretary proposes must be built and operated in compliance with the compacts, statutes, treaty, court decisions, and so forth, that constitute the "law of the river."

2. STATES OF ORIGIN MUST BE PROTECTED

The "States of origin" must be protected. My bill requires the Secretary to include in his plans "adequate and equitable protection of the interests of States from which water may be imported into the Colorado River system, to the end that the quantities of water remaining available for use in those States shall be adequate for ultimate requirements therein, at prices to the users which are not adversely affected by the exportation of water from those States to the Colorado River system."

3. COOPERATION WITH ALL AFFECTED STATES IN PLANNING

The Secretary is directed to cooperate with all of the States affected, in making his investigations and reports. His reports must go to the States concerned for comment before being submitted to Congress.

4. RESTRICTIONS ON CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

The Secretary, in finding water for the central Arizona project, shall not destroy existing projects. The bill tells him that if he is unable to supply the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned by the decree in Arizona versus California, the water rights of the central Arizona project shall bear the shortage, because its rights are junior to those of the existing projects in Arizona, Nevada, and California. But California's existing uses would be protected only to the extent of the basic 4.4 million acre-feet apportioned to California by the decree, not to the extent of the full 5.1 million acre-feet now used in California.

NEW PROVISION TERMINATES PROTECTION OF EXISTING PROJECTS WHEN IMPORTED WATER ACTUALLY ARRIVES

I am adding a new provision, which was not in the legislation introduced in the 88th Congress. The new provision is important. My bill says that the priority protection which it gives to existing projects as against the new central Arizona project shall cease "whenever the President shall proclaim that works have been completed and are in operation, capable in his judgment of continuously delivering water in aggregate annual quantities of not less than 2,500,000 acre-feet into the main stream of the Colorado River below Lee Ferry, from sources outside the natural drainage area of the Colorado River System; and that such sources are adequate, in the President's judgment, to permanently supply such quantities without adverse effect upon the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of any State from which such water is imported into the Colorado River System."

In the 88th Congress, the representatives of the government and the people of Arizona offered to recognize the principles that California's existing uses must be protected to the extent of 4.4 million acre-feet, but only for 25 years. It was represented to us that importation works surely would be built within 25 years. If this is so, then the right way to express the principle is to make the protection ironclad until the imported water actually arrives. The 25-year restriction is totally unacceptable to California water users.

I said at the time that it would be similar to a man purchasing a policy of life insurance with the provision that the policy would lapse if the man should pass away. I think that is true, because the only reason to indicate a guarantee effective in any fashion is to tie that guarantee to the construction of public works by which into the lower basin would come sufficient quantities of supplemental water to supply not one but the two great States of the Pacific Southwest—Arizona and California—and Nevada as well, and simultaneously ease the burden of the Colorado River with respect to those States so ably represented by our colleagues in the Upper Colorado River Basin. If imported water is delayed, there is no justice in drying up California's existing metropolitan aqueduct so that Arizona's new aqueduct can run full.

THE MEXICAN TREATY BURDEN

Quantities other than 2.5 million acre-feet can be suggested as the proper measure for the Presidential finding which the bill requires. But the importation of about 2.5 million acre-feet annually would offset the Mexican Treaty burden, which guarantees 1.5 million acre-feet annually to Mexico at the boundary, and would offset evaporation and regulatory losses, some of them involved in the storage and transportation of water for Mexico, to the extent of another million acre-feet. It appears to me reasonable, therefore, to use the 2.5 million acre-feet figure as fair and just for all affected States.

The Secretary is to advise Congress what part of the cost of importing water to offset the Mexican Treaty burden should be made nonreimbursable.

IMPORTATIONS INTO THE MAIN STREAM

I stipulate that the importation must be made into the main stream in the lower basin. This eliminates one of the objectionable features of the original Udall plan, which would have delivered northern California water into points in southern California. I want to make it plain that the importation is to benefit everyone on the Colorado: It would improve the quality of water for all lower basin users as well as Mexico, a country which now rightfully complains of the salt being pumped into the river from under an Arizona project. It would relieve both upper and lower basins of the Mexican treaty burden, and enable the upper basin to store water that it must now deliver to Mexico. Finally, it would provide Arizona and California enough water so that they could support each other's projects, including the central Arizona project, instead of quarreling over shortages.

All I ask is that existing projects, on both sides of the river, in both our States—Arizona and California—shall not be hurt for the benefit of any new Colorado River project in either State while we are waiting for the imported water to arrive. Delivery of water into the mainstream, as my bill provides, assures that Metropolitan Aqueduct and the All American Canal will serve the constructive functions for which they were designed at a cost of $500 million—indeed, more—which the taxpayers of my State have bonded themselves to pay.

III. CONDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF IMPORTATION WORK

In the hearings last spring on the Udall plan, I pointed out that one of its major flaws was that it failed to authorize importation works to bring into the Colorado the water that the Secretary said was needed to meet deficiencies, while at the same time firmly authorizing the central Arizona project, which would increase the overdraft on the main stream. I asked whether it was possible to write in a conditional authorization, such as appears in the 1939 Reclamation Project Act, so that the importation project would be presently authorized subject to the later filing of a finding of feasibility by the Secretary. There was general approval of this thought.

Another major defect of the Udall plan was that it was admittedly too small. The importation project on which it proposed a feasibility study—not an authorization—would have added only 1.2 million acre-feet to the supply, all from northern California, whereas the Secretary's figures showed the necessity of importing at least twice that much as the first stage, and more later on.

My present bill attempts to meet these two objections to the Udall plan.

I propose that Congress authorize, now, the construction of works to import 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the Colorado River, but subject to the submission to Congress of a finding of engineering and economic feasibility approved by the President. As I have stated, there is existing statutory authority for this procedure, found in section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. My bill modifies the existing law on this point in three respects. First, we require that the Secretary's findings, to be operative, be approved by the President. Second, a portion of the cost, related to water shortages occasioned by the Mexican Treaty burden, is to be written off. Third, the portion to be repaid is to be recovered in 75 years, not 40 to 50, as the 1939 law provides. The reason is that we are dealing here with a multi-billion-dollar undertaking for the preservation of the economy on which tens of millions of people are dependent, or soon will be. As the Supreme Court said about a much smaller stream on which some improvements were in controversy, a hundred years is but a short time in the life of a nation. Note that the President is to act twice: first, in approving the finding of feasibility which will authorize construction of works to import 2.5 million acre-feet; again, in proclaiming that works are successfully completed which will accomplish this result. Not until then do we release the priority protection of existing projects on both sides of the river.

To the extent that importation of water is necessary to enable the Secretary to supply, under his Boulder Canyon contracts, the 7.5 million acre-feet of consumptive use apportioned by the Supreme Court decree, the bill provides that the imported water be furnished by the Secretary at the same costs and on the same terms as water originating in the Colorado River system.

To the extent that importations enable the Secretary to supply more than 7.5 million acre-feet of consumptive use, the bill provides that the excess be made available as under the Supreme Court decree. The decree gives half of the excess to California, half to Arizona and Nevada. One of the preliminary drafts of the Udall plan proposed that someday a second 1.2 million acre-feet would be added to the river, but it gave all of this excess to Arizona. California water users objected to it, feeling that if the water supply of the Colorado were increased by Federal expenditures, Arizona should not properly claim more than if the supply were increased by rainfall. But imported water constituting part of the "excess" would have to be paid for at cost.

IV. AUTHORIZATION OF BRIDGE AND MARBLE CANYON DAMS

The bill unconditionally authorizes the construction of Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams, with their powerplants and transmission lines, describing them just as Secretary Udall did in his proposal. These dams and powerplants will be "cash registers" to finance the project.

But because people who are sincerely dedicated to preservation of scenic and recreation values were greatly concerned about these dams, I have tried to allay their apprehension by adding a number of provisions for the protection of those values. The bill, for example, directs that the level of the reservoir behind Bridge Canyon Dam be maintained so that it will not fluctuate in elevation more than 10 feet, so far as this can be done practically. Exactly the same rule now applies, by contract, to the lake created by Parker Dam. The purpose is to preserve the Bridge Canyon Lake as a spectacularly beautiful means of access to scenery that rivals the Norwegian fiords. These desert fiords can be reached in no other way. They will thus be opened up to enjoyment by millions of visitors, just as previously inaccessible wonders have been opened up by the construction of Glen Canyon Dam. As Bridge Canyon Dam is altogether a power producer designed to be operated at a constant high head, this restriction on fluctuations, I am told by engineers, is quite workable.

The bill authorizes construction of bypass roads, or other devices, to make it possible for small boats, pulled on trailers behind passenger cars, to be transported around the great dams. Finally, it prohibits diversion of water at either Marble or Bridge Canyon Dams.

V. AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

The bill authorizes the immediate construction of the central Arizona aqueduct, as described by the Secretary's reports. But, until the President proclaims that importation works have been completed, capable of continuously delivering at least 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the main stream below Lee Ferry, diversions for the central Arizona project must be limited, in the event of shortage. They will be limited to the extent necessary to assure a supply of 4.4 million acre-feet for the partial satisfaction of California's existing uses, which are 5.1 million, and to assure a supply for the Arizona and Nevada projects that are now dependent on the river, or that Congress has authorized. But this importation must be from sources that the President certifies are adequate permanently to supply that quantity without adversely affecting the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of the States of origin. This differs from S. 2760, my previous bill, which made the protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet permanent. The new bill ends that protection when imported water arrives at the river in an amount of 2.5 million acre-feet annually. And the imported water is to be made available at the same cost to the user as Colorado River water, up to the portions of the basic 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to each State by the Supreme Court decree.

VI. CONSERVATION WORKS

This bill, like the Udall plan, authorizes certain conservation works—such as channelization, and so forth—and canal lining. But it provides that if any canal lining is done, it shall be covered by a contract between the Secretary and the water users who are served by that canal. I want to make it clear that we do not intend that the Secretary, by lining one water user's canal, can take the water that is saved away from that user—who may urgently need all the water he can get—and turn it over to someone else.

VII. RECREATION AND PROTECTION OF WILDLIFE

As to recreation, in addition to the special provisions about Bridge Canyon Dam that I have mentioned, we provide that all allocations of costs to recreation shall be nonreimbursable. We also provide that the fees that people pay for the use of these facilities shall be earmarked for their operation and maintenance, or for further investments for similar purposes.

As to fish and wildlife, we authorize the Secretary to spend the money that the Udall plan proposed. But we limit the quantity of water that may be consumed for this purpose—for example, in growing rice for birds, or in maintaining swamp areas—to the quantities of water that the Supreme Court decreed for this specific purpose. This was about 60,000 acre-feet, whereas the Udall plan proposed to consume about 340,000 for wildlife conservation. The bill tells the Secretary to submit to Congress, for further consideration, any such projects that he has in mind that would use more water than the Supreme Court decreed.

VIII. FINANCING

A basin account, to be known as the Pacific Southwest development fund, would be created. Advances would be made to this fund from the General Treasury, for construction. Such a fund was created by the statutes which authorized the Boulder Canyon project and the upper Colorado River storage project. Into this fund would be paid revenues from Bridge and Marble Canyon powerplants, and from Hoover, Davis,

and Parker powerplants after those projects have paid for themselves under existing laws, plus revenues to be received from the storage and delivery of water for irrigation, and municipal and industrial purposes. From this income, the fund would repay the Treasury's advances under the general scheme of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, that is, without interest on capital allocated to irrigation, but with interest on capital allocated to power and industrial and municipal water supplies. Such income would also repay a portion of the cost of importation works. The bill would permit subsidies from this fund not only to the central Arizona project, but also to the Dixie project, Utah, and the southern Nevada and Moapa projects, to the extent that the Secretary may recommend and the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the two Houses may approve.

IX. PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION

The bill would create a Federal-State commission with long-range planning functions. On it would be represented each State affected—the seven States of the Colorado River Basin plus every State from which water is imported into the Colorado—and each major Federal department or agency concerned.

X. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The bill groups together a number of general provisions applicable to all operations under the act. Of these, the most significant is one borrowed from the Colorado River Storage Project Act, amended to meet deficiencies that have been discovered in it. This directs all Federal agencies to comply with the "law of the river"—the applicable compacts, statutes, treaty, court decisions, et cetera, and, in the internal distribution of water within each State, to comply with that State's laws, including intrastate priorities. In the event of noncompliance, any affected State may bring suit against the offending agency or official in the U.S. Supreme Court or in the District Court for the District of Columbia, and grants the consent of Congress to the joinder of the United States in such a suit, as defendant or otherwise. This is because, without the consent of Congress, the United States may not be sued.

CONCLUSION

I reiterate what I said during the hearings on the Udall plan last spring, when I introduced S. 2760, the present bill's predecessor. In that bill, I offered what no California Senator or Congressman had ever offered before: to join in sponsoring the authorization of the central Arizona project. I made the offer on two conditions: First, that that project be part of a regional project, which would help solve the water problems of the whole Southwest, not merely Arizona. Second, that existing projects in all three States be protected against the shortages which construction of the central Arizona project would bring about. The protection asked for California was limited to 4.4 million acre-feet, the quantity that California was apportioned from the first 7.5 million. That offer was rejected.

Arizona first denied that there would be a water shortage at all. If that is so, she cannot possibly be hurt if she recognizes that existing projects in California, Arizona, and Nevada are entitled to the protection of the 100-year-old rule of water law in the West, that existing projects shall not be destroyed to create new projects. But Arizona did reject this protection to California and Nevada, while her legislature passed two acts assuring this very protection to existing Arizona projects as against this same proposed central Arizona project, by name.

We stood firm. Next, Arizona offered to recognize the principle of the protection of California's existing uses up to 4.4 million acre-feet, but only for 25 years. I rejected this position. California's water users, likewise, have rejected it.

I again hold out the hand of friendship to Arizona. I am willing now, as the bill I have just introduced demonstrates, and as my bill, S. 2760 in the 88th Congress demonstrated, not only to acquiesce in the construction of the central Arizona project, but also to join in sponsoring a bill authorizing its construction, on two reasonable conditions. The first is that the central Arizona project be part of a broader plan, simultaneously authorized, for the relief of the water shortages in the whole Colorado River Basin, not just Arizona. The second is, that if construction of the central Arizona project is to begin before imported water actually arrives in sufficient quantity to assure both States the survival of their economies that are now dependent upon the Colorado River, the central Arizona project bear the risk of the shortages that its construction would bring about. If Arizona will agree to these conditions, let us join hands in a single bill that will not only authorize construction of the central Arizona project, but which will also meet two other needs, which are just as urgent as Arizona's: the survival of the lower basin projects which already exist, and the filling of the upper basin reservoirs. The future life of the whole Colorado River Basin is at stake.

Mr. President, I repeat, this Congress can go down in history as the savior of the Pacific Southwest region of the United States. There is a rapidly burgeoning economy and a rising population in Arizona. The amazing progress in population and in wealth in my State of California continues. Their economies are intertwined. Their people are friendly neighbors. They need—as I am sure my friends in Arizona will agree—to think and plan together so that Congress can successfully enact legislation which will help both States, and which will also help Nevada and the Upper Colorado River States without doing damage to any other State.

Therefore, in good faith, I introduce the proposed legislation, for appropriate reference to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I know that the dean of the Senate, whom I am honored to call a friend, will give consideration to the sort of proposed legislation which I now send to the desk today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 294) to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF BILL TO ESTABLISH THE GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas.

Over 70,000 acres of the highest, ruggedest mountains in Texas would be set aside for the enjoyment of future generations under this proposal.

Last year the Interior Department in recommending approval of this proposal stated that this area:

> Contains a combination of scenic and scientific attributes that qualify it as an outstanding addition to the National Park System. It contains the most diversified and beautiful scenery in Texas, some of the most beautiful landscape in the entire southwestern part of the United States, and its Permian marine limestone mountains contain the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world.

Lying 100 miles east of El Paso, Tex., and 30 miles southwest of Carlsbad Caverns, N. Mex., the Guadalupe Mountains are visible above the arid lands of west Texas for scores of miles as one approaches them. The mountain range culminates in the massive bluff of El Capitan and the height of Guadalupe Peak. The sudden rise in elevation of nearly a mile brings one from a near-desert to mountain forests and shaded canyon streams. The Guadalupe Mountains abound in wildlife, including mule deer, antelope, bear, mountain lion, elk, and wild turkey. It includes areas of grassland, shrubs as well as forests of pine, maple, fir, oak, and pecan, and is watered by springs and wells.

This area has been surveyed many times by the Interior Department, culminating in its recommendation for national park status by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments in its November 1963 meeting. The proposal is also widely hailed by conservation groups and civic associations in the area.

This bill provides for the acquisition of some 70,000 acres of land of the heart of the Guadalupe Mountains, to be added to 5,600 adjacent acres presently owned by the United States. Most of the land to be acquired is part of the Guadalupe Mountain ranch owned by J. C. Hunter, Jr. This individual has wisely operated

this ranch so as to preserve the environment and wildlife values, in hopes that someday the beautiful area could belong to the public. He is to be saluted for preserving these mountains in virtually their native condition, worthy of national park status.

I first introduced a bill to create this national park in 1963, the year after the enactment of my bill creating the Padre Island national seashore recreation area. There is a tremendous contrast between the sun-drenched beach at Padre Island and the rocky bluffs of the Guadalupe Mountains, illustrating the great variety and contrast of our continent, and that part of it found within the State of Texas. For future generations we must make sure that some of each natural component of our environment is preserved for enjoyment and study. The Guadalupe Mountains compose a unique area that should be made a national park.

The bill I introduce today is almost identical with that recommended by the Interior Department to the 88th Congress, with minor changes in boundaries to reflect the best thought of myself and others as to the most desirable area to be included. I do not think there will be any controversy over these changes and there may be still other minor boundary adjustments that will appear desirable during consideration of the bill. This bill also contains a provision similar to one enacted in the Padre Island national seashore recreation bill of the 87th Congress, requiring consent of the State of Texas and local governmental bodies to acquisition of land interests owned by them. The State of Texas does own the mineral interest in a considerable portion of this area, but I anticipate no problem in insuring conservation and protection of the natural beauties of the area while avoiding any financial loss to the State of Texas as a mineral owner.

This week our President in a great address to the Nation, called on us to act to protect the beauty of our heritage. He said:

> We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish—as a green legacy for tomorrow—more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any other period in our national history.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill for the Guadalupe Mountains National Park as a step toward this noble goal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the matters referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 295) to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached articles describing the beauty of the Guadalupe Mountains and the public support for the establishment of a national park on this site be inserted as an appendix to my comments at this point in the RECORD.

The matters presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH are as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE SUPPORTING GUADALUPE MOUNTAIN AREA AS A NATIONAL PARK AND DECLARING IT A HISTORIC SITE WORTHY OF PRESERVATION

Whereas it is the statutory purpose of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee to conduct studies and surveys of the various aspects of historical heritage and to stimulate the development of historical resources in every locality of Texas; and

Whereas members of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee have personally visited and inspected the Texas Guadalupe Mountain area and found these mountains and canyons to be of historical significance to the region, State and Nation; and

Whereas historians may delve into the recorded history in the mountains—only touched by the elements—and find fossils, pictographs in caves, Indian pottery and the ruins of a stagecoach stand by El Capitan Mountain, landmark to travelers and campsite for Indians and cavalry; and

Whereas Pinery Station is the only Butterfield Stage station located on a major U.S. highway, its foundations are intact and the original plans are available, therefore affording excellent opportunities for authentic renovation; and

Whereas this area is now being surveyed and studied by the National Park Service with the idea in mind of acquiring a portion that would include the above and other historic sites and trails; and

Whereas firmly believing we should preserve the reminders of the past to find strength for the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas State Historical Survey Committee in its quarterly meeting in Austin, Tex., on October 11, 1963, does urge this area be designated a national park and that the mountains remain in their untouched state, affording Americans the opportunity to see the historical beauty of their country: And be it further

Resolved, That under the powers conferred upon us by law that we do declare this a historic site worthy of preservation.

TEXAS' TALLEST TALE—THE GUADALUPES

(By Robert Schick)

Soon after I arrived from Missouri to take up residence in Texas, a Lone Star State native welcomed me with this short and sweet analysis of my adopted State.

"You'll like it, son," he said. "Texas just about has it all, except for three things—ugly women, short men, and tall mountains."

After living in many parts of the State for two decades, I found that he was wrong about the women—I've seen three or four downright homely ones. As for the men, I'm not sure for I measured them more by attitude than by altitude. But regarding the lack of tall mountains, all I could do was to face the West and ask pardon for my friend's ignorance from the guardian spirits of the tall Guadalupe Mountains.

It is strange but true that many Texans have little conception of the mountain grandeur of their State. People who are the greatest boosters of the rugged attractions of Colorado or New Mexico, delightfully find the Big Bend a scenic shocker. The Guadalupe Mountains, the State's highest, are even more surprising. When you speak to some people of the sublimity of the Guadalupes—now being proposed as the site of Texas' second national park—they think you're pulling their leg. Go further and tell them that the mighty frontpiece of this range—El Capitan—is one of the world's great individual mountains and they are likely to wonder about your sanity.

But El Capitan qualifies. True, the peak is only 8,200 feet above sea level and isn't even Texas' highest. (The crown goes to Guadalupe Peak, a less imposing relative that sits on El Cap's shoulders.) Look up the elevations of the world's other illustrious peaks and you'll find most of them are much higher—on paper. But old Capitan isn't a "paper" mountain. It has everything a king-peak should have—an overpowering presence, domination of its surroundings and an unforgettable profile.

I'll certainly never forget the first time I saw it. The car I was riding in was crawling cautiously up Guadalupe Pass, bucking a rousing sandstorm. The sky had lost that luminous, white-gold purity typical of those parts and had taken on a delinquent color of rusty dishwater mixed with dusty asphalt. We were lost in a one-dimensional, almost ceiling-zero world. It had been this way since Van Horn. The Guadalupes, ordinarily visible from 75 miles away, had been wiped from the horizon by the giant curtain of the storm. But half way up the pass, I suddenly saw a monster form looming through the swirling, murky tableau of sand. It was El Capitan: immense, overwhelming, seeming to rise to the top of a nonexisting sky. I knew that it wasn't the tallest mountain in the world, but at that moment, for me at least, it had to be.

Capitan's dimensions speak for themselves. It rises a vertical mile above the nearby salt flats. Its knobby summit, resembling a giant clinched fist threatening the world, is 3,000 feet above its base and the last 2,000 feet is sheer cliff. It's easy to see why it has always been the most famous landmark in the Southwest.

The Mescalero Apaches must have held it in religious awe. It certainly was used for their "smoke talk." The first white men to see El Cap probably were Spaniards from Onate's expedition in the late 16th century. Their approach must have been first detected from this high place and the warning smoke seen by half the Mescalero Nation. From Onate's time onward, no white men could enter this land without being picked up by the "Apache radar" on El Capitan.

Called Signal Peak on the early maps, the mountain was to be a beacon to westering Americans for over a century. It guided 49'ers in ox wagons, travelers on the Butterfield stages, U.S. cavalry, Texas Rangers, buffalo hunters, early cattlemen, rustlers and renegades. When man got wings, he found he still had to take Capitan into account. Pilots know it well and respect it. They should, for they know that planes have been dashed to pieces against the limestone monster. Far up there somewhere still remains a memento of tragedy, the crumpled wreckage of a B–29 that didn't make it over "the Hump of Texas" during World War II. In 1958 Noel Kincaid, foreman of the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, accomplished a folklore-inspiring feat of hauling a monument to the top of El Cap by mule power. The memorial, now in place, honors the airmen who died on the mountain.

El Capitan today is a familiar sight to thousands of east-west motorists who pass almost under its loom on the four-lane highway (U.S. 62–180) over Guadalupe Pass. But the Guadalupe range that lies behind the goliath is one of Texas' least known wilderness areas and one of its most beautiful.

The National Park Service recently acquired 6,000 acres of the McKittrick Canyon section near the New Mexico line. The Texas Guadalupes have been privately owned but its current proprietors, Wallace Pratt, of Houston, and J. C. Hunter, of Abilene, have used this ownership as a public trust. It

was Pratt who donated the acreage now operated by the Park Service as an extension of Carlsbad National Park. Hunter is the owner of one of the Southwest's most fabulous holdings, Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, a 71,000-acre spread that covers the greater part of these mountains including El Capitan. It's a working ranch but it is well known that Hunter's abiding interest in the Guadalupes is its preservation as one of the continent's most remarkable geologic and wildlife sanctuaries.

Right now Mr. Hunter would like to see his work of half a lifetime capped by the establishment of a separate national park over the whole of the Texas Guadalupes. His dream may be realized for at this time there is a bill before Congress, introduced by Texas Representative JOE POOL, calling for just this. If the bill is passed and the park becomes a reality, national park rangers will only continue a job of preservation and conservation begun and successfully carried out by this dedicated Texan.

With a hospitality known throughout the West, Hunter and his famous foreman, Noel Kincaid, have been welcoming lovers of the Guadalupes to his ranch for years. The carelessly irreverents who come uninvited with rifles and matches to endanger this wild empire are a different matter. In the days of the Old West, ranchers kept their cowhands on constant vigil to prevent rustling and fence cutting. On Guadalupe Ranch, riders are just as alert to spot those who despoil the land itself and its wild creatures.

In the ranch section of McKittrick Canyon you won't find a head of cattle grazing although it has the finest grass and the best water in the Guadalupes. Instead you will see elk. Mr. Hunter introduced and has protected Texas' only elk herd which now includes over 200 of these lordly animals. You certainly will see deer—white tail, Sonora and mule deer. And you are liable to startle wild turkeys into raucous flight. In the swift, cold stream that splashes down the canyon floor for 5 miles before disappearing underground, are found Texas' only Rainbow trout.

McKittrick Canyon could be called Texas' hidden Yosemite. It has Yosemite's wild grandeur, softened like Yosemite's, by luxuriant growths of trees and grass. Like Yosemite it has its mighty, upthrusted monolith of stone. In McKittrick it is Lover's Leap, a 2,000-foot high, sheer bluff of solid limestone, a thing of almost terrifying beauty.

McKittrick's beauty is the creation of water, which indeed is the transforming genie in all arid lands. Water laid bare its vast limestone outcroppings which are among the world's greatest. Water carved the canyon itself and water nourishes its profoundly varied vegetation.

It is this variety and profusion of growing things that delight and amaze the visitor who has known only the majestic but barren face the Guadalupes turn to the world. Here on the slopes of McKittrick, ponderosa pine stand like regiments of green church spires keeping watch on throngs of trees native to almost every clime. You'll see the ponderosa's neighbors from the upper Rockie—Douglas-fir, western yellow pine, Rocky Mountain juniper and that tree that showers autumn gold, the aspen. A glamordoll of a tree is here. It's the madrone whose peeling bark, revealing layers of different colors, turns its trunk into a jeweled column. If it is a hot day, put your cheek against the madrone's bark and feel its welcome coolness. And, if you look hard, you can find a real exotic in McKittrick's woods—the mahogany tree.

Trees from the Yankee forests are part of the show, big tooth maple from the North Woods and the East's familiar sugar maple, walnut, cherry, chinquapin, and species of oak. These northern hardwoods set the canyon afire with color in the fall.

Water lured these migrant trees, but McKittrick isn't all a watered paradise. Where moisture is scarce and the sun hot, the native southwestern vegetation is boss. On the drier, south-facing slopes you are reminded that the desert is never far away. Like the Apaches watched the intruding white men, the sotol, the agave, the mesquite and the cacti wait to reclaim the land from the "stranger" trees. Not to be outdone, these dry slopes boast one marvel—the great faxon yucca, a magnificent and rare plant.

If a national park does materialize in this area, the close proximity of world-famous Carlsbad's subterranean wonders and the high altitude beauties of the Guadalupes would offer tourists a travel experience unmatched, in its own way, on this continent. The real clincher for the mushrooming of tourism in the Trans-Pecos country, however, could be the linking, in the public mind, of this twin park with Big Bend National Park, only some 200 miles to the southeast.

In the entire West, there are only three or four other regions that can equal the Trans-Pecos in potential tourist lure. They are the regions already blessed with two or more national parks so located that visitors can see more and enjoy more on less money.

Just how long it will be before the Guadalupes become a national domain is hard to tell, but it is time now to make its giant signpost, El Capitan, the unofficial "State mountain" of Texas.

Its image could be a visual symbol of the State as Mount Rainier is of Washington State, Mount Hood is of Oregon and, skipping overseas, old Vesuvius is of Italy. By the way, compared to the Neapolitan Mountain, El Cap is not only taller but has better manners—it doesn't chain smoke and it has never blown its top.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, July 7, 1963]

A NEW PARK FOR FAR WEST TEXAS

An increase of nearly a fourth in visits to the Big Bend National Park suggests the growing attraction of the rugged beauty of far west Texas for vacationing Americans.

In the first half of this year the huge park counted 53,390 visitors, compared with 42,995 in the first half of 1962. Most significant of the park's spell perhaps is a 91-percent increase in campers. The park's climate permits it to remain open and operating throughout the year.

The interest shown in the Big Bend by vacationers is a strong argument in favor of Federal acquisition of additional available acreage in the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas northward from the Big Bend and just under the New Mexico State line for creation of a new national park.

Six thousand acres in this region already belong to the National Park Service. Extensive adjoining ranch lands belonging to J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene—72,000 acres containing some of the most spectacular scenery in Texas—have been visited by members of a Park Service field survey party whose findings will be analyzed by specialists in the Service.

There is a strong hope for a favorable decision. The high, forested region the park would include contains Guadalupe Peak, which rises to 8,751 feet to form the highest point in the State, and the jagged eminence called El Capitan.

The situation of the area permits easy accessibility for visitors at the closely neighboring Carlsbad Caverns National Park in New Mexico, and good highway facilities connect both to the more distant Big Bend area.

Establishment of a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains thus would complete a group of three great national parks in the same areas, all linked and each distinct in its characteristics.

It would be a loss to future generations if the present opportunity, which may be unique, to acquire such an addition to the Nation's recreation lands were allowed to pass. The population is increasing rapidly, and already the existing recreational areas are being crowded. It is important, in any case, that such scenic regions as the Guadalupes be preserved against the ruination of haphazard development, and preservation can best be accomplished by the National Park Service.

RESOLUTION OF THE WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Guadalupe Mountain area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex. is now under study as a suitable and desirable park site; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Tourist Development Committee of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce personally visited and inspected the area on July 12–14, 1963; and

Whereas this subcommittee made its report and presented a resolution, covering all the virtues and attributes of the area now under study, which was adopted unanimously in a called meeting of the Tourist Development Committee held in Big Spring, Tex., on August 13, 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, September 26, 1963, do support the studies looking toward the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a park site; and order copies of this resolution forwarded to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor of the State of Texas and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission.

E. H. DANNER,
President.

FRED H. HUSBANDS,
Executive Vice President.

SIERRA BLANCA, TEX.,
July 10, 1963.

SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The following is a copy of the resolution adopted by the commissioner's court of Hudspeth County at their regular session July 8, 1963.

Upon a motion duly made by Commissioner J. D. Lee, seconded by Commissioner W. F. Hargrove, Jr., and carried unanimously, it is ordered by the court that the following resolution be adopted.

Whereas it is the opinion of the commissioner's court of Hudspeth County, Tex., that places of natural beauty should be maintained for the emjoyment of present and future generations; and

Whereas the national parks now in existence are few and many are only seasonably accessible for the enjoyment of the traveling public; and

Whereas the establishment and maintenance of a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains, in and around McKittrick Canyon, would be of great value to the entire country as well as surrounding areas and would afford year-round recreation in a setting of high rugged mountain peaks, running mountain water, and beautiful trees, and shrubs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The commissioner's court of Hudspeth County, Tex., assembled in regular session this 8th day of July, A.D. 1963, unanimously endorse the creation of a national park by the National Park Service of the U.S. Government in North Culberson County

in the Guadalupe Mountains in the McKittrick Canyon area.

Yours very truly,

TOM H. NEELEY.

Whereas the Guadalupe Mountain area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., is now under study by the National Parks Service for a possible designation as a suitable and desirable national park site; and

Whereas said area is most fitting and suitable for a park site because of its outstanding natural beauty and historical significance; and the Southwest being abundant in maple, wild cherry, ash, walnut, madrone, etc.; in the upper elevations are El Capitan, landmark of the early settlers in their movement to the West, and Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas, 8,751 feet, and where are found heavy stands of ponderosa, limber and pinon pine together with Douglas-fir and aspen; this being the only location in Texas that has rainbow trout and Rocky Mountain elk; plus a dense population of mule deer, wild merriam turkey, mountain sheep, black bear, mountain lions and a normal population of small game; and

Whereas this is one of the few areas remaining in its natural, virgin state in Texas, much of the area never having been utilized for livestock and/or commercial purposes and which has the characteristics that meet the criteria for park use as set forth by the National Park Service; and

Whereas the National Park Service now owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Guadalupe Mountains, adjacent to and including the entrance to the beautiful and spectacular McKittrick Canyon, a result of the generous gift of Mr. Wallace Pratt, celebrated Texas geologist, now being preserved by the Park Service but being of insufficient size to develop into a park; and

Whereas this location is only 35 miles from Carlsbad Caverns National Park and could be operated in conjunction therewith thus effecting a considerable saving; and

Whereas this would add to the existing attractions in the Pecos Valley and the Trans-Pecos areas and would complement our Balmorhea State Park and swimming pool, Fort Davis with its old military installations, scenic drive, and McDonald Observatory; and

Whereas the projected population of Pecos and Reeves Counties will demand more recreational areas to serve our own needs and with the completion of the new highway from Orla in Reeves County to the New Mexico line, we have a direct road to the Guadalupes that will serve not only Pecos and Reeves Counties but will enable Pecos to get its share of the tourists to and from the park; and

Whreas this development would help in the campaign to sell the tourist "on spending an extra day in the Pecos area" as well as the State tourist program of offering more to see and do in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Pecos Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, September 10, 1963, do support the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a national park site; and order that copies of this resolution be sent to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor and our State senator and representative.

ARCHIE SCOTT,
President, Pecos Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING GUADALUPE NATIONAL PARK LEGISLATION, MARCH 23, 1964

On this day, on motion of Commissioner Mays, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez, it is ordered by the court that the following resolution be adopted by the commissioners' court of El Paso County, Tex.:

Whereas the commissioners' court of El Paso County, Tex., on the 29th day of July 1963, went on record as actively and vigorously endorsing and supporting the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch area as a national park; and

Whereas U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH introduced in the Senate bill 2296, and Congressman at Large JOE POOL introduced in the House of Representatives bill H.R. 9312 asking Congress to establish said park; and

Whereas El Paso County commissioners' court continues to believe that the site is fitting and suitable for a national park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, on this 23d day of March, 1964, That the El Paso County commissioners' court supports the proposed legislation and urges the Congress of the United States to pass this legislation in order that this area may be preserved for the enjoyment of present and future generations of Americans.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News, May 19, 1964]

GUADALUPE AREA UNSPOILED BY MAN

(By Henry Wolff, Jr.)

GUADALUPE MOUNTAIN RANCH.—Spanish conquistadores riding north from Mexico in the 1500's must have experienced many of the same inquisitive thoughts of modern day travelers as they approach the Guadalupe mountain range.

Traveling by the scenic range, one cannot help but wonder how El Capitan, the point of the wedge; Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas; and numerous other peaks and interesting canyons would appear on closer inspection.

Today, the average tourist most often does not get a chance to inspect these impressive displays at close range. However, if a proposal of Congressman at Large JOE POOL becomes reality, many future tourists through this area of Texas will get an opportunity to share its beauty and outdoor recreation possibilities.

OVER 8,000 FEET

Rugged El Capitan rises to 8,200 feet above sea level. It has an impressive sheer face and is visible for over 50 miles. Guadalupe Peak, directly north of El Capitan, is 8,751 feet high. Near Guadalupe Peak is Pine Top Mountain, 8,362 feet.

Guadalupe Mountain and part of nearby McKittrick Canyon are on acreage of the 71,790-acre Guadalupe Mountain Ranch owner by J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene. A portion of the Canyon was owned by Wallace Pratt, a noted geologist, who gave approximately 6,000 acres to the National Park Service in March of 1961. The Park Service has explained that because the area is relatively small, it would not be feasible to do more than give protection at this time.

At the time Pratt made his gift to the Nation, he commented, "If the public is to enjoy anything like a full measure of the grandeur and scenic beauty of McKittrick Caynon and the surrounding Guadalupe Mountain, the limits of the new national park must be extended to include these privately owned lands."

At the present time the area is unspoiled by man. Population is scarce and those who live on the land take a great pride in its beauty. When hiking up McKittrick Canyon, Hunter will often stop to pick up a gum wrapper or other litter that some careless visitor has left behind. He is careful to leave behind only that which will return to the earth easily.

It is currently a good hike over rock and through stream to view much of the beauty of the canyon. It has a stream which lazily travels some 4 miles through the cut in the mountains before vanishing underground. Trout swim in the cool, clear water. On each side of the stream, mountains often rise to nearly 6,000 feet. The canyon itself is a rich museum of living plant life, ranging from cacti and other desert vegetation to ponderosa and other pine, more often seen outside the State.

To get a highland view of Guadalupe Peak and El Capitan, one can ride a horse or mule up the rocky, twisting, and narrow trail that leads to the top of Pine Top Mountain, nearly 3,000 feet above Frijole, the ranch headquarters. The view is one not to be forgotten for those few who get an opportunity to venture this far into the mountain range. The State's only herd of wild elk roams this area. Though the elk and trout were not around when Mescalero Apaches inhabited the region, the rest has not changed. The beauty which they knew has been slightly marred only by man's fences and roads.

WANDER TO LEGENDS

With a strong mountain breeze rustling the pines, man can today stand on Pine Top viewing the two more noted peaks before him and quickly find himself leaving thoughts of today behind while letting his mind wander into legend and lore.

While Gen. Lew Wallace was Governor of New Mexico, he says he found a document in Santa Fe describing how a converted Indian conducted a party of Spaniards to a rich gold deposit on the eastern spurs of the Guadalupe Mountains. It is said that Geronimo, leader of the Apaches, used to say that the richest gold mines in the world lay hidden in the Guadalupes. In the 1880's, Ben Sublett, a prospector from Odessa, used to venture into a cave somewhere on the mountain and return with nuggets.

Today, the mountains might not offer man what some of the legends say they did in years gone by, but they can still offer him a chance to get away from crowded civilization for a closer look at nature. They are located in what is already an area with considerable tourist interest. New Mexico's White City, located within a few miles of Carlsbad Caverns and 20 miles from Carlsbad, is only some 25 miles. El Paso with its gateway to Mexico is less than a 2-hour drive.

Though pleased to look at her beauty today, tourists with that desire to enjoy the outdoors must travel through on their way to other spots of interest feeling somewhat deprived of having a more intimate contact with the majestic mountain range.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, July 3, 1963]

GUADALUPES SHELTER WILD, COLORFUL TERRAIN

(By Don Williams)

The grandly forbidding Guadalupe Mountains of far west Texas enfold a sweep of woodland, canyon, and stream whose presence is unrevealed to those who take U.S. Highway 180 between Carlsbad, N. Mex., and El Paso.

Most Texans, in fact, probably have little idea of the scope and variety of the high country behind the steep, barren wall of the range.

And if a survey should be made, it probably would show that 9 out of 10 Texans think El Capitan—the rocky and almost sheer peak at the south end of the ridge—is the highest mountain in the State.

It isn't. It is only the most spectacular and most photographed.

The highest one is Guadalupe (pronounced waddle-oopy by ranchers in the area, but gwaddle-oopy is acceptable) Peak, elevation 8,751 feet above sea level.

An Abilene oil operator, J. C. Hunter, Jr., owns both mountains as well as the rest of the ridge that includes the highest and the second, third, and fourth highest mountains in the State.

His, too, are the Ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir forests of the high bowl country

behind the ridge, and the maple-lined stream that idles down McKittrick Canyon.

The stream is full of 8- to 16-inch rainbow trout, and until it is proved otherwise they may be considered the only trout outside of captivity in the State.

The presence of this unique and colorful hidden terrain might be of only academic interest to the public, except for one thing: Hunter has reason to think the National Park Service is interested in developing the land as a public vacation ground.

Field representatives of the Service spent 5 days on the Hunter ranch last month, riding and camping in the summit ranges and picking their way through the rocks of the canyon.

They told Hunter they were favorably impressed with the site as a possible national park.

The findings of their field survey, which was authorized by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, will be analyzed by specialists in the Department. Udall will receive their recommendation and if it is favorable the proposal could go before Congress for authorizing legislation and an appropriation.

Hunter, whose father acquired the 72,000-acre ranch over a period of years beginning in the early 1920's, hopes all the departmental wheels turn in the direction of making his ranch public land.

He has the ranch up for sale, anyway, and he would like to have its new owner preserve it for the enjoyment of millions.

NORTHEAST LIMIT NEAR FAMED CAVERNS

"It would hurt me to have loved those mountains this many years and then see them ruined by some commercial development," he said.

The Hunter Ranch starts at the New Mexico line southwest of Carlsbad and stretches south and west. Its northeastern limit is 20 miles or less from the edge of Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

Visitors to one park would find it convenient to spend the night in the area and then go through the other, if the Park Service should buy the Guadalupe Mountain area, Hunter said. As it is visitors to the caverns are inclined to get back in their cars and leave for distant parts—and nearly all parts are distant from the Carlsbad-Gaudalupe territory.

Hunter showed representatives of newspapers and wire services over his ranch last weekend.

One tour went by horseback and muleback up a narrow trail from the Hunter ranch headquarters near Highway 180 to the rocky summit of Pine Top Mountain, elevation 8,362 feet. Westward across a canyon from Pine Top stands Guadalupe Peak, which slopes hundreds of feet downward to the top of El Capitan, elevation 8,078. The riders also went through The Bowl, timbered country that lies between 7,500 and 8,000 feet. The rim is marked by Bush Mountain, 8,676 feet, Shumard Peak, 8,626 feet, and Bartlett Peak, 8,513 feet.

The second tour was by foot, about 4 miles up McKittrick Canyon from Hunter's lodge at the 5,300-foot level to the narrows at 6,800 feet.

The rock walls of the canyon rise precipitously in places, with about 1,700 vertical feet in sight from canyon floor to limestone crest.

The stream trickles from pool to pool, but the deep spots are patterned by the forms of nice-sized trout, lying like linear shadows in the clear water. The party saw one rainbow with an agreed-upon length of 16 inches. It flashed to the surface and grabbed a piece of bread someone threw in. No one had any fishing tackle. Hunter discourages fishing on the principle that the stream is not big enough to support much depletion.

Hunter's father, the late J. C. Hunter, an oil man who for a time was county judge of Culberson County, had the trout put in the creek in the 1930's. It was restocked after a flood in the early 1940's. Since then, the fish have multiplied without any human augmentation.

ELK, TURKEYS CALL RANCH HOME

Hunter, who is 48, drives out to the ranch from Abilene on special occasions or when he has guests. He runs about 100 Brangus cattle and 3,000 Angora goats on the ranch. His foreman, Noel Kincaid, keeps the stock out of the canyon and the bowl so that the timber and undergrowth will not be harmed. At least partly for this reason, the creek always had water in it but rarely floods. There also are several springs on the ranch.

A kind of an island in zoological and botanical terms, the ranch has 250 or 300 elk (offspring of a small herd introduced years ago), numerous wild turkeys and mule deer, a few bears and occasionally a transient mountain lion.

It has maples that turn brilliant red and orange in late October and early November, and, in the high country, a few quaking aspens and small spruces and true firs that usually grow at Alpine elevations.

Those on the trip up the canyon Sunday saw bright red dragon flies and an emerald green June bug. Canyon wrens fifed a tune that tumbled like a waterfall, and at night an owl sang and a whippoorwill called.

Temperatures ranged from about 60 in the early morning to the lower 90's at midafternoon on the canyon floor. It is cooler in the higher places. May and June are the dry months. From July through September there are frequent afternoon showers.

PARK RANGER LIVES IN $70,000 HOME

Six thousand acres of the Guadalupe Mountain country already belongs to the Park Service. It was given to the Government in 1961 by Wallace Pratt, a noted geologist who spends some of his time on the land but lives most of the year in Tucson.

A park ranger, Pete Sanchez, who is unmarried, lives alone in the $70,000 Pratt home near the mouth of the canyon. The service is already making plans for initial development of the Pratt grant, which adjoins the Hunter property.

Congressman at large JOE POOL introduced a bill earlier this year to have a survey made of the mountain country with a national park in mind. This bill is now in committee. But Secretary Udall's authorization of a survey seems to have made it of no consequence whether or not the Pool bill is adopted, since the proposal is already being carried out.

If the Hunter and Pratt properties should be made a national park, it would be the second one for Texas. Big Bend National Park is about 230 miles southeast of the Guadalupe Range.

A ridge drive, along the summits of the range from northeast to southwest, might be one of the attractions of the proposed new park. It would provide a big view downward and outward for those who like to do their roughing from a car.

Aside from that and a few trails and other minimal conveniences, Hunter hopes that the Guadalupe National Park, if it materializes, retains a lot of untracked wildness. That's the way he has known and preserved it.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EL PASO COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY FAVORING ESTABLISHMENT OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Whereas the preservation of sites where significant historical events and movements have occurred and which possess a colorful and rich historical heritage are of particular importance to a regional historical society; and

Whereas the area designated in a bill now before the U.S. Senate as "Guadalupe National Park" is stamped with an historical heritage which represents the great cultures, ideas, and movements which have molded the traditions of the American southwest; and

Whereas the Guadalupe Peak-McKittrick Canyon area is rich with the lore of the Southwestern Indian tribes; was the site of important campaigns against the Comanches and Apaches; was a welcome landmark and beacon arising above the desert plains for travelers along the southern routes; was visited by travelers, traders, and immigrants who passed it on several important southwestern travel routes, including the famous Butterfield Express Line; abounds with stories of lost mines and buried treasures; and was the witness of the most significant and colorful chapter of Southwestern history; the great westward migration; and

Whereas it is the belief of the El Paso Historical Society that the rich historical heritage of this area can best be protected and preserved, and the natural beauty of the area best displayed and made available to the public by the U.S. National Park Service; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the El Paso Historical Society unanimously endorse the bill now before the U.S. Senate to create "Guadalupe National Park" and recommend and encourage its prompt enactment into law.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DIRECTORS OF ODESSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENDORSING DESIGNATION OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS AREA AS NATIONAL PARK

Whereas the Guadalulpe Mountains area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., is now under study by the National Park Service for a possible designation as a suitable and desirable national park site; and

Whereas said area is most fitting and suitable for a park site because of its outstanding natural beauty and historical significance; and

Whereas in the area is McKittrick Canyon with plantlife unique in the Southwest being abundant in maple, wild cherry, ash, walnut, madroñe, etc.; in the upper elevations are El Capitan, landmark of the early settlers in their movement to the West, and Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas, 8,751 feet, and where are found heavy stands of pondersoa, limber and piñon pine together with Douglas-fir and aspen; this being the only location in Texas that has rainbow trout and Rocky Mountain elk; plus a dense population of mule deer, wild merriam turkey, mountain sheep, black bear, mountain lions and a normal population of small game; and

Whereas this is one of the few areas remaining in its natural, virgin state in Texas, much of the area never having been utilized for livestock and/or commercial purposes and which has the characteristics that meet the criteria for park use as set forth by the National Park Service; and

Whereas the National Park Service now owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Guadalupe Mountains, adjacent to and including the entrance to the beautiful and spectacular McKittrick Canyon, a result of the generous gift of Mr. Wallace Pratt, celebrated Texas geologist, now being preserved by the Park Service but being of insufficient size to develop into a park; and

Whereas this location is only 35 miles from Carlsbad Caverns National Park and could be operated in conjunction therewith thus effecting a considerable saving; and

Whereas this would add to the existing attractions in the Permian Basin and Trans-Pecos Areas and would compliment our own Meteor Crater, Odessa College Museum and Rim Rock City; and

Whereas the projected population of Odessa alone will demand more recreational areas to serve our own needs and with the completion of the new highway from Orla in Loving County to the New Mexico line, we

have a direct road to the Guadalupes that will serve not only Odessa but will enable Odessa to get its share of tourists to and from the park; and

Whereas this development would help in the campaign to sell the tourist "on spending an extra day in the Permian Basin," as well as the State tourist program of offering more to see and do in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, August 27, 1963, do support the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a national park site; and order that copies of this resolution be sent to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor and our State Senator and Representative.

JACK LOGAN,
President,
Odessa Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

R. W. HEDGES,
Executive Vice President,
Odessa Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DIRECTORS OF MONAHANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS AREA AS A NATIONAL PARK SITE

Whereas the Guadalupe Mountains area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., has now been approved by the National Park Service for a possible designation as a suitable and desirable national park site; and

Whereas said area is most fitting and suitable for a park site because of its outstanding natural beauty and historical significance; and

Whereas in this area is McKittrick Canyon with abundant plantlife unique in the Southwest, being maple, wild cherry, ash, walnut, madroñe, etc.; in the upper elevations are El Capitan, landmark of the early settlers in their movement to the West, and the Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas, 8,751 feet, and where are found heavy stands of ponderosa, limber, and piñon pine together with Douglas-fir and aspen; this being the only location in Texas that has rainbow trout and Rocky Mountain elk; plus a dense population of mule deer, wild Merriam turkey, mountain sheep, black bear, mountain lions, and a normal population of small game; and

Whereas this is one of the few areas remaining in its natural, virgin state in Texas, much of the area never having been utilized for livestock and/or commercial purposes and which has the characteristics that meet the criteria for park use as set forth by the National Park Service; and

Whereas the National Park Service now owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Guadalupe Mountains; adjacent to and including the entrance to the beautiful and spectacular McKittrick Canyon, a result of the generous gift of Mr. Wallace Pratt, celebrated Texas geologist, now being preserved by the Park Service but being of insufficient size to develop into a park; and

Whereas this location is only 35 miles from Carlsbad Caverns National Park and could be operated in conjunction therewith thus effecting a considerable saving; and

Whereas this would add to the existing attractions in the Permian Basin and Trans-Pecos areas and would compliment our own Monahans Sandhills State Park and Museum; and

Whereas the projected population of the Permian Basin will demand more recreational areas to serve our own needs and with the completion of the new highway from Orla in Loving County to the New Mexico State line, we have a direct road to the Guadalupes, that will enable Monahans to get its share of tourists to and from the park; and

Whereas this development would help in the campaign to sell the tourist "on spending an extra day in the Permian Basin," as well as the State tourist program of offering more to see and do in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Monahans Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, April 9, 1964, do support the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a national park site; and order that copies of this resolution be sent to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor and our State legislators.

H. J. ASHER,
President,
Monahans Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

R. T. WILSON,
Manager,
Monahans Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MIDLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE URGING ESTABLISHMENT OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Senate bill 2296 to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park has been introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Midland Chamber of Commerce in regular meeting of August 21, 1963, did pass its resolution supporting the designation of the Guadalupe Mountain area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., as the site of a national park; and

Whereas since that time, distinguished Americans have visited the proposed site and have agreed with the Midland Chamber of Commerce that the area contains outstanding scenic and scientific value which ought to be preserved; and

Whereas the best interests of the United States will be served by the favorable consideration and passage of the legislation introduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Midland Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting this 15th day of April 1964, do hereby urge the Senate to pass the legislation introduced to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution receive the widest possible publicity and that copies hereof be addressed to the Secretary of Interior and the Governor of this State; be it further

Resolved, That John Younger, immediate past president of the Midland (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce be, and hereby is, authorized and delegated to urge the passage of S. 2296 in hearings before the Senators on the 21st and 22d of April 1964.

WALTER C. BEARDSLEY,
President.

STEP BACK INTO TIME IN EL CAPITAN'S SHADOW

(By Robert H. Johnson, Jr.)

PINE SPRINGS, TEX.—The Guadalupe Mountains turn a forbidding face on travelers hurrying past in the desert glare. But it is only a front—shielding a green highland wilderness of canyon and forest. Elk, deer, and turkey wander there, and trout dart in a cold, clear stream.

The National Park Service now owns a small part of this area. It is looking into the possibilities of acquiring another 60,000 acres so that the interior beauty of the Guadalupes can be seen by everybody.

The new park would take in Texas' most famous natural landmark, El Capitan, and the State's highest point, Guadalupe Peak.

The Guadalupes are a wedge-shaped range stretching from southern New Mexico to a point in west Texas about 100 miles east of El Paso and 40 miles southwest of Carlsbad, N. Mex.

El Capitan is the southernmost point of the range. Its sheer limestone walls rise awesomely from the foothills to a height of 8,078 feet. Behind it several peaks tower higher, and Guadalupe Peak reaches 8,751 feet.

This high country now is part of Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, 71,790 acres of desert and mountain owned by J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, an independent oilman whose father bought the ranch in 1924.

Over the years, the Hunter family has protected the wilderness as a game and vegetation preserve.

Wallace Pratt, a geologist often called the father of Humble Oil's geology department, has a ranch near the Hunters. In March 1961, he gave about 6,000 acres of it to the National Park Service.

The Park Service has a ranger stationed to protect this relatively small area from harm. The public is not admitted now.

The additional 60,000 acres would come from the Hunter ranch. Pratt's former land adjoins Hunter's in McKittrick Canyon.

From the Hunter family lodge, the canyon cuts into the east side of the Guadalupes.

A rough foot trail disappears among limestone boulders. Maple, oak, wild cherry, ash, walnut, ponderosa pine, and alligator juniper trees—so called because of their rough bark—grow on either side of McKittrick Creek and along the canyon walls. Madroñes spread smooth, salmon-colored limbs ending in clusters of deep green leaves. Sotol and mescal grow among the trees.

Cliffs rise straight up, as much as 2,000 feet above the canyon floor.

It is a rough hike up the canyon.

The limestone walls and boulders, the towering trees, and the sentinel-like mescal—or century plant—all create an impression of rugged, enduring grandeur.

Yet, there is fragile beauty, too. Swifts dart above you. Canyon wrens whistle their descending scale, and mockingbirds echo them.

Where cloudbursts and winds have hollowed wide overhangs in the walls over centuries, constant seepage deposits delicate buds of white limestone on moss, and maidenhair fern fringes the crevices. Yellow columbine and blue lupine grow in the sunny places along the stream.

Emerald-green June bugs buzz in the trees. And Chinese-red dragonflies flirt with death over the pools where rainbow trout—the only ones in Texas—glide between sunlight and shadow.

To get to the big timber country high in the mountains, it's best to go horseback. Noel Kincaid, foreman of the Hunter ranch, leads the way up Bear Canyon from his headquarters just off U.S. 180.

Bear Canyon is on the southern face of the range. It rises in a rocky surface dotted with scrub spruce, mescal, sotol, and madroñes.

The trail switches nearly 3,000 feet up a 70° slope, where your horse needs a goat's feet in the shale.

At the crest, a rolling green forest spreads over the ridges and an area called the Bowl. Ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, and oak tower together. This is the land of the elk—like the trout the only ones in Texas—and wild turkey.

A little farther up is the rocky summit of Pine Top Mountain, 8,362 feet high. From there you can see the hazy blue line of the Davis Mountains, nearly 100 miles to the southeast. You can look down on the majesty of El Capitan. Guadalupe Peak's summit seems at eye level. And you can pick up rocks that show clearly in fossil remains how eons ago tiny sea animals died and gradually built up this limestone mass that once was part of the Capitan Reef of the Permian Sea.

Mescalero Apaches lived in the Guadalupes when the Spaniards came to this country.

Both Apache and Spaniard handed down legends of gold in the Guadalupes.

Passengers on the Butterfield stage speculated about treasure as they watched El Capitan sit before them mile after dusty mile.

And in the 1800's, an old prospector called Ben Sublett may have found it. He used to go into the mountains and take big nuggets back to Odessa. The secret died with Sublett in 1892. And the only sign of him left in the mountains is his initials, "WCS," carved into an alligator juniper, now scoured nearly smooth by wind and sand.

Nobody since Sublett has found the lost gold. But there may be another treasure of the Guadalupes for Americans today—camping, riding, and hiking in these hidden wilds.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY OR VACANCY IN OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to deal with the vexing problem of Presidential disability and with vacancies which have existed some 16 times in the office of Vice President. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate now to read the imposing list of cosponsors who have joined me in offering this measure; however, I ask unanimous consent that their names, their States, and the text of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names, States, and text of the joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"SEC. 3. If the President declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. If the President does not so declare, and the Vice President with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"SEC. 5. Whenever the President transmits to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits within two days to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress will immediately decide the issue. If the Congress determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I invite specific attention to the fact that the joint resolution bears the names of 68 cosponsors in addition to my own name. This makes a sponsorship of 69 Senators, the number necessary to pass this important piece of legislation. I believe this demonstrates a recognition on the part of a large number of Members of this body of the importance of this problem. The President, in his outstanding state of the Union message, pointed out his recognition of this problem, as well.

I hope it will be possible for this body to reach a speedy acceptance of this measure, which was once passed by the Senate by a voice vote and later by a vote of 65 to 0 in the closing days of the last session.

I close by referring to the remarks made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who recognized this problem when he introduced, a moment ago, a resolution dealing with the problem of vice-presidential vacancy. He said it was his opinion that the reason this measure would not receive consideration in the House was that disability had been included.

I hope the House will join the Senate in recognizing the seriousness of this problem. President Eisenhower was disabled three times, President Garfield for 80 days, and President Wilson for 16 months. Congress needs to deal both with the problem of disability and vice-presidential vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have always believed that the people are the fountainhead of governmental power under our form of government. Therefore, I send to the desk a proposed constitutional amendment to clearly set out the right of the people to choose whether or not they wish to have one house of the legislature of their State apportioned on the basis of factors other than population. This is the same legislative system we have in the Federal Government. The amendment would make the use of such a system optional for the States. In the case of a unicameral legislature, the standard of apportionment would be a reasonable one which could be reviewed by the courts.

In order that other Senators who wish to join me in sponsoring this amendment may have an opportunity to do so, I ask that the resolution lie on the table for 3 days.

I also request, Mr. President, that the the text of the proposed amendment be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE I

SECTION 1. The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or from giving reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR TRANSMISSION OF THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate joint resolution, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated .

The resolution (S.J. Res. 3) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 201 of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 25, 1965, the budget for the fiscal year 1966; and (b) notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15

U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 28, 1965, the Economic Report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the joint resolution is considered and agreed to.

FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Senate last year passed Senate Joint Resolution 110 which I sponsored naming the Washington Channel Bridge on Interstate Route 95 the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge." The resolution had been favorably reported by the District Committee. Unfortunately the measure was not acted on by the other body last year.

I am sending to the desk the resolution as it was approved by the committee and passed by the Senate in the hope that it can be acted upon early in the present session.

The late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota was an indefatigable supporter of the Interstate Highway System and for the District of Columbia, making this structure, linking the District and the interstate route, an especially appropriate memorial to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 5) to designate the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets SW., as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge" introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY—THE NEED FOR A DIRECT AND SIMPLE SOLUTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that a constitutional amendment is required to clarify the question of Presidential inability. This was a subject of comment in the President's state of the Union message on Monday last.

The relatively permanent nature of an amendment to the Constitution requires the closest examination of all proposed amendments with an eye toward the attributes of the original Constitution. The language must provide Congress with the power to legislate mechanisms for the transfer of Presidential powers and must reflect the sound principles upon which the Constitution was built.

The thorough hearings and discussion conducted by the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee under the leadership of Senator BAYH resulted in a proposed solution. That solution was passed in the 11th hour of the 88th Congress by the Senate. It was not considered by the House of Representatives. The study of this problem by that subcommittee has been helpful in developing thoughtful approaches.

However, the committee proposal is one with which I do not find myself in full agreement. The proposal does not contain two aspects which are fundamental and necessary. The first is to avoid "locking intc" the Constitution a detailed and complex method of deciding the presence and termination of inability of the President. The second is to honor the spirit and the word of the doctrine of separation of powers.

In regard to the advisability of setting forth a detailed and complex procedure in the Constitution by amendment, it is helpful to note the comments of the Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, now Acting Attorney General, in the hearings held last year, when he stated:

> The wisdom of loading the Constitution down by writing detailed procedural and substantive provisions into it has been questioned by many scholars and statesmen. The framers of the Constitution saw the wisdom of using broad and expanding concepts and principles that could be adjusted to keep pace with current needs. The chances are that supplemental legislation would be required in any event. In addition, crucial and urgent new situations may arise in the changing future—where it may be of importance that Congress, with the President's approval, should be able to act promptly without being required to resort to still another amendment to the Constitution.
>
> Since it is difficult to foresee all of the possible circumstances which the Presidential inability problem could arise, we are opposed to any constitutional amendment which attempts to solve all these questions by a series of complex procedures (1964 hearings, p. 203).

An objection which has been raised against a simple constitutional amendment requiring subsequent legislation is that it will give Congress a "blank check" on writing implementing legislation. The second aspect of this problem is important on this point. The principle of separation of powers should be included in the amendment. If this is done Congress will not have a "blank check" but firm limitations will be placed upon the mechanism devised for the determination of inability. For this reason, it is my firm belief that any constitutional amendment adopted should leave the determination of disability to the executive branch of our Government.

A look at history will dispel any doubts as to the importance of separation of powers. It is helpful to review the case involving the impeachment of a President. Historical accounts of the impeachment trial of President Andrew Johnson illustrate the clear dangers presented when Congress is called upon to consider where to place the mantle of the Presidential powers. We should not provide additional commingling of powers in the case of inability.

There are sound reasons for applying the principle of separation of powers in this situation. First, the determination of the presence of inability is a factual matter. No policy is involved. The issue is simply the presence or absence of inability on the part of an individual. Congress has no expertise in such a determination, by experience, by proximity, nor by temperament. In fact, it is not inconceivable that fact could be clouded with considerations of a political nature should Congress be brought into the question of the President's inability. None of us would have our doctor prescribe treatment for an illness on the basis of political factors. We must take care to assure that the President of the United States is not subjected to such a determination.

Second, this is a decision which cannot be subject to long delays. In an age of advanced weapons and an accelerated pace in national and international affairs, we cannot afford the luxury of weeks or days of delay for a final determination to be reached.

Third, the parties having firsthand access to the facts regarding inability are found within the executive branch and not in Congress nor the Supreme Court.

In the case of a constitutional amendment we do not have the protection of the veto power of the President to assure that the procedure prescribed by the Congress does not transgress his prerogatives, as would be the case with implementing legislation subsequent to an open-ended amendment.

Even if this protection were present, the crucial point in the separation of powers concept is the time that the Presidential power hangs in balance. Any amendment must meet this delayed reaction test.

For these reasons, I am sending to the desk a constitutional amendment to resolve this lingering "blind spot" in our Constitution and ask that its text be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks; and that the resolution lay on the desk till Monday next to permit of addition of cosponsors to same before printing.

It is my hope that this amendment will provide the relatively direct and simple solution which will allow speedy consideration by both the Senate and the House of Representatives and will, in its simplicity, be quickly ratified by the required number of State legislatures.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in connection with this proposal I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two newspaper articles; one written by C. P. Trussell, of the New York Times, and another which was printed in the Washington Post of Wednesday, January 6, 1965.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 6, 1965]

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY BILL REVIVED ON HILL

Leaders in both Houses plan early hearings and expect congressional approval this year of a constitutional amendment to cope with

the never-settled issue of presidential disability.

They will use as a starting point the Bayh amendment which was passed by the Senate 65 to 0 last year and reportedly is supported by President Johnson.

This is two-part amendment, containing a formula for determining when a Vice President should act for a disabled President and providing for appointment of a Vice President in case that office becomes vacant.

The President told Congress in his state of Union message that he would submit proposals on disability. He did not spell them out. But Senator BIRCH E. BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana, who had discussed the question with the President, promptly announced that he would reintroduce his amendment today. He has already collected 33 Senate cosponsors.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has introduced a resolution identical to BAYH's and said it had top priority on the committee's agenda.

The amendment provides that, if the Vice Presidency becomes vacant, either because of the death of the President or Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President subject to confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

The disability problem arises from the vagueness of the Constitution. It says that in case of presidential disability the President's "powers and duties * * * shall devolve on the Vice President." But it does not tell how to decide whether a President is disabled, nor does it make clear whether a recovered President could reclaim his job.

The amendment provides that, if the President is disabled and so states in writing, the Vice President shall become Acting President. If the President does not so declare, perhaps because he is unconscious, the Vice President may act as President with concurrence of the majority of the Cabinet.

The President would take back the reins of his office with a written statement to Congress that he has recovered. In case of a disagreement between the President and the Vice President backed by the Cabinet as to his ability to function, Congress would decide the question.

The amendment provides that Congress act "immediately" and that the President would resume the powers and duties of his office unless two-thirds of both Houses decided he was unable to act.

Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio, senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, introduced a resolution generally similar to BAYH's, but requiring that Congress act within 10 days on an argument over disability. BAYH said a deadline had been considered by his subcommittee and had been rejected on grounds that Congress could be depended upon to act quickly, but that there was no way to force it to do so.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1965]

BAYH TO PRESENT SUCCESSION PLAN: BILL ON REPLACING AN AILING PRESIDENT DUE TODAY

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, January 5.—A plan for the replacement of an ailing President appeared certain today of early Senate and House consideration. The plan, which also calls for keeping the Vice-Presidency filled, is expected to have President Johnson's active support. He urged such action in his state of the Union message last night.

The plan would be presented as a constitutional amendment, which requires a two-thirds majority approval by Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

A similar bill was approved by a 65 to 0 vote of the Senate last September. It was sent to the House but Congress adjourned before hearings could be started.

Senator BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana, the original sponsor of the Senate resolution, will reintroduce it tomorrow and was expected to be joined by a score or more cosponsors.

NO SNAGS EXPECTED

Such programs previously had run into considerable opposition in the House but this time leaders expect no trouble getting the measure to the floor. The Senate is expected to repeat its performance of last autumn.

Senator BAYH plans only 1 day of hearings on his bill, since transcripts of last year's hearings are available. He said he believed there was new support throughout the country for the proposed amendment.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the Brooklyn Democrat who heads the House Judiciary Committee, introduced a companion measure yesterday as House Joint Resolution 1.

A similar measure was introduced by Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, the ranking Republican on Mr. CELLER'S committee.

"This legislation," Mr. CELLER said, "will be the first order of business of our committee. Hearings will start as soon as the committee is organized for the new Congress."

The Senate's action last September was the first it had taken to correct a succession system that has left the country without a Vice President 16 times for a total of 37 years.

The proposed constitutional amendment makes these proposals:

If a President were removed from office by death or resignation, the Vice President, as under the present constitutional formula, would become President.

Whenever there was a Vice Presidential vacancy, the President would nominate a Vice President to take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

If the President declared in writing that he was unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, these would be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

If the President did not so declare, and the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments (the Cabinet) or such other body as Congress might provide by law, transmitted to Congress his written declaration of Presidential inability, the Vice President would immediately become Acting President.

Whenever the President transmitted a written declaration to Congress that an inability no longer existed, he could reassume his powers and duties unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the departments, declared to Congress within 2 days that the President was in fact disabled.

In the last-mentioned instance, Congress would immediately decide the issue. If Congress determined by a two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President was not able to resume his duties, the Vice President would continue as Acting President. Otherwise the President would resume the powers and duties of his office.

The sponsors expressed hope that the legislation could clear Congress without material amendment.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution pertaining to a proposed constitutional amendment relating to the electoral college. The joint resolution is the same as others which have been introduced in Congress on several occasions. Similar joint resolutions were sponsored in this body, first by former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, and later by Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee. I have joined in sponsoring them every time. One such joint resolution passed this body by an overwhelming majority.

I strongly believe that something needs to be done regarding the electoral college. It was quite interesting to observe that in his state of the Union message the President included a statement that something would be done to change the electoral college system.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred, but that first it may lie on the table for a week, to permit Senators who may wish to do so to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISTRIBUTION OF FILM ENTITLED "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, before we turn our attention to the challenges which lie ahead for this new Congress and the new era of the Great Society, I would like to call attention to one small but important step we should take to keep faith with the past.

I refer to the splendid film which has been made by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," which depicts events in the administration of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

The USIA is properly prohibited from producing films for domestic consumption, but to my mind there never was a clearer case for exception to this rule than is presented by this film.

"Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" is a masterpiece of documentary photography. It tells the moving story of the New Frontier with accuracy and good taste. It recaptures the stark tragedy of the assassination without being maudlin, for the theme of this film is that one "day of drums" could not obliterate the splendid achievements of the Kennedy years, and that John F. Kennedy does indeed live on in the accomplishments of his administration and in the spirit which he imparted so richly to American public life.

It seems to me that this remarkable film should be seen by as many Americans as possible—particularly by young Americans in our schools—because it is an inspirational challenge for the kind of active citizenship which John Kennedy personified. I believe that Congress should therefore take special steps to permit domestic distribution of this film.

The joint resolution which I introduce today would simply express the sense of Congress that the U.S. Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make this film available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States. While it will be necessary to distribute the film on a commercial basis to cover the costs involved, it seems to me that the net proceeds should be applied in some way to perpetuate the memory of the late President. My joint resolution, therefore, directs that the net proceeds revert to the Treasury for the express benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I can think of no more fitting way in which to assist the construction of this lasting memorial to President Kennedy.

I might add that there was one precedent for making such an exception to the usual policy prohibiting domestic distribution of such films, and that involved another excellent USIA film depicting the visit of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy to India in 1962. Unfortunately, the intent of Congress was not clearly expressed on that film because the House failed to act on a Senate concurrent resolution, with considerable confusion resulting. I hope that Congress will lose no time in expressing its will clearly with regard to this new film on President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I send my joint resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) to authorize the distribution in the United States of the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy. Accordingly, it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film described above available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States.

SEC. 2. The net proceeds resulting from any such distribution shall be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and made available, in addition to appropriations authorized in the John F. Kennedy Center Act, to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts for use in carrying out the purposes of such Act.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, interest in our electoral college reform has reached an alltime high; in part, I suspect, because of the recent Supreme Court decisions on the one citizen-one vote concept. In part also, it is because the State of Delaware has recently given notice that it will file a Federal suit on behalf of the State of Delaware to break up the "winner take all" block system of electoral college voting.

In part, certainly it is because the President of the United States in his state of the Union address called attention to the inequities and evils in the present electoral college system, and placed himself on record as being in favor of some type of reform.

It is appropriate, therefore, that on this day, when the electoral college votes are to be counted, we should reintroduce the proposed constitutional amendment which has been before the Senate for some time—namely, Senate Joint Resolution 12, which I now send to the desk for appropriate reference and for the usual number of cosponsors and coauthors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that now is the time to act on this important question.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides the formula for correcting the situation, on which the present President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, when a Senator from Texas, voted in this chamber.

So it would seem that the signs augur well for the passage of electoral college reform in the early future.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity again to cosponsor with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and others, a proposed constitutional amendment to effect certain changes in the method of electing the President and Vice President. For the past several Congresses I have joined in this effort to reform the electoral college because, in my opinion, there is no political issue of greater significance to our Nation.

As all Members of the Senate know, the present system of electing the Nation's two highest officers is governed by article II, section 1, and the 12th amendment to the Constitution, which provide simply that the President and Vice President shall be chosen by electors appointed by each State in the manner directed by its legislature. Each State has the same number of electors as it is entitled to representatives in the Congress, and the candidates receiving a plurality of the popular vote receive the State's entire electoral vote.

A major popular objection to this system is that it is possible to elect a minority President. On 11 occasions since the adoption of the Constitution, a President has been elected without a majority of the popular vote although he received more popular votes than any other candidate. On three occasions, the candidate elected President had fewer popular votes than his leading opponent. In 1888, for example, Grover Cleveland received a plurality of about 100,000 votes over Benjamin Harrison, but Harrison received 233 electoral votes and Cleveland received only 168. There will always be the possibility under the present system that this result will occur, and in a great democratic society the majority vote shall always be reflected in the election of the people's choice.

I believe, however, that the greatest danger of our present system is in the ever-increasing concentration of population in a few States and the disproportionate influence these areas exert in our national elections.

At the present time, the 11 largest States, plus any one other State, have a sufficient number of electoral votes to control the election. These 11 States are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida, Missouri, and Indiana. Within these States, one or two large cities control the entire electoral vote. In a very real sense, these relatively few urban areas determine who will be the President and Vice President of the United States. It can hardly be questioned that this political power is disproportionate to the population of these few cities.

This situation has developed because of the growth of our two-party system and the movement of our population to large urban areas. While I do not suggest that we change our political party organization, or that residents of our major cities be denied proper representation, I do believe that the electoral vote should more accurately reflect the total national popular vote. Brief mention has already been made of the so-called minority Presidents that have been elected under the present electoral system. Even when the candidate receives a majority of both the popular and electoral votes, the disparity is often great. In 1936, for example, President Roosevelt received 60 percent of the popular vote and 98 percent of the electoral vote. General Eisenhower received 83 percent of the electoral vote in 1952, but only 55 percent of the popular vote. In 1960, the late President Kennedy's popular vote exceeded that of Vice President Nixon by only two-tenths of 1 percent of the total vote, but he received 300 electoral votes to 223 for Mr. Nixon. In the State of Illinois, Mr. Kennedy received less than 10,000 votes more than Nixon out of almost 5 million votes, and yet he received all of the State's 27 electoral votes.

This disparity between the popular and electoral votes exists in these cases largely because a simple plurality in these large States controls the entire

electoral vote. Because of this development in our electoral process, many proposals have been submitted to Congress through the years to reform the electoral college system.

These proposals have taken three basic forms which are generally described as first, the direct popular election plan; second, the proportional election plan; and third, the direct election plan. I favor the direct plan which is basically incorporated in the resolution just introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. Basically, this plan retains the electoral vote system. Each State would choose two electors on a statewide basis, corresponding to their representation in the Senate, and would also choose an elector from each of several single-elector districts corresponding to the number of representatives to which that State is entitled in the House of Representatives. Under this system, a State's entire electoral vote would not go to the candidate receiving a plurality of the total popular vote, but would be divided according to the vote in each district. Had this system been in effect in Illinois in the 1960 election, for example, Mr. Kennedy would have received 15 electoral votes and Mr. Nixon would have received 12.

It can be readily seen that this division would have more accurately reflected voter sentiment in that State, instead of Mr. Kennedy receiving all 27 electoral votes.

All Senators are generally familiar with this proposal, Mr. President, and I therefore shall not discuss it in detail at this time. I believe that its merits are easily recognized; its adoption would result in a great improvement over the present electoral system. In my opinion, it is absolutely necessary that the Congress consider this proposal and submit it to the States for ratification if we are to continue to be a great representative democracy. Unless some change is made, the smaller, less populous States will have no significant voice in the election of the President and Vice President. The time for passage of this or a similar proposal is now, and to that end I urge prompt action by the Senate.

Mr. President, soon after I came to the Senate in 1947 a resolution similar to the one now submitted passed this body by a vote of more than two-thirds. I do not believe that it was ever considered on the floor of the House of Representatives, but that vote then demonstrated a need and a realization of that need. The measure has several times previously been considered by the Senate. I believe that the facts are now sufficient, and that the realization of the need is great; they will be so recognized, and the measure will be passed by this body.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO FUTURE VACANCIES IN THE OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to future vacancies in the office of Vice President.

Simply stated, it provides that in the event of a vacancy in this office, the the President shall nominate a Vice President of the same party affiliation as that of the President.

The nominee would take office only upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress sitting in joint session.

Senators will note that my proposal addresses itself to the heart of the question relative to filling the office of Vice President. It does not contain superfluous language or concern itself with side issues, which would only bog down the Congress in endless controversy while the immediate problem is left unresolved.

Our concern at the moment should be to set up the machinery to fill the Vice-Presidency in the event of death or resignation of the President. In one word—"continuity."

Any other issues, such as the disability of the President, can be left for later decision and action. Such a question as this can be resolved, at least temporarily, by arrangement between the President and the Vice President.

Mr. President, as I understand it, the reason why the bill passed by the Senate in the preceding session was not acted upon by the House was the great difficulty in resolving this particular issue.

It must be underscored again that the issue of immediacy is filling the post of Vice President.

In addition, my proposal would meet head on the problem of future controversy, should the Congress be controlled by a party not the same as that of the President.

If this language is not included, I can envision a problem such as Mr. Truman would have had in the late 1940's when he assumed the Presidency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be appropriately referred, printed in the RECORD, and lie over for additional cosponsors through Friday, January 15, 1965.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, will be printed in the RECORD and lie over for additional cosponsors through Friday, January 15.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to vacancies in the Vice-Presidency, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In the case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall be a member of the same political party as the President, who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress sitting in joint session."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Wilson Hopes Congress Acts Soon on Succession," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of December 17, 1964, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WILSON HOPES CONGRESS ACTS SOON ON SUCCESSION

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Now that the electoral college has acted and Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY are formally elected President and Vice President, respectively, the new Congress should lose no time enacting legislation on the succession to the Vice Presidency.

Ordinarily the opening weeks and even months of Congress are unproductive and Congress has little excuse not to adopt this essential legislation by April 15.

The action of the electoral college on December 14 filled one vacuum but left another. If President Johnson should die prior to January 20, HUMPHREY would not be entitled to succeed to the Presidency. The man in line is the Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, 72. HUMPHREY would not be entitled to the Presidency until January 20.

BAYH'S BILL

If he then succeeded MCCORMACK, there would be no Vice President and a Speaker of the House would once again be second in line. This condition would continue, exempting mortality, for 4 years.

This illustrates how unsatisfactory are the present laws of succession. The country is constantly faced by the possibility that a man will succeed to the Presidency who was not specifically chosen for this role, who might have no qualification for the office whatsover, but who might serve for several years.

In practical effect there is no problem. A presidential candidate chooses his running mate and thus his possible successor. It follows logically that a President should choose a new Vice President if the incumbent Vice President dies. This is provided by a bill introduced by Senator BAYH, of Indiana which passed the Senate at the last session.

The trouble with the Bayh bill is that it involves other questions which could well be left for later decision after Congress has provided that a President may fill the vacant office of Vice President. What is needed now is action on this one simple question. The Bayh bill provides that the President shall nominate a new Vice President for the duration of an unexpired term and that he shall then be elected by a majority of both Houses of Congress.

If the President's nominee were to be rejected then he shall submit additional names until Congress has approved. BAYH offers his proposal in the form of a constitutional amendment. It is doubtful if the approval of Congress should be called for at all.

Take, for example, the case of President Truman. He was without a Vice President for nearly 4 years and during that time both Houses of Congress were controlled for 2 years by the Republican Party. If the Bayh proposal had been in effect Truman would have been forced to get approval of his Vice-Presidential choice from a Republican Congress,

which might or might not have given approval.

A DISABLED PRESIDENT

Other debatable matters are included in the Bayh proposal. One of them is that a majority of the Cabinet could declare the President disabled thus enabling the Vice President to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency. Such arrangements are better left to written understandings between the Vice President and President.

President Eisenhower had such an understanding with Vice President Nixon. A similar arrangement was made between President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, and Johnson has announced he will make such an agreement with Humphrey when Humphrey becomes Vice President.

Congress need only address itself to the simplest problem, that of filling the Vice-Presidency if this office falls vacant.

ALL-INCLUSIVE SETTLEMENTS

All-inclusive settlements of the various problems entering into the many possible different forms of succession are likely to be found unduly restrictive in the future.

What is needed is the settlement of one single part of the problem which arises now in direct form. This can be done by giving the President the right he already has in practical politics, the right to choose his possible successor for a limited term. If this can be done without a constitutional amendment so much the better.

If the legislation is not adopted this will be the typical situation in the future if a President dies in office: The Vice President will succeeed to the Presidency, there will be no Vice President and the next in line for the Presidency will be a Member of Congress, elected by a fraction of the voters in one State, who may or may not be a member of the President's political party. He will be a man of mature years and of high seniority in Congress; otherwise he would not be Speaker of the House.

ADDITIONAL JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

The following additional joint resolution was introduced, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

HIGH-SPEED RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN THE NORTHEASTERN PART OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to reintroduce my original, basic joint resolution to provide high-speed rail passenger service in the northeastern part of the United States.

This Senate joint resolution, which I first introduced in the 87th Congress on June 1, 1962, and reintroduced in the 88th Congress, has prompted a remarkable volume of public debate and deliberation in spite of the fact that it has never been considered in committee. I am proud indeed to reintroduce it today, particularly in view of the fact that President Johnson found enough merit in my idea to incorporate it into his program for the Great Society as set forth by him in his state of the Union message.

This is a very simple bill. It would simply authorize the eight Seaboard States between Boston and Washington plus the District of Columbia to enter into a compact and form a public authority to operate rail passenger service. It would do nothing more than permit a group of States to combine to form a new agency for financing public transportation. It would not commit the Federal Government to any program of direct subsidy, although I have suggested that it be desirable for the Federal Government to guarantee a portion of the bonded debt of the authority.

This simple joint resolution is, thus, only a suggested innovation for financing railroad rehabilitation. Although the language of the bill makes no attempt to spell out just what form this rehabilitation would take, the immense possibilities of what could result, I believe, have caught the fancy of the traveling public everywhere.

I have suggested from the beginning that the very minimum improvement should be the acquisition of new equipment which would permit frequent service at 100 miles per hour speeds between the great urban centers of our northeastern megalopolis. The existing railroad companies, caught in the spiral of their own decline in passenger service, are unwilling or unable to make such an investment. I believe it is in the public interest for Government to take limited steps to stimulate such activity.

My reasoning has been that because of the unique geographic, economic, and demographic features of our area, the railroads inevitably will play an essential role in moving people. We have in our northeast megalopolis over 20 percent of the Nation's population and nearly 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing operations crowded on only 1.4 percent of the Nation's land area. There is no other comparable area in our country where there are so many people competing for space and for channels of transportation.

By 1980, we are told, intercity travel in this megalopolis is expected to increase by about 170 percent, and we are already beginning to see limitations to the existing modes of transportation.

Our highway system in some areas is overbuilt, monopolizing an excessive portion of our valuable and costly urban area, often without adequate planning for its overall economic and social impact. We may soon approach the condition of Los Angeles where, for example, at least 50 percent—and possibly as much as 68 percent—of surface space in downtown Los Angeles is devoted to vehicle movement and storage.

And the Commerce Department reports that up to $1 million in runway expansion will be required to accommodate normal increases in air service in the megalopolitan corridor by 1980, even if no new alternatives are presented.

Finally, the railroad passenger service has steadily declined in every conceivable way as passengers are being increasingly tossed about on the deteriorating railroad facilities. In fact, I refer to the night train along our seaboard as the "waker," not the "sleeper."

It is against this background that I originally conceived my proposal for high-speed rail passenger service in the Northeast States.

It seems to me that the railroads, with their valuable, restricted rights of way, have a huge, unrealized potential for efficient, dependable, and safe transportation. A single set of rails can do the job of up to 18 lanes of highway. And rail service is relatively immune from the twin plagues of airborne and highway travel—weather and traffic jams. We had a striking demonstration of this fact last Christmas eve when dense fog up and down the eastern seaboard forced thousands of travelers to depend on the railroads.

But the railroads, in order to fulfill their destiny, must attempt to be competitive. I am convinced that in the intermediate length hauls of the megalopolis they can be. With proper innovation the trip from Washington to New York by rail could be made in about 2 hours, and the trip from Washington to Boston could be made in 4.

If such competitive service were to be made available, I believe the railroads would come back into their own as passenger carriers, and their service thus would be preserved intact and viable to meet the even more complex needs of the future. For this reason, I believe that Government should act now to preserve and develop what private industry is unable to save.

I am very glad indeed that the administration of President Johnson has found merit in my general thesis and now is moving ahead with plans for long-range research and development as well as immediate demonstration projects.

The executive branch took an early interest in my proposal in October 1962 when President Kennedy first asked for an evaluation of the plan. This led to feasibility studies by the Department of Commerce during 1963 and 1964 which terminated last August with the conclusion that "the promise of efficient, low cost, fast rail service along the Northeastern Corridor is sufficient to warrant proceeding with detailed investigation and evaluation, including research, design, testing, and demonstration."

In October, President Johnson directed the Secretary of Commerce to initiate a program of high-speed rail demonstration projects and to plan an extensive program of research and development to stimulate new technology in high-speed ground transportation.

It was this two-part program to which the President referred when he pledged in his state of the Union message last Monday:

I will ask for funds to study high-speed rail transportation between urban centers. We will begin with test projects between Boston and Washington. On high-speed

trains, passengers could travel this distance in less than 4 hours.

As the author of the concept which stimulated all of this activity, I can only say that I am immensely gratified and pleased. I hope that Congress will act favorably and quickly on the implementing legislation and appropriation requests which the administration is expected to submit shortly.

I might add that while I fully support this forward-looking development program, I am greatly aware that much needs to be done here and now for the pressing problems confronting our railroads, particularly in New England. I hope to have more to say on this matter later this week.

Finally, I would point out that the compact bill which I introduce today is one of several possible approaches which may be taken when the administration's program enters the developmental stage. It is by no means the only one and others may be put forward for consideration in time. The original compact bill, nonetheless, is a reasonable and practical approach which I wish to keep before Congress unless and until a better concept presents itself.

Mr. President, I send a joint resolution to the desk, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am happy to note that identical or similar bills are being introduced in the House today by Congressmen GIAIMO and ST. ONGE, of Connecticut, ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island, SICKLES, of Maryland, and WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 16) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the eastern seaboard area containing the eight States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, is rapidly becoming a megalopolis, and now has a population of over thirty-seven million, and contains almost 30 per centum of the Nation's manufacturing and 21 per centum of the Nation's retailing establishments, as well as the Nation's Capital;

Whereas this area is now serviced by a multitrack system of railroads which for the most part have sufficient rights-of-way to provide adequate passenger transportation throughout the area, but the railroads involved have not been able to provide such passenger service on a paying basis and must rely on profits from freight transportation to keep their entire systems operating;

Whereas it therefore appears that a Government authority must be organized to provide such passenger service which is essential to the welfare of the Nation as well as the area involved, and that the existing railroads would continue to provide necessary freight transportation; and

Whereas it appears that a multistate authority formed by the States involved would be the best type of governmental authority to carry out this passenger rail transportation function: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and to the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact for the purpose of establishing a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. Such consent is given upon the following conditions:

(1) a representative of the United States, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in such negotiations and shall make a report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into; and

(2) such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the States involved or upon the District of Columbia unless and until it has been ratified by the legislature of each of such States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is not the first time I have commended the Senator from Rhode Island for the introduction of his measure on a rapid transit railroad service in this part of the country. I think it would set a pattern that would spread elsewhere in the country. I was delighted the other night when the President recommended the principle of the Senator's proposal in his state of the Union address. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will be successful not only in getting hearings on his measure but in passage this year. To that end he can count on any assistance I can give him.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

RESOLUTION TO EQUALIZE PAY OF THREE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the pay act which was enacted last year, there were three subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee which, because there were no funds available, would not have their pay equalized at the end of January.

My understanding is that a resolution to correct that situation would have to be acted upon almost immediately, or at least before the 10th day of the month in order to make pay equalization possible for the month of January.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader and myself I submit a resolution to accomplish that equalization and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mrs. SMITH:

Responses by recipients of Hadassah Myrtle Wreath Awards, at New York City on December 3, 1964.

RETIREMENT OF MR. CHARLES L. WATKINS—HIS DESIGNATION AS PARLIAMENTARIAN EMERITUS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber on Monday when the majority leader, my colleague from Arkansas, and several other Senators joined in paying tribute to Charlie Watkins on his retirement.

I wish to join in what was said then and to add my thanks to Charlie for the wise counsel and long service which he has given to the Senate. All of us in the Senate have to take second place to him both in seniority and in knowledge of the Senate rules and procedures. His long tenure as Parliamentarian has given him a tremendous fund of experience and knowledge about the Senate, its rules, its traditions, and its Members. He has been relied upon by Vice Presidents, majority leaders, and freshmen Senators alike. He has never failed to give calm and unerring counsel.

It is a source of special pride to me that Charlie Watkins is a native of my State, having come to Washington over 60 years ago as secretary to Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas, whose statue, I might add, is contained in the lower hall of the Capitol.

The Senate will miss Charlie Watkins, and I hope he will drop by occasionally to be sure that things are in good order. I know that all Members of the Senate join in wishing him good luck and Godspeed in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles about the retirement of Charles Watkins, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star and the Arkansas Gazette, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Arkansas Gazette]

SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN, FIRST, ONLY ONE, RETIRING—HE'S NATIVE OF ARKANSAS

WASHINGTON.—Charles L. Watkins, 85, the only official Parliamentarian in Senate history, will retire today after 59 years of continuous service in one Senate job or another.

Watkins, a native of Mount Ida, Ark., has been Senate Parliamentarian continuously since 1937, when the job was created as a separate post. For 2 years before that, he was both Parliamentarian and Journal clerk.

Watkins, still trim and spry, was closing up his office and looking forward to retirement when he paused to reminisce with reporters. He has no special plans, he said.

"I plan to do as much of nothing as I can and take it easy," he said, "and get a good rest."

Senate Secretary Felton M. Johnston, in announcing Watkins' retirement, named Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian since 1952 and an established authority on congressional procedure, as Parliamentarian to succeed Watkins.

Murray Zweben, an assistant in Watkins' office for the last 2 years, was named Assistant Parliamentarian.

Watkins figured in virtually every important Senate ruling and controversy for more than 50 years.

The scholarly, mild-mannered Watkins laughed off any suggestion he might write a book or compile his memoirs. In effect, he said, he couldn't afford to. Too many people have trusted him with too many secrets.

Watkins grew up at Mount Ida and took shorthand there. After 3 months, he went to Little Rock and got a job on the staff of Attorney General Jeff Davis, who later served three terms as Governor of Arkansas. He worked as a secretary under Davis and studied law on the side.

He came to Washington on December 1, 1905, to join the staff of Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas. Watkins went to work in the office of the Secretary of the Senate in 1914.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star]

PARLIAMENTARIAN RETIRES—60 YEARS WITH SENATE

(By Cecil Holland)

A Senate tradition has come to an end and a repository of Senate secrets has been closed voluntarily with the retirement of Charles L. Watkins after 60 years of service in the Senate.

The Parliamentarian of the Senate for more than a quarter of a century ended his long service yesterday as quietly as he had made his rulings during many controversial Senate debates.

A notice of his retirement and a brief biography of his Senate service dating back to 1904 was sent to the Senate Press Gallery.

Watkins drove to his home at 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., with no fanfare after his final official day at the Capitol.

He left with the best wishes for his successor, his assistant for the last several years, Floyd M. Riddick, and for the Assistant Parliamentarian who once served as Watkins' secretary, Murray Zweben.

As Parliamentarian, the 85-year-old retiring Senate official sat directly in front of the Vice President or whoever was presiding officer in the Senate. In this position he overheard many discussions and many Senate secrets.

But for Watkins there will be no memoirs, no history, and no published recollections.

He said he plans to do no writing and has kept no notes and does not intend to comment on "what I have heard."

Any such comments, he said, were "confidential."

The slender wispy and soft-spoken Parliamentarian was a great favorite of the Senators, newspapermen, and all others who knew him.

In some of the major Senate battles over the years, Watkins occupied his seat in front of the presiding officer for as long as 12 hours at a time. He has been connected with the Senate debates for more than 40 years.

He served as Parliamentarian under 10 Vice Presidents and 3 of them became President. These were Calvin Coolidge, Harry S. Truman, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

The retiring official's greatest stresses came during filibusters and with a wry comment he remarked: "I've been through a lot of them."

His greatest strains came through Senate consideration of such measures as the Fair Employment Practices Act, antilynching proposals and civil rights legislation. He believes the parliamentary situation is clearer now on such issues since "the pattern is pretty well outlined."

Watkins was born in Mount Ida, Ark., on August 10, 1879. He was graduated from the Mount Ida Normal Academy and the University of Arkansas' law department.

His connection with the Senate began on December 1, 1904, when he was appointed as a stenographer in the office of Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas. After various service in other offices he was appointed Journal clerk of the Senate in 1919.

In 1923, when the office of Parliamentarian was still not created, he was given in addition to his regular duties the position of unofficial adviser to the Vice President.

On July 1, 1935, his title was changed by the Senate to Parliamentarian and Journal clerk. Two years later these duties were divided and he was assigned to the responsibilities which he has filled since that time.

In 1945, on leave given by the Senate, he served as Parliamentarian of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

His successor as Senate Parliamentarian has been an assistant in the office since 1952. Riddick, who lives in Manassas, Va., is a native of North Carolina and a recognized expert on Senate procedures.

Zweben, a George Washington University Law School graduate, has been Second Assistant Parliamentarian of the Senate since January 1963. He practiced law after serving as secretary to the Parliamentarian from 1956 to 1959.

CHARLES L. WATKINS: DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we begin this week a new and challenging chapter in the legislative history of the United States—the 89th Congress is convened and already embroiled in the complex business of forging the laws of our Nation. But, as we gather again in this Chamber to begin this demanding task we note with regret that a familiar face is missing.

Charles L. Watkins has richly earned the pleasures and relaxations of retirement after nearly threescore years of service to the U.S. Senate. As Parliamentarian in this body, his has been a difficult and often thankless duty—to provide procedural advice to insure the orderly conduct of business in a forum which is the scene of almost daily controversy. To say that he has done his job well is to deal in monumental understatement.

Since coming to the Senate as a spokesman for the people of West Virginia in 1958, I have had many opportunities to observe Charlie Watkins at work. In the midst of heated debate, with feeling and partisanship much in evidence, Mr. Watkins was ever the impartial and unperturbable adviser of the Chair. His unfailing accuracy and extensive knowledge of precedent were alternately a source of amazement and inspiration to me. And, it is also likely that he has successfully endured more exposure to the spoken word than any other living American, for the Senate is not a place of stony silence.

We are saddened that our friend and coworker, Charlie Watkins, is no longer at our side as we again take up the burdens of government. However, we rejoice that he can now devote himself to leisure pursuits. We are grateful to Charles L. Watkins for his years of steadfast service; grateful that he leaves us with a capable replacement, Dr. Floyd Riddick; but perhaps most grateful for the indelible imprint that he has made on the character and continuity of action in the U.S. Senate. In this, his has been an invaluable service to the people of our Nation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, I was unavoidably called off the Senate floor when a number of the Members of the Senate paid fitting tribute to our esteemed retiring Parliamentarian, Mr. Charles L. Watkins. I want to take this opportunity to join in these tributes and tell of my high admiration and respect for Mr. Watkins and for the service he has performed for the U.S. Senate. Mr. Watkins has labored long and diligently in his position as Parliamentarian. In fact, Mr. Watkins is the creator of the position of Senate Parliamentarian, serving as the first and, until his retirement, as the only Parliamentarian of the Senate. His Government service spans some 59 years in all, with continuous Senate service of more than 50 years. He has advised many Vice Presidents and other presiding officers while they were presiding over the Senate, and has always been a fair and impartial arbiter of the rules. His personal life has been no less impeccable than his public life. Mr. Watkins has been honored for rendering 35 years of continuous service as secretary of his Sunday school.

Fortunately for us, Mr. Watkins leaves behind an invaluable compilation of Senate procedures and a staff of able assistants to continue in the tradition set by Mr. Watkins. In his position as Parliamentarian emeritus, he will be available for consultations and advice when the Senate is in need of his clear and cogent thinking on any parliamentary problem. The Senate will not be the same in the years ahead without Mr. Watkins, but I wish for him many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I would like to add to the sentiments expressed by other Senators my personal admiration and appreciation for the service Mr. Charles L. Watkins has rendered the Senate for over half a century. We shall miss his wise and unfailingly fair counsel and feel a sense of loss at his retirement. Mr. Watkins leaves us an able successor, Dr. Floyd Riddick, to continue in the tradition of conscientious fairness.

I wish for Mr. Watkins good health, long life, and much happiness in the future.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND RULE XXII

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which declares that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," and to the advisory opinions of Vice President Nixon that rules which restrict the power of a majority of the Senate of a new Congress to change its rules are not binding on the Senate at the opening of a new Congress, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and myself, a resolution to amend rule XXII, and request its present consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must regretfully object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard; and the resolution will go over, under rule XIV.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice of a motion to amend rule XXII, as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CERTAIN SENATE RULE

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and without prejudice to the constitutional right of a majority of the Senate of the 89th Congress to accept, reject, or modify any such rule, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules in the following particulars, namely:

That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is: To provide for bringing debate to a close under certain circumstances by vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK P. BRIGGS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of the Nation's outstanding public servants, a former member of this body, Hon. Frank P. Briggs, of Macon, Mo., currently Assistant Secretary of the Interior, has decided to retire from Government.

No one would deny that this outstanding Missourian, former chairman of the Missouri Conservation Commission, and a former Missouri State senator, who completed the term of President Harry S. Truman, has full right, after such a long and distinguished career, to retire from public service. His retirement, however, is a loss to the people of both our State and Nation.

Frank Briggs has worked tirelessly for the wildlife conservation program of this country. His vision as expressed in his efforts have been a practical interpretation of President Johnson's hope to establish "a green legacy for tomorrow."

Those of us who know this able public servant not only respect his ability and capacity, but are very grateful to him for his true and loyal friendship. Frank Briggs leaves the mark of friendship on every path he travels.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Kansas City Times of December 26, "Frank Briggs Will Return to the Outdoors," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Dec. 26, 1964]

FRANK BRIGGS WILL RETURN TO THE OUTDOORS

On March 1, Frank P. Briggs will step down as the Nation's No. 1 outdoor man. For the last 4 years he has served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife. During his tenure, Briggs has placed special emphasis on the problems of migratory waterfowl and the so-called endangered species of birds and game, such as the whooping crane and the buffalo. His record has been good.

Briggs accepted the assignment from President Kennedy after a long career in Government, which included many years as an able and hard-working member of the Missouri Conservation Commission. Earlier he had served in the State senate and had filled out the final 2 years of the senatorial term of Harry S. Truman.

The retiring Assistant Secretary has had a lifelong fascination with the duck blinds and quail country of north Missouri. Briggs has missed this rolling countryside. In Washington, he has given up countless hours of personal hunting to help guarantee that there will be plenty of birds left for others in future years. An integral part of the program has been his work with Canada to set aside sufficient "wet lands" for nesting and breeding. During his 4 years, the Interior Department has more than tripled the acquisition of land for wildlife conservation in the United States.

Frank P. Briggs has forged a long and enviable career of public service to Missouri and the Nation. Next March he plans to return to his home in Macon, Mo., and, we presume, to many more contented hours in the great outdoors.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK LUTHER MOTT, DEAN EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this last fall Missouri lost an able educator and fine gentleman and American, one of its foremost scholars in the fields of history and journalism, in the death of Dr. Frank Luther Mott, dean emeritus of the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Dr. Mott, a native of Iowa, was respected and honored not only in Missouri and nationally, but also throughout the world for his contributions to freedom of the press and his scholarly work on the history of American journalism.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star on October 24, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Oct. 24, 1964]

DR. FRANK LUTHER MOTT

Warmth marked whatever Frank Luther Mott wrote about or did. He had great relish for life and splendid insight into what makes people tick. Dr. Mott had long been recognized as the dean of American historians of journalism. One of his many authoritative books in this field, "American Journalism: A History" has been standard for a generation.

Dr. Mott earned national fame in education and journalism long before becoming dean of journalism at the University of Missouri in 1942. The native Iowan developed a love for the variety of Missouri that was reflected in his most recent book, "Missouri Reader," an anthology of writings linked to the Show-Me State.

Dean Mott himself was a distinguished literary craftsman as well as a prolific producer of nonfiction. He could and did write first-rate fiction. One of his short stories, "The Man With the Good Face," has been translated into several languages. Cheerful and with a bow tie as a trademark, he could also be entertaining in the classroom.

Nationally, Dr. Mott's greatest recognition came from his "History of the American Magazine." Two volumes of that work brought him the Pulitzer Prize for history in 1939. Illness that preceded his death yesterday at the age of 78 prevented completion of the fifth volume.

After becoming dean emeritus in 1951, Dr. Mott continued his lifelong habit of hard work. His wife, who died last month, was his faithful research assistant. In a volume of biographical essays Dr. Mott observed: "I led one life in classroom and office, one in libraries and at my typewriter, and a third as a family man and a social being of sorts."

Frank Luther Mott touched many lives as a teacher, dean, and author. He was the ideal preceptor for young journalism students as well as a brilliant chronicler of America's newspaper and magazine heritage.

TRIBUTE TO BYRON SPENCER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the death this last fall of Byron Spencer, Kansas City lost one of its dedicated

service leaders and one of its most able public servants. As a former member of the Kansas City Council and a recent president of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Spencer contributed much both in his profession and in his public service to the advancement of his city and his State.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Times on October 29, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Oct. 29, 1964]

BYRON SPENCER

Byron Spencer's career covered many years and a broad range of interests. Few adopted Kansas Citians—he practiced law in his native St. Joseph until his middle twenties—have shown more dedication to advancing what was good for this city.

Mr. Spencer served on the city council in the early 1930's and as president of the chamber of commerce just last year. In all that span of time he was concerned with building a better Kansas City. Sometimes his focus was on better streets and highways; at others, on adequate taxes to operate the city, and at still other times he worked to get and keep a major league baseball team here.

In more than 40 years of law practice, Byron Spencer, who died Monday, became as respected for his business judgment as his legal opinions among the various companies he served. Outside office hours, he found civic activity a source of satisfaction rather than an obligation. It was a message he sought to pass along to younger men. He had an abiding interest in the future of the generation behind him, the young lawyers in his firm, his Phi Delta Theta brothers at MU. Their future accomplishments may well serve as a reminder of the civic philosophy of Byron Spencer.

FLOODS IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when Nature occasionally goes on a rampage, tremendous forces often are loosed which, far beyond the ability of man to control, inflict grievous damage and—regrettably on occasions—heavy toll of human suffering on wide areas of the Nation.

The devastation caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, floods, blizzards, and other tragic occurrences has been experienced from time to time in virtually every section. Most recently, as all in this body appreciate, my native State of California and neighboring States of the Northwest have been afflicted. Property damage runs into the hundreds of millions. Sorrowfully, more than two-score lives were lost, some of them in gallant but futile rescue and relief efforts.

The widespread consequences of the unprecedented floods which poured down western streams will demand tremendous labors in rehabilitation and rebuilding. It undoubtedly will be necessary for Congress to enact special measures under which needed funds can be provided and steps taken for rebuilding highways and bridges, replacing and repairing basic facilities rendering essential service such as water and sewage plants and systems, extending financial aid to businesses, industries, and individuals, and otherwise aiding in restoring lost enterprises and possessions.

I shall be cooperating with my colleagues from adjoining States when it becomes clear what measures are advisable. I trust that the Congress, traditionally sympathetic in such tragic situations, will act expeditiously on whatever proposals or requests are put forward.

While man frequently is impotent to control these furious forces of nature, human ingenuity and perseverance have enabled our people to take some protective measures against certain vicious threats. Conspicuous in this field are the water projects which the Federal Government has joined with States and other non-Federal entities in constructing. Both multipurpose developments and single-purpose flood control works in which tremendous sums have been invested during the past several decades once more demonstrated during the recent Christmas season misfortune the soundness of such efforts and the wisdom of the heavy outlays.

Incalculable benefits were derived from the dams, levees, debris basins, channelization, and other undertakings accomplished, often on a cooperative basis with other agencies, by the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

In harnessing rivers for water conservation, power production, and flood prevention, we made it possible in many instances to retard the runoff of the recent torrential downpours. While human suffering and property damage was lamentably great in many locations, people and property in other sections were spared a recurrence of past tragedies by public works projects such as Shasta and Folsom Dams in California, channel clearance and bank protection on the Sacramento, Yuba, Feather, and lesser rivers. The greatest devastation appears to have been inflicted in basins such as the Klamath, the Eel, and tributaries where to date few such measures have been undertaken.

These facts point up the need for continuing with determination and vigor these worthwhile programs of natural resource conservation and flood protection. We must pursue aggressively the policy of cooperative effort in this direction and, to the limits of our financial and physical ability, speed the building of other desirable projects.

Several impressive instances of the benefits which can be attributed to works of the sort I have in mind have been enumerated in a recent review by the Department of the Interior. A statement based on preliminary estimates shows that Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs are credited with having averted more than $100 million of threatened damage in my State of California and adjoining States in the Christmas storms. Let me note that ironically this is the second time in a decade that sections of California have had the usually happy holiday season turned into a period of suffering and tragedy by the fury of nature.

To illustrate the importance of action and the value of efforts taken in the past, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a press release from the Interior Department on this matter and an excellent editorial from the Sacramento Bee entitled "Dams, Even Uncompleted, Pay Large Dividends."

There being no objection, the press release and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS IN FAR WEST AVERT TREMENDOUS FLOOD LOSSES

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said today that surging floodwaters trapped and controlled by Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs in the Far West prevented damage of nearly $100 million in California and Nevada and at least $13.5 million in other States in the Pacific Northwest, during last week's devastating floods.

"These estimates are only preliminary and by no means complete," Secretary Udall said. "They take no account of many river basins such as the Trinity in California and the Rogue in Oregon, where no dollar estimates of savings have come in yet, but where we know reclamation dams played a vital role in reducing downstream flooding. And I want to say, too, that dollar signs are pretty inadequate as a means of judging the value of flood prevention. You can't begin to sum up the worth of human lives saved or the misery and suffering averted in terms of cold dollars."

Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy pointed out that the most devastating damage and loss of life and property occurred where there are few, if any, river regulating dams—such as the Eel River Valley in northern California and the Klamath Basin in southwestern Oregon.

"In several watersheds Reclamation dams were able to hold the streams completely in check and prevent any damage at all," Commissioner Dominy said, "and in others, the operation of Reclamation structures was able to hold damages to a very minimum."

A dramatic example of the flood controlling function of a multipurpose dam was afforded on the morning of December 23, by Folsom Dam on the American River above Sacramento. For 2 days Folsom had been reducing flows of the American River through the city by nearly half, thus preventing the flood from topping the main Sacramento levees. Then a non-Federal upstream dam still under construction gave way and sent 30,000 acre-feet of water roaring into the American River and Folsom Lake. Folsom Lake caught the flood and held it. This additional surge would have sent 278,000 cubic feet per second of American River water rampaging through Sacramento in the absence of Folsom Dam. That day saw the highest flow ever recorded in the American River, and marked the third time in 10 years that Folsom Dam has saved Sacramento from a major flood.

Folsom Dam is credited with saving $45 million in damages in the Sacramento area during the crisis.

An additional $40 million in damages in the Sacramento River Valley is estimated to have been saved by the floodwaters stored in Reclamation's Shasta Dam on the upper Sacramento River, where 700,000 acre-feet of flood runoff were caught and held during the 4 days of maximum flow.

"If it hadn't been for Shasta Dam," Commissioner Dominy said, "the Sacramento River from Redding on down would have spilled over its banks like the Eel River to the north. I'm only sorry we aren't a few years ahead in our planning on the Eel. That river needs control badly, both for the local benefits that control would accomplish, and

because all that surplus water could be diverted and bring tremendous benefits to the arid Pacific Southwest where excess water is a dream instead of a nightmare."

Other Reclamation dams in California that played important roles in preventing or reducing floods are Trinity, Monticello (Lake Berryessa), East Park, and Stony Gorge. No dollar estimates of savings are yet available for the watersheds below those structures, though the damages prevented are known to be substantial.

On the east slope of the Sierra, Reclamation's Boca and Prosser Creek dams on the Truckee River are estimated to have saved between $5 and $10 million in damages to the Reno area. Just before noon on December 23, the Truckee reached a peak flow of 12,000 cubic feet per second, topping the banks in downtown Reno, but doing relatively little damage. At the same time, Boca and Prosser Creek reservoirs were holding back an additional 14,000 cubic feet per second in flood flows, much of which would otherwise have wound up in Reno's streets, homes, and business establishments.

In Idaho, Reclamation's most impressive flood control structures were Anderson Ranch and Arrowrock Dams in the Boise River Basin. These two reservoirs, operating in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers' Lucky Peak Reservoir just above the city of Boise, stored all the peak inflow of 34,000 cubic feet per second except for a rock-bottom minimum of barely 150 cubic feet per second—the minimum required to support the fish population in the river. There was no downstream flooding at all, and an estimated $11 million in damages was thereby saved.

Another million dollars and more in estimated damages were saved in Idaho by three Reclamation dams on the Payette River above Emmett: Black Canyon, Cascade, and Deadwood. These three structures held back 14,000 cubic feet per second during the flood. Damages occurring along the lower Payette River were the result of side inflows entering the stream below the control structures.

Other Reclamation dams making substantial contributions to flood reduction in Oregon were: McKay Dam (Umatilla River), Owyhee Dam (Owyhee River), Emigrant Dam (Rogue River), Bully Creek Dam, and Prineville and Ochoco Dams (Crooked River). Without these latter two structures, the local irrigation manager estimated that downtown Prineville would have been under 4 feet of water.

The flood crests have passed in all damaged areas and no further losses are expected. In the main, Reclamation structures withstood the flood force and sustained very little damage. A section of Corning Canal in the Sacramento River Valley was washed out, due to inflow from an uncontrolled tributary. Several irrigation distribution systems have been flooded out and ruptured, but the extent of damages will not be known until flood waters recede further. At the dams which played such important roles in flood curtailment, Reclamation crews will experience considerable problems in clearing away debris.

Otherwise, Reclamation's multiple-purpose water conservation structures appear to have weathered the storm in fine shape.

DAMS, EVEN UNCOMPLETED, PAY LARGE DIVIDENDS

Northern California has just experienced a historic storm. It was the type which just over a half century ago would have turned the Sacramento Valley into one vast lake.

But thanks to the huge reservoirs which store sufficient water to take the top off the natural crests, overflow and damage have been kept to a minimum.

Even Oroville Dam, only partially completed, undoubtedly saved Yuba City from a repetition of the tragic Christmas flood of 1955 by holding back enough of the runoff to mean the difference between the river remaining within its levees or topping them.

The major flooding which occurred was on rivers which have not been controlled by dams or levees. The property loss and personal sorrow which occurred should be the spur to provide protection also on those streams—the Eel, Russian, Van Duzen, and Smith Rivers.

And no one should deceive himself regarding the security on some of the streams which do have dams. In a few instances the margin of safety was too narrow for comfort. This includes the American.

The 1964 storm as well as that of 1955 should convince Congress that the protection on the American will not be enough until Auburn Dam is constructed. The next torrential rains may not stop just in the nick of time.

Not only did the big dams save large farm areas and possibly populous urban districts from inundation but they are storing water for irrigation next summer and for the generation of electric power.

It takes occurrences such as the one just passed to prove these dams pay for themselves over and over again and to show how narrowminded, how unconcerned with the public welfare were those who opposed them.

J. EUGENE HARLEY—HOW THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS WAS CREATED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, J. Eugene Harley was an outstanding professor of international relations of the University of Southern California during most of his adult life. I had the honor to be one of his students in law as a student at USC. Professor Harley passed away last November.

He prepared an excellent paper on how the Charter of the United Nations was created. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his paper be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

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

HOW THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS WAS CREATED

(Prepared at the suggestion of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles by J. Eugene Harley, emeritus professor of political science, University of Southern California; member of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, research affiliate of the American Association for the United Nations)

PREFACE

Carl Q. Christol (professor of international law and chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Southern California; chair of international law, Naval War College, 1962–63; president of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles, 1961–62):

"The United Nations Association of Los Angeles is obliged to provide factual information about the United Nations to the members of our community. We are very fortunate in having as a member a distinguished authority on international organization who attended the San Francisco Conference and who has studied and written about the United Nations from 1945 to the present. It is with pleasure that I am able to introduce this recent analysis by Dr. J. Eugene Harley, and to express my appreciation to him for his superior scholarship. I am particularly hopeful that our members will insure a very wide distribution of this study. Please ask the office of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles for additional copies."

TEXT

"A Stradivarius violin is nothing more than an assemblage of wood and catgut. It takes a musician to get harmony out of it. But if the player is at fault, there is no sense in blaming it on the instrument—still less in smashing it to pieces."

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom's representative on the U.N. Security Council) in pleading for patience, understanding, and support for the United Nations. (Quoted from 5 U.N. Bulletin, Aug. 15, 1948, p. 667.)

In 1962, as in past years, there will be a recognition of the day (June 26, 1945), when the Charter of the United Nations was signed. And October 24, 1962, will be observed as United Nations Day to mark the date when the charter went into effect on October 24, 1945.

Twice in the lifetime and memory of millions of the generation now living there has occurred a remarkable tidal wave of practical idealism and efforts for world peace. After World War I this great surge of public opinion was led by President Woodrow Wilson and resulted in the Covenant for the League of Nations.

Once more, during and after World War II, the suffering and devastation caused by the war kindled again the desire for an effective organization for world peace and this led to the writing of the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco.

In this critical year when under notable difficulties the United Nations is striving for an orderly and peaceful world it is well to recapture the more important elements in the story of the United Nations Charter. It is timely and reassuring to take note of the historical trends toward international cooperation and the remarkable extent of the contributions of many individuals, statesmen, and nations, to the creation of the charter of the United Nations. These highlights in the forging of the charter serve to emphasize the range and extent of the positive efforts for world peace by the 104 nations already members of the United Nations.

In the broader historical sense it may be said that some of the basic ideas in the charter were found in the writings and plans of outstanding men of past centuries such as Mo Ti (ancient China), Osoka (India), Kant (Germany), William Penn (England, United States), Simon Bolivar (Latin America), and Henry Root (United States) to the formation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague and the Permanent Court of International Justice (especially through the Root-Phillimore plan) were of major significance.

On the basis of the writings by outstanding and imaginative thinkers came the demands for official action. Thus there were the Bureau of American Republics (1889) which became the Pan American Union, the two Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907 with the remarkable Convention on Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes and Permanent Court of Arbitration, the League of Nations (1919–20), and the Kellogg-Briand Pact for the Renunciation of War (1928).

The League of Nations: A special word must be spoken to emphasize the fact that the United Nations rests heavily upon the cornerstone that was the League of Nations. Notable contributors to the creation of the League of Nations were President Woodrow Wilson, Gen. Jan C. Smuts (South Africa), Lord Robert Cecil (Great Britain), former President William Howard Taft, and men from many nations. As evidence of their appreciation of the work of President Wilson in the creation of the League of Nations, the city of Geneva, Switzerland, had carved in capital letters on a white stone near the Secretariat of the League the following words, the original being in French:

"To the memory of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, founder of the League of Nations."

A careful comparison of the League of Nations Covenant with the Charter of the United Nations reveals with striking clarity the extent to which the United Nations drew upon the League of Nations. This is illustrated by the General Assemblies, the small councils composed of large powers with permanent seats plus a group of other members elected by the assemblies, the secretariats, the "world" courts, sanctions, recognition of regional arrangements, mandates system as basis for trusteeship system, control and reduction of armament, methods for peaceful settlement of international disputes, and other points that could be mentioned.

MAKING THE CHARTER

Like the Constitution of the United States and the covenant of the League of Nations the charter of the United Nations evolved from many plans, conferences, and preceding drafts. The charter is truly a "composite" document which rests upon the work of many individuals, nations, and official international agreements.

The fact that the Charter of the United Nations is the product of many minds, especially those of experts in the United States, is emphasized by the following quotation:

"Probably no other major governmental policy has ever been the product of so many minds as the American proposals for an international organization. Numerous private organizations devoted themselves during the war years to studying the problems of the postwar period, some of them in a most technical fashion, others in more general terms."

Besides the League of Nations Covenant, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and regional organizations like the Pan American Union, other notable documents pointing to peaceful cooperation were the Inter-Allied Declaration of St. James Palace (June 12, 1941) in which 14 allied governments agreed to cooperate against the menace of aggression and to work for social and economic security in peace and war, the Atlantic Charter (1941), the joint declaration by the United Nations (January 1, 1942), the Fulbright and Connally resolutions (1943) which stated in effect that the United States was willing to join a world peace organization according to the constitutional processes of the Nation. The Fulbright resolution was unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 15, 1943, and on September 21, 1943, it was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 29.[1] The Connally resolution was approved by the Senate on November 5, 1943, the vote being 85 for and 5 against.[2]

In late October 1943, Secretary of State Cordell Hull—taking his first trip by airplane—met in Moscow with representatives of the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., and Nationalist China to talk about common problems, especially a general organization for peace. On October 30, 1943, the representatives of these four governments agreed on the text of the Moscow Declaration which recognized the "necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to the membership of all such states, large and small."[3]

Dumbarton Oaks proposals: Early in 1944 a small group of well-known experts in the field of international organization met as a citizens committee created by President Roosevelt to work with Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and his associates in preparing the first American working draft of a charter for the United Nations.[4] This Committee included Isaiah Bowman, former president of Johns Hopkins University, James T. Shotwell, professor of history at Columbia University and chairman of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of the Foreign Affairs quarterly, Benjamin V. Cohen, former counsel for the Department of State, and Clark M. Eichelberger, then director of the League of Nations Association (now the American Association for the United Nations). As noted later some of these men were participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations and their thinking was helpful in the formation of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. (Dr. Shotwell and Mr. Eichelberger were later consultants at the San Francisco Conference.)

The Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was aided by the views of the men listed above and in addition had the viewpoints of such experts as Norman Davis, James C. Dunn, Stanley Hornbeck, Harley A. Notter, Green H. Hackworth, and Leo S. Pasvolsky. By the early months of 1944 these experts had prepared for the Department of State a working draft of a forthcoming charter. Secretary Hull also obtained the views of Charles Evans Hughes, ex-Governor Nathan L. Miller, of New York, John W. Davis, and leaders in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. At this juncture the Government of the United States in May 1944 invited the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. to send representatives to Dumbarton Oaks—a private estate in the Georgetown area of Washington, D.C.—for informal talks looking to the outlines for the projected Charter of the United Nations.

The Dumbarton Oaks "conversations" began on August 21, 1944. In the first phase of the discussions the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union were represented. In the second phase representatives from Nationalist China met with representatives from the United States and the United Kingdom but the Soviet Union was not represented during this period.

For the Dumbarton Oaks conversations Nationalist China sent 4 representatives, the United Kingdom sent 15, the Soviet Union sent 9, and the United States was represented by the following: Edward R. Stettinius, Isaiah Bowman, Benjamin V. Cohen, James Clement Dunn, Lt. Gen. Stanley D. Embick, Maj. Gen. Muir S. Fairchild, Henry P. Fletcher, Joseph C. Grew, Green H. Hackworth, Adm. Arthur J. Hepburn, Stanley K. Hornbeck, Breckinridge Long, Leo Pasvolsky, Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Rear Adm. Harold C. Train, Vice Adm. Russell Willson, and Edwin C. Wilson.[5]

The four Governments agreed on the text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a General International Organization, October 7, 1944, and this document was used as a basis for discussion at the San Francisco Conference.[6]

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

San Francisco, April 25–June 26, 1945

During the period between the completion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the beginning of the San Francisco Conference there were two important conferences which had some bearing on the United Nations Charter. These were the Yalta Conference, February 4–11, 1945, and the Mexico City Conference, February 21–March 8, 1945. At Yalta agreements were reached by President Franklin D. Roosevelt (United States), Winston S. Churchill (Great Britain), and Marshal J. V. Stalin (U.S.S.R.). With respect to the forthcoming international organization for peace it was agreed that the United Nations Conference on International Organization would meet in San Francisco on April 25, 1945. At Dumbarton Oaks there was an unresolved deadlock on the procedure for voting in the Security Council. This deadlock was broken at Yalta by an agreement to the effect that the permanent members of the Security Council would have a "veto" as to "substantive" but not on "procedural" matters.

Since the Latin American nations were not represented at Dumbarton Oaks the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace had as one of its main purposes that of affording to the people of Latin America an opportunity to express their views as to the proposed Charter for the United Nations.

The delegates to the Mexico City Conference favored the principle of universality for the world peace organization. They wished to increase the powers of the General Assembly and to extend the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. In line with previous views held by many Latin American nations the delegates stressed the importance of an agency to promote intellectual cooperation among nations and the need to allow for the peaceful settlement of international disputes on a regional basis in harmony with the general principles of the world peace organization. A special point was made of the matter of giving proper representation to Latin American nations on the Security Council. It was recommended that Argentina should be allowed to resume active collaboration with the other nations of Latin America and in pursuance of this gesture Argentina was seated as a member of the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco.[7]

On April 25, 1945, the United Nations Conference on International Organization opened with Secretary of State Stettinius as temporary chairman. With some 3,000 persons in the War Memorial Opera House including delegates from 46 nations—later increased to 50 nations—President Truman addressed the Conference from Washington, D.C., by way of transcontinental telephone.

Members of the delegation of the United States: Before his death and as announced from Yalta, February 13, 1945, President Roosevelt selected the following delegates to represent the United States at the San Francisco Conference:[8] Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, chairman (Democrat); Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, senior adviser (Democrat); Tom Connally, chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Democrat); Arthur H. Vandenberg, ranking Republican member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Sol Bloom, member of House Committee on Foreign Affairs (Democrat); Charles A. Eaton, member of House Committee on Foreign Affairs (Republican); Comdr. Harold E. Stassen, U.S.N.R. (Republican); Virginia C. Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College.

It is thus seen that the delegation represented Democrats and Republicans and no doubt President Roosevelt chose this bipartisan group so as to avoid partisan difficulties such as those experienced by President Wilson when the Covenant of the League of

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 21, 1943, p. 7225.

[2] Ibid., Nov. 5, 1943, p. 9222.

[3] See U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 6, 1943, pp. 308–309.

[4] See U.S. Department of State, Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–45. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950. See also Clark M. Eichelberger, UN—The First Fifteen Years (New York, Harper & Bros. 1960), p. vii.

[5] See Yearbook of the United Nations, 1946–47, annex 1, p. 43.

[6] For full text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals see ibid., pp. 4–9.

[7] See Bulletin of the Pan American Union, May 1945, p. 263.

[8] See Department of State Bulletin, vol. 12, Feb. 13, 1945, p. 217.

Nations came before the Senate for ratification. Dean Gildersleeve's appointment was a well-merited recognition of the role played by women in efforts for world peace.

In order to achieve a wide reflection of public opinion some 42 private organizations in the United States were allowed to send consultants to the San Francisco Conference. Thus a cross section of opinion was sought. These consultant groups—of national significance—represented various interests such as business, labor, agriculture, education, religion, and men's and women's service organizations. (For a complete list of these organizations see appendix.)

Besides the delegates themselves there were several hundred specialists and advisers who served the delegations to which they were attached. For example, John Foster Dulles was a principal adviser to the delegation of the United States. Following the usual practice in regard to international conferences the host country provided the persons who made up the secretariat which consisted of 1,058 technical and clerical workers, not including Army and Navy personnel and volunteers.

The San Francisco Conference was an ad hoc conference and the secretariat of this conference is not to be confused with the Secretariat of the United Nations. The role of Alger Hiss as secretary general of this conference is not to be confused with that of the Secretary General of the United Nations—a position held to date by Trygve Lie (Norway), Dag Hammarskjold (Sweden), and U Thant (Burma). The role of Mr. Hiss was limited to the mechanical and administrative duties of the conference and was not related to the creative work of writing the charter which was done by four main commissions and 12 technical committees as explained below.

It was decided that the presidency of the plenary (general) sessions should rotate amongst the four sponsoring nations including the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and Nationalist China. France was not a sponsoring nation.

There were four general committees. The Steering Committee, composed of the chairman of all delegations, with Mr. Stettinius as presiding officer, dealt with the more important problems of policy and procedure. The Executive Committee of 14 made recommendations to the Steering Committee. The Coordination Committee of 14 members assisted the Executive Committee and supervised the final drafting of the charter. The Credentials Committee verified the credentials of the various representatives.[9]

THE ACTUAL WORK OF WRITING THE CHARTER

Actually, the work of writing the charter was that of four major Commissions. Each of these Commissions had the assistance of a number of technical committees. Commission I on "general provisions" included committees on preamble, purposes, and principles, membership, Secretariat. The president was Henri Rolin (Belgium). The rapporteur was Vicente G. Sinco (Philippines) and the executive officer was Malcolm Davis (United States).

Commission II on the "General Assembly" was presided over by Field Marshal Jan C. Smuts (Union of South Africa) with Octavio Mendez Pereira (Panama) serving as rapporteur. The executive officer was Huntington Gilchrist (United States). This commission had committees on structure and procedure, political and security functions, economic and social cooperation, and the trusteeship system.

Commission III on "The Security Council" had committees on structure and procedure, peaceful settlement, enforcement arrangements, and regional arrangements. Its president was Wilhelm M. Morgenstierne (Norway) with Celso R. Velázquez (Paraguay) as rapporteur. Grayson Kirk (United States), now president of Columbia University, was the executive officer.

Commission IV on "judicial organization" had a committee on the International Court of Justice and a second committee on legal problems. Its president was Caracciolo Parra-Pérez (Venezuela) with Ato Emmanuel Abraham (Ethiopia) as rapporteur. Norman J. Padelford (United States) served as executive officer.

There were 10 plenary sessions at the San Francisco Conference. In his opening address, April 25, 1945, President Truman—by way of telephone from Washington, D.C.—told the delegates that "if we do not want to die together in war, we must learn to live together in peace." He called upon "Almighty God to guide us in building a permanent monument to those who gave their lives that this moment might come."

Many well-known diplomats and statesmen addressed their fellow delegates at plenary sessions. A careful screening of the texts of speeches reveals an abundance of noble as well as practical sentiments. Many tributes to President Roosevelt were heard. Among the delegates whose words were heard with interest and respect were Anthony Eden (Great Britain), General Smuts (Union of South Africa), General Romulo (Philippines), Masaryk (Czechoslovakia), Spaak (Belgium), Paul-Boncour (France), Stettinius, Vandenberg, and Connally (U.S.A.), Belt (Cuba), Evatt (Australia), Kleffens (Netherlands), Malik (Lebanon), Molotov (U.S.S.R.), and Soong (Nationalist China).

Speakers from small countries, by reason of their sincere appeals to the better side of motivations in life and their captivating words, revealed that many big ideas come from statesmen from little nations. Thus, great applause was heard when Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Chairman of the Philippine Delegation, said in part, April 28, 1945:

(*Excerpts from General Romulo's speech*)

"Let us make this floor the last battlefield.

"We are here to determine whether the human race is going to exist or whether it is to be wiped out in another world holocaust. Those among us who have watched the death agony of great cities, those among us who come from the foxholes of battlefronts, have no illusions as to what another war will do to all men. This may be our last opportunity to achieve peace. We are here to fight for our lives." [10]

Senator Vandenberg spoke of the United Nations as a "town meeting of the world." He made a very noteworthy contribution to the Charter by insisting that justice should be emphasized as a major goal in addition to the goals of peace and security. This emphasis upon justice is quite in line with the decision to make the International Court of Justice an integral part of the United Nations peace machinery, thus dignifying the Court and the role of internationl law as factors in preventing war and preserving peace in the world. With reference to justice, Senator Vandenberg said: "As a result of the San Francisco Conference, Dumbarton Oaks has been given a new soul. As originally drawn, it avoided any reference to justice—without which there can be no stable peace. San Francisco's Charter fills that void. The Charter names justice as the prime criterion of peace." [11]

Besides the decision to stress the importance of international law and justice by making the International Court of Justice an integral part of the United Nations organization the delegates at San Francisco, largely because of the pleas of the Australian Delegation, especially Dr. Evatt, voted to raise the level of the economic and social committee to that of a major organ of the United Nations, viz, the Economic and Social Council. The Trusteeship Council took the place of the old mandates system of the League of Nations. In general, the powers of the General Assembly were increased as compared with those listed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Thus, the way was paved for the subsequent actions by the General Assembly in regard to difficult problems of peace, especially when the Security Council was stalled by inaction caused by deadlocks and vetoes.

Limitations of space do not permit an extensive review of the Charter which consists of 110 articles. The Statute of the International Court of Justice contains 70 articles. A third basic document agreed to at the San Francisco Conference was the Text of Interim Arrangements providing for a Preparatory Commission to plan for the first meetings of the organs of the United Nations.

The special agencies: It is appropriate to draw special attention to the remarkable galaxy of "specialized agencies" which are related to the United Nations through action by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council as provided by articles 57 and 63 of the Charter. The titles of these special organizations give an indication of how such "functional" efforts are working to remove the causes of war and to promote international cooperation. By means of special agreements these specialized agencies are related to the United Nations. The list of such agencies follows:

1. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); 2. International Labor Organization (ILO); 3. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); 4. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); 5. World Health Organization (WHO); 6. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; 7. International Monetary Fund; 8. International Development Association; 9. International Finance Corporation; 10. International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO); 11. Universal Postal Union (UPU); 12. International Telecommunication Union (ITU); 13. World Meteorological Organization (WMO); 14. Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO).

Thus the delegates had completed their task of creating the Charter of the United Nations. President Truman came in person to the last plenary session, June 26, 1945, and addressed the Conference. This was the day when the charter was signed on behalf of the participating nations. The delegates returned to their homes with hope and faith that the new organization might realize its high ideals of world peace, world security, and world justice. Meantime, there remained the problem of ratification of the charter and the finding of the permanent home for the United Nations. Anticipating the ratification of the charter the Preparatory Commission worked on plans for the first meetings of the organs of the new peace organization.

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER APPROVED: AN HISTORIC OCCASION

The Charter of the United Nations was unanimously approved on the evening of June 25 with Lord Halifax (United Kingdom) serving as President. Because of its historic significance the following statement by Lord Halifax is reproduced verbatim:

"Now, ladies and gentlemen of the Conference, we come to the final action of this, the penultimate session. The rapporteurs of the four commissions and of the steering committee have reported on the work of

[9] See United Nations Yearbook, 1946–47, p. 13.

[10] See Verbatim Minutes of the Fourth Plenary Session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization. Doc. 24 (English), p. 8. Apr. 29, 1945.

[11] See his speech to the Senate, June 29, 1945. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1945.

those bodies in the formulation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including the statute of the International Court and the agreement on interim arrangements, providing for the establishment of the Preparatory Commission. These texts have, I think, been distributed to the delegates and it is now my duty, my honor, and my privilege in the chair to call for a vote on the approval of the Charter of the United Nations, including the statute of the International Court, and also of the agreement on interim arrangements. I feel, ladies and gentlemen, that in view of the world importance of this vote we are collectively about to give, it would be appropriate to depart from the usual method of signifying our feeling by holding up one hand. If you are in agreement with me, I will ask the leaders of delegations to rise in their places in order to record their vote on an issue that I think is likely to be as important as any of us in our lifetime are ever likely to vote upon.

"If I have your pleasure, may I invite the leaders of delegations who are in favor of the approval of the charter and the statute and the agreement on interim arrangements to rise in their places and be good enough to remain standing while they are counted. [Here the vote was taken.]

"Thank you. Are there any against?

"The charter and the other documents are unanimously approved.

"[At this point the delegates and the entire audience rose and cheered.]

"I think, ladies and gentlemen, we may all feel that we have taken part, as we may hope in one of the great moments of history." [12]

[It was announced that the actual signing of the charter would occur the next day, June 26, 1945.]

The Preparatory Commission: In pursuance of the Text of Interim Arrangements which was adopted along with the charter a "Preparatory Commission" was established for the purpose of planning for the first meetings of the General Assembly and for organizing the United Nations. Each member of the United Nations had one representative on this Commission which began its working sessions on August 16, 1945. Gladwyn Jebb—later Sir Gladwyn Jebb—of the United Kindgom was elected Executive Secretary of this Commission.[13]

Based upon the careful planning of the Preparatory Commission the first meetings of the General Assembly were held in London, January 10–February 14, 1956. Prime Minister Attlee of the host country addressed the delegates at the first plenary session of the General Assembly, January 10, 1946. He told the delegates that:

"We realize that as perhaps never before a choice is offered to mankind. Twice in my lifetime a war has brought untold sorrow to mankind. Should there be a third world war, the long upward progress toward civilization may be halted for generations, and the work of myriads of men and women through the centuries be brought to nought.[14]

The General Assembly proceeded with its special tasks of electing the nonpermanent members of the Security Council, the members of the Economic and Social Council, and to discharge its function in regard to the election of judges of the International Court of Justice—a function which was shared with the Security Council. These, and many other duties, were carried out during the first session. (The second part of the first session met at Flushing Meadow Park, New York, on October 23, 1946.)

THE CHARTER RATIFIED AND PUT INTO EFFECT

Affirmative action by the Senate of the United States: The action taken by the Senate of the United States on the charter is reflected through hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee resulting in a report favoring ratification and extensive debates in which nearly every Senator participated in recognition of the great importance of the question. Then came the final vote advising ratification. One remarkable feature of the hearings was the submission by Chairman Tom Connally of an "exhibit A" which in four pages of fine print listed the various organizations (and some individuals) for and against the ratification of the charter. This array of oral and written statements, telegrams, and other communications showed an overwhelming majority in favor of ratification.[15]

The final vote on ratification came on July 28, 1945. The count of votes showed 89 Senators voting "yea," 2 Senators (Langer, Shipstead) voting "nay," and 5 Senators not voting. Of those not voting Senator Johnson (California) announced that his vote was "nay" and it was paired with "yea" votes by Senators Reed (Kansas) and Thomas (Idaho). Senator Bailey (North Carolina) was ill and announced that if his vote for ratification had been necessary it would be "yea." Likewise Senator Glass (Virginia) was absent on account of illness and he stated that if he were able to be present his vote would be "yea." [16]

The Charter of the United Nations came into effect on October 24, 1945, when it had been ratified by the five permanent members of the Security Council and a majority of the other signatory states. October 24 of each year has been observed as "United Nations Day."

The members of the United Nations decided—upon the invitation of the United States—to locate the permanent headquarters in New York City. Temporary meetings of the organization were held at Lake Success and Hunter College in New York. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., already noted for his philanthropy, gave to the United Nations for its New York headquarters a tract of land—about 17 acres—worth $8,500,000. The Government of the United States loaned the United Nations a sum of money for the purpose of building the 39-story structure which now houses this world peace organization. This loan of $65 million is interest-free and it is being regularly repaid in annual installments ranging from $1 to $2½ million, the last installment to be paid July 1, 1982.

Thus was born the United Nations. The charter sets forth the three great objectives of world peace, world security, and world justice. It is strikingly in line with the "common denominator" points found in plans for peace and order as stated by many of the great minds of the past: (1) an organization of nations (peoples) into a continuous forum for discussion and peaceful settlement of international disputes; (2) a world court to decide legal (justiciable) disputes; and (3) sanctions (methods of enforcement).

In the debates and addresses at the San Francisco Conference and in the Senate of the United States there were three points emphasized time and again: (1) Another world war will mean the end of civilization as we know it; (2) this time—after World War II—we must build a worthy "living monument" to the war dead by creating a workable world organization dedicated to international peace and order; and (3) this time we must put "teeth" (sanctions, enforcement power) in the peace organization.

Another way of stating the great purpose of the charter is that its framers were trying to substitute reason and rationality (through courts and conferences) for brute force—now topped by thermonuclear weapons—in the settlement of international disputes.

Does the United Nations Charter meet the requirements as set forth above? Time alone will provide the answer. Meantime, the faith, prayers, and earnest efforts of millions of people throughout the world—as never before in history—are dedicated to the support of the United Nations as the best insurance toward a brighter world, a world governed by law and justice and serving the interests of humanity.

SELECTED REFERENCES

The first "Yearbook of the United Nations, 1946–47," gives a good account of the making of the charter and the early months of the United Nations.

The basic reference covering the work of the United Nations Conference on International Organization is the fifteen volume series photo-lithographed by Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, from the original documents and published by the United Nations Information Organization (38 Russell Square, London and 610 Fifth Avenue, New York). Published in cooperation with the Library of Congress.

Many of the basic documents relating to the formative period of the United Nations are found in "A Decade of American Foreign Policy, Basic Documents, 1941–49." Prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Staff of the Committee and the Department of State. 1381 pages. 81st Congress, 1st Session, Document No. 123.

U.S. Department of State, "Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–45." Publication 3580, General Foreign Policy Series 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950. (This is the most comprehensive account of the work of scores of experts who served the State Department and some of the committees in planning for postwar foreign policy, especially the outlines for a world peace organization.)

Ruth B. Russell, assisted by Jeannette E. Muther, "A History of the United Nations Charter." Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1958, 1140 pages. (This volume is very useful in providing a detailed story of the role played by the United States from 1940 to 1945 with reference to planning for the United Nations Charter.)

Authoritative articles on the work of the four main Commissions which took the leading role in writing the charter at San Francisco were written by the Executive Officers of these Commissions and printed in "International Conciliation," September 1945.

An extensive coverage of the debates at San Francisco and in the Senate of the United Nations is given in J. Eugene Harley, "Documentary Textbook on the United Nations; Humanity's March Towards Peace." second ed., revised and enlarged, 1950, 1,470 pages.

Clark M. Eichelberger, "U.N.—The First Fifteen Years," New York: Harper & Bros., 1960. (This volume by the Executive Director of the American Association for the United Nations gives a readable, accurate, and up-to-date account of the more important developments in the work of the

---

[12] See verbatim minutes of the ninth plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, June 27, 1945. Doc. 1210 (English) p. 20.

[13] For a list of representatives on the Preparatory Commission see the United Nations Yearbook, 1946–47, p. 49.

[14] See the official records of the first part of the first session of the General Assembly, plenary meetings. Verbatim record. Jan. 10–Feb. 14, 1946. Central Hall, Westminster, London.

See also the report of the U.S. delegation to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946, 54 pages.

[15] For text of "exhibit A" see hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, on the Charter of the United Nations, Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. 712–714.

[16] See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1945.

U.N. from its beginning to 1960. Paper cover edition, 50 cents.

Two of the indispensable sources of information about the United Nations are the periodical United Nations Review and the volume entitled "Everyman's United Nations," sixth edition, 1959, published by the Office of Public Information of the U.N.

APPENDIX

List of national organizations which sent consultants to the San Francisco Conference.

The Secretary of State announced on April 10, 1945, that the following organizations had been invited to send representatives to serve as consultants to the American delegation at the United Nations Conference on International Organization:

American section of the International Chamber of Commerce.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Foreign Trade Council.
American Bar Association.
National Lawyers Guild.
American Federation of Labor.
Congress of Industrial Organization.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
American Legion.
American Veterans Committee.
Disabled American Veterans of the World War.
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
Farmers Union.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
National Grange.
American Association of University Women.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
National League of Women Voters.
Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.
American Jewish Conference.
American Jewish Committee.
Catholic Association for International Peace.
Church Peace Union.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
American Association for the United Nations (Commission To Study the Organization of Peace).
Americans United for World Organization, Inc.
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
Council on Foreign Relations.
Foreign Policy Association.
National Peace Conference.
Kiwanis International.
Lions International.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Exchange Club.
Rotary International.
American Council on Education.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Education Association.

"An effort has been made * * * to select organizations which, taken as a whole, constitute a fair cross section of citizen groups." (List taken from 12 U.S. Department of State Bulletin, April 15, 1945, pp. 671–672.)

IS THERE A REPUBLICAN FUTURE?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, an able member of my staff, my legislative assistant, Mr. Stephen Horn, prepared an address, which he delivered on November 20, 1964, at Princeton, N.J., before the Woodrow Wilson Association of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. The address dealt with the rather vital subject "Is There a Republican Future?"

He answered the question in the affirmative.

I believe his comments deserve study by my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the address be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

IS THERE A REPUBLICAN FUTURE?

(Address by Stephen Horn, legislative assistant to Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the Woodrow Wilson Association of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, November 20, 1964, Princeton, N.J.)

I

The year 1964 has been an interesting year for Republicans and for the Nation. If we were Chinese—and there has been some allusion to Mao's tactics and even policies being advocated in the campaign recently concluded—if we were Chinese, we might call it the year of the political paradox. Perhaps that will be what historians call it, but probably many of us who followed the campaign and hoped for enlightenment by either candidate will also remember it as the year of the bore. As a Republican, I hope we can look on it as the last of its kind to confront our party.

There were many paradoxes, but 10 come readily to mind:

(1) the conservative candidate won even though he was not nominated by what some have called the presumedly conservative political party. The radical candidate was repudiated.

(2) there has been more active infighting in the 2 weeks following the national election and pious statements on the need for leadership by certain Republican politicians than there were in the crucial 2 months prior to the San Francisco Republican Convention, especially by some from whom we waited in vain to hear during the California Republican primary.

Said Mr. Nixon: "anyone who sits on the sidelines in a struggle cannot assume a role of national leadership in the party."

A few days later, although correctly interpreting the election as "a rejection of reaction, a rejection of racism, a rejection of extremism," Mr. Nixon went on to inform all Republicans who might be interested that in his judgment Senators Case, Javits, and Kuchel, Governor Rockefeller, and his former running mate Ambassador Lodge were too "ultraliberal" to aid in rebuilding the Republican Party. He failed to mention that these were the men who almost alone had borne the burdens in the fight to save the Republican Party from reaction, racism, and extremism.

But then some were heard from who were also visible prior to San Francisco. Said Congressman DERWINSKI (one of Mr. Goldwater's stanchest supporters): "The party can't go to the liberals. How could they possibly ask for conservative support after the example they set? If people like JOHN LINDSAY and George Romney are supposed to be the white hopes, the Republican Party may as well disband."

Said Denison Kitchel, the Goldwater campaign director: "We may have to wait 4 years, but we're going to get this Government back where it belongs."

(3) The pamphleteers who painted with a broad and usually inaccurate brush decades of recent history failed to discern the very obvious fact of November 3: there are no 10 million "conservatives" who have not voted in the past for want of a "choice, not an echo."

Said Phyllis Schlafly, those conservatives did come out and vote but they were overcome by another factor. "The Democrats got a large number of people out who never voted before. They got them out on the social security issue and on the issue of war and peace." She thinks these issues were big lies and notes, perceptively, I think, that "If the choice turns out to be between war and peace, people will go for peace." She concluded that: "I think it's pretty wonderful that 26 million Americans support Barry Goldwater and his principles."

Former Senator Knowland noted that this was a higher vote than any presidential candidate had received from George Washington through the election of Harry Truman in 1948—a rationalization which no doubt will be of interest to historical statisticians.

The fallacy here is that the 26 million included a lot who do not agree with Mr. Goldwater's policies but supported him because of party loyalty. But more important, it should be remembered that 42 million votes is a lot more.

As the San Francisco Chronicle correctly editorialized: "Before crowing over 26 million votes, Senator Goldwater and his apologists might well consult the results of the 1960 presidential election. Then, with the total vote virtually identical to this year's, the Republican candidate, unburdened by Goldwater's kind of conservatism, polled more than 34 million votes. It is fair to suggest that Goldwaterism cost the Republican Party more than 8 million votes."

As with "right to work" in 1958, if "Goldwaterism" aroused any voters, who had been sleeping on election days and not been going to the polls, they probably voted Democratic. As one California Republican Congressman noted: "You made the choice, now listen to that echo."

One awaits the word from that glossy pontificator, National Review, which noted prior to the election: "This Tuesday conservatives throughout America will have the opportunity which they have not had for a generation, to state their allegiance in a meaningful way. When they are through, their critics may indeed feel that they have emerged not from a taffy pull, but from a wrestling match. Already they are traumatized by the nature of the beast they have had to confront. They are not likely to emerge from the ring unchanged."

(4) But the great paradox of the election was the overthrowing of an assumption that when the political ax falls on either party it usually falls primarily on those from the marginal districts and not on those from the so-called "safe" districts. Thus, so the rule goes, if there are survivors they are those with seniority, who, over time, become frequently more inflexible regardless of their party since they have no constant demand to accommodate themselves to a "mainstream" which results from competitive two-party American politics.

It is unusual for Republican Congressional candidates to run ahead of the national ticket; witness the 1952 and 1956 Eisenhower and the 1960 Nixon elections. In this election it was commonplace for not only the Republican winners but also the Republican losers to run ahead of the national ticket. Truly, with a handful of notable exceptions such as Keating in New York and Schwengel in Iowa, it was the moderate incumbent who survived.

Thus, John Lindsay, an articulate progressive, in a 2-to-1 Democratic district in New York secured 71 percent of the 3-party vote (yes, Virginia, there are Conservatives, all 5 percent of them). In the 1960 Presidential election, Lindsay received 56.1 percent of the vote. This year he even ran ahead of President Johnson.

Across the Nation, in California, in a 60-percent Democratic district, John Baldwin, an outstanding Republican Congressman,

despite being the victim of a particularly dirty campaign, won by the largest margin of his career; almost 65 percent. In 1960, he had received 57.9 percent of the vote.

But to show I'm not reasoning by exception, let's look at this another way.

Twenty-three incumbent Congressmen signed up to help Goldwater defeat Rockefeller in California. All ran for reelection. Seven of the twenty-three were defeated. Only three of the seven were in marginal districts (less than 55 percent of the vote in 1962). These individuals had actively opposed the last Republican administration substantially more on rollcall votes (15.5 percent) more than the average Republican Congressman.

Sixty-two incumbent Congressmen signed the Goldwater endorsement ad which appeared in the New York Times on July 7, 1964. Of the 62, 5 did not run for reelection. Three of those five seats are now held by Democrats. Of the 57 who did run, 20 or over one-third were defeated. A few others who won will probably think twice next time before committing themselves: RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana, with 50.4 percent; JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia, with 50.3 percent; and CARLETON J. KING, of New York, with 50.03 percent.

On the other hand, the Committee to Support Moderate Republicans, chaired by Charles P. Taft, endorsed 32 incumbent House Members. Only four were defeated.

(5) The master craftsmen of nominating convention politics proved to be perhaps the most unskilled practitioners of general election politics in our modern history. They failed to understand that one wins in America by putting together a majority which includes often diverse groups and individuals of varying beliefs and feelings. With self-righteous zeal they rejected moderate support.

"Accommodation" is proudly not in the rightwing lexicon—for they truly would rather be right than President. They see the world in blacks and whites. They see American politics in apparently a similar light sometimes with the emphasis seemingly only on the whites. One has difficulty determining whether in their perspective it is worse to be a "me-tooer" or a Communist for to the true believer they are one and the same.

(6) The Republican Party of equal opportunity after almost a century has finally broken into the one-party Democratic South of largely unequal opportunity at the congressional level only on the wrong and most transitory grounds while once Republican States, such as Vermont and Iowa, were largely inundated by the Democrats on a much sounder basis.

Thus, the Southern States (except for Mississippi) which had still voted 4 years ago for the Democratic candidate who had telephoned Mrs. Martin Luther King, in 1964 split among a southerner who had largely opposed civil rights legislation until he became President and a southwesterner who while avoiding mention of it would leave racial relations basically to jurisdiction of the States.

It is estimated that the 6 million Negroes who voted this year—and whose forebears until the thirties were wedded to the party of Lincoln—gave at least 90 percent of their votes to President Johnson. Certainly Negro support of President Johnson was decisive in his carrying Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Their effect was also felt in other contests, as in the reelection of Congressman CHARLES L. WELTNER, the Atlanta Democrat who voted for the final passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. No doubt Negro feelings toward the top of the ticket had an adverse effect on the failure to elect such a distinguished Republican, and supporter of civil rights, as Robert A. Taft, Jr., candidate for the Senate in Ohio.

When it was progressive Republican leadership in the Senate and House of Representatives who vigorously pressed a constantly stalling Kennedy administration for two and a half years to introduce civil rights legislation and Republican Members of the Senate and House who provided a greater proportion of their party's vote, than did the Democrats, for this long overdue and needed legislation, such a loss is particularly tragic. Given the attitudes of and representations made by the national ticket, such a loss is completely understandable. They could do no other.

(7) Supposedly Republican suburbia went for the Democratic candidate. President Johnson ran as much as 20 percent better than President Kennedy did in the suburbs.

Congressional Quarterly estimates that 50 congressional seats are predominantly suburban in character. Before November 3, 31 were Republican and 19 were Democratic. After November 3, 26 were Republican and 24 were Democratic. President Johnson, of course, carried the suburbs in all areas but the South and even there he carried the suburbs in Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Virginia.

(8) The temporary Republican candidate gave hope to those who seek to eliminate the income tax by advocating a cut in Government spending while berating the present administration for not spending more on the Air Force and our national defense. The paradoxes to be developed in terms of the Republican candidate's stands on the issues compared to the actual voting record of Republicans in Congress are endless. Suffice it to say that on the 25 issues endorsed in the Republican platform of 1960 which came before the Senate for a vote, Mr. Goldwater opposed the platform on all 25 occasions and Senator Kuchel, the assistant Republican leader, supported the platform on all 25 occasions. A majority of Republican Senators supported the platform on 23 of the 25 occasions.

(9) "Farley's law," in eclipse since 1948 and which appeared amended by the Republican primaries—as voters apparently changed their minds while entering the voting booths from New Hampshire through California—gained a new lease on life as little change in public opinion occurred between the conventions and the election.

(10) Finally, from the architects of disunity we have heard much of the merits of party unity—provided, of course, that it is on their terms alone.

Thus, Republican candidates who wisely saw the debacle in the making and sought to steer clear of the national ticket and thus with varying degrees of success attempt to avoid self-inflicted political suicide are now labeled "so-called" Republicans. SCOTT in Pennsylvania, Romney in Michigan, and to a lesser degree, FONG in Hawaii and MURPHY in California, were successful practitioners of this oldest example of preventive political medicine. I imagine the less successful practitioners such as Keating, in New York, Beall in Maryland, Taft in Ohio, and Percy in Illinois must view with awe and wonderment Senator Goldwater's morning-after statement. "I think if some Governors and Senators and some Congressmen had more actively supported the ticket they would have been better off."

Forgotten by the architects of defeat is that their most ardent supporters harassed the Republican Party in such States as New York where the so-called conservative party plies its trade.

Forgotten by the architects of defeat is that in Virginia where a gallant Republican, Richard A. May, waged the first campaign against HARRY F. BYRD in 18 years the "Virginia Republicans for BYRD" was headed by Admiral Lewis L. Strauss and the other ardent Goldwater leaders. No public endorsement was given Mr. May by the national ticket.

This week, Mr. Goldwater, as the temporary sage of Montego Bay, described Governor Rockefeller, Governor Romney, Senator SCOTT, and Senator KUCHEL as "so-called Republicans."

This is certainly no new position based on any incident in the last campaign since on page 113 of the book, "Barry Goldwater," by Rob Wood and Dean Smith, Mr. Goldwater is quoted as saying over 4 years ago that Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York and THOMAS H. KUCHEL of California "were hypocrites and don't belong in the Republican Party."

So much—perhaps too much—for some of the paradoxes; now what is the problem?

II

The problem is that the Goldwater clique has completely misunderstood American politics. They have sought to structure an ideological program—largely a negative program—onto a political party which, like its counterpart, has succeeded by being pragmatic and positive—or realistic—since the Founding Fathers idea of a unity of the able and select broke down into factions and then evolved into viable, competitive political parties. The history—and perhaps the success of American politics—has been marked with flexibility of means within certain broad goals. Each party has sought to attract to itself a majority of the people in order to be entrusted with the right to govern. Each party wanted to win—desire for power, putting ideals into action, call it what you will, the men who guided our parties preferred to be "in" rather than "out." They had no desire to become a perennial minority debating society by digging in their feet and resisting the changes wrought by their more fortunate opponents. Republican dominance after the Civil War was broken by Cleveland just as Democratic dominance after the great depression was ended by Eisenhower.

While new vistas of natural resource development were opened up with the Reclamation Act of Theodore Roosevelt, it was under a Democratic administration that the dream of a progressive Republican Senator, George Norris, for a Tennessee Valley Authority reached fruition.

While social security was enacted under Franklin Roosevelt, its first great expansion came, in 1954, under the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower when benefits were given the biggest increase in history and 10 million more workers were covered. And so it goes.

Each party has, on the whole, tried to practice the essence of politics—accommodation of conflicting interests in order to serve a higher interest—the national interest. When accommodation failed in the Nation, the result was the Civil War just as when accommodation failed within the Republican Party, the result was the debacle of November 3d. Now is the time for humane reconstruction, with appropriate education, so that such an event can never again occur.

For our parties have not evolved merely to gain boodle, since, in this era of the civil service and the general feeling that ambassadors should at least know the language of the country to which they are assigned, there is little boodle to pass out.

The evolution of two competitive political parties has resulted in vigor in the pursuit of a freely arrived consensus and thus the preservation of liberty, in the long run, in our land. Where competition has not existed, such as in the South, the progress of all the people has long been delayed. Highhandedness in the alleged pursuit of the public duty should always be a vice whether it takes the form of removing Americans of Japanese ancestry from the west coast, attempting to draft railroad workers during a labor dispute, or merely having Federal agents knock on the door of newsmen in the early hours of the morning following a rise

in steel prices. A Republican mayor of Tacoma, Wash., Harry Cain, later a U.S. Senator, was the only public official to speak out against the unconstitutional removal of our fellow Americans, of Japanese origin, from the Pacific coast, just as a Republican Senator, Robert A. Taft, alone blocked the House-approved proposal of President Truman to draft striking railway workers.

The most valuable attribute of a moderate is his greatest burden: He is a moderate. Yet he would have it no other way. He does not believe that he has discovered infinite truth and has arrived at infinite wisdom. He seeks rather to prevent infinite error.

Thus in seeking to counteract the extremists and negativists in his midst, he confronts the dilemma of how to carry out what must be accomplished if he is to survive, and his party is to survive, without adopting the very tactics and attitudes of those whose actions he most deplores. One does not have to look too far in either Mr. Welch's "Politician" or "Blue Book" to realize that Mr. Welch in his zeal to eliminate the Communist Party, the extremists of the left, has consciously patterned his extremists of the right after them in organization, in propaganda, and often in the end result of the basic policies he advocates which would weaken America; get out of the United Nations, eliminate the income tax, and withdraw from NATO. He disapproves of representative democracy. He, by his actions, would foment distrust of the responsible leadership of both great political parties. Extremists have always profited, hopefully, only temporarily in the long stretch of history, by this dilemma. Thus Kerensky, who fervently believed in democratic values, on reflection as to whether he would have incarcerated or executed Lenin if he had it to do over again, could give no other answer but that he would let him go free.

While no political party will ever be able, in a free society to eliminate an extremist cancer from its midst, it can take the initiative and educate the remaining party members so that the extremists are politically isolated by an aroused membership—a membership that cares—and thus frustrated in their efforts to control the party apparatus. This political preventive medicine must be the first order of business for the Republican Party if it is to provide the vigorous two-party competition which it has a responsibility to provide in our land.

The extremist to be successful depends on apathy. If he thinks about his position in a rational way, he knows that his zealousness is the secret of his success. He has a mission, a clearcut goal, and unlimited heathen to convert to his "true" beliefs.

My own State of California seemingly has more than its share of extremists. Whether they be bearded or clean shaven, "I'd rather be Red than dead" or "I'd rather be dead than Red," we have them. This is not a recent phenomena. Long ago Frank Lloyd Wright wryly observed that when they turned the United States on end everything loose fell into southern California. As a Californian, I, of course, deny that we have more than any other State—they are just more visible in the sunshine.

Both political parties in my State have them. It is just that the extremists are currently at work primarily on the Republican Party. Thus, as Republicans, we are confronted with the same problem which confronted the Democratic Party in the decade of the 1940's when the Communists attempted, with varying degrees of success, to infiltrate their local units. The Americans for Democratic Action arose as a response to this infiltration with a desire by its founders to create a "liberal," but non-Communist political organization. Labor unions in the 1930's and 1940's early and successfully led the fight against extremist subversion from the left.

In my judgment, part of the reason for this new extremism of the right results from not merely the nature of our mobile and burgeoning society where social and economic instability exists, but also from the nature of communication within that society.

What is the source of information most of our fellow citizens have for what is going on in the world about them? Newspapers, television, radio, books, friends: all play a part. Yet, how many read books and how many have really informed friends who can deal with the complexities of the Congo one day, South Vietnam the next, Panama the next, Cyprus the next or maybe all of them at once? Thus, our information, if any, comes primarily from the mass media: the daily or hourly written and spoken word.

But, what is news? News is conflict. News is not that men are good, it is when men are bad. News is not that our Nation has kept a government from going Communist, that we are shoring up the economies of many free world countries such as India and Brazil so that they can put their own house in order and offer hope and opportunity to their people. News is that the West, the free world, whatever you would call it, is losing, is giving way. An embassy is stoned here, a flag is hauled down there, an American is held for ransom in one part of the world for what is happening in another part of the world. Somebody is on the march, it is so easy to infer. It isn't us—so it must be the international Communist conspiracy.

The broad outline comes in the 1 minute hourly newscast; perhaps there will be an "in depth" report of 3 minutes on the evening television show. Who fills the vacuum? Who interprets and tries to put sense in the news? Why, Mr. Welch and "American Opinion," Mr. Smoot and his "Report," Mr. Manion and his "Forum," the Courtneys and their "Independent American," and Gerald L. K. Smith and his "Cross and the Flag"—to name but a few. If you prefer a longer version you can turn to Phyllis Schlafly and her "A Choice, Not an Echo" or John Stormer and his "None Dare Call It Treason."

Whatever you turn to, you will find it provocative and readable. There will be more villains than appear in a month of watching "The Lone Ranger"—besides the international Communist conspiracy which is often relegated in importance to the internal Communist conspiracy, you will find kingmakers and "Me-Too Republicans," the eastern establishment and the sensation-seeking columnists and you won't find a very careful line drawn between any of these groups. If room is left over, the ax might also fall on the Texan or just "That Man" be he Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, or Hubert Humphrey. If a line is drawn, it usually attempts to link all of these people directly with the Council on Foreign Relations and, of course, in the extremists' weird world, that leads to Nelson Rockefeller.

The result is an "infected" core group which then spreads the dogma to those around them and thus fills the "information gap."

That people who are well educated, in the formal sense, can follow the tenets of the John Birch Society whose self-appointed leader openly believes that the last Republican President was "a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy" and that only "treason" can describe Dwight D. Eisenhower's actions is something that is beyond belief. It is beyond belief until you confront them in the precincts and see the gleam in their eyes, the fear in their faces, and often, sadly, the hate in their hearts. Then it becomes very real.

It is unbelievable to me that such people can follow such absurd statements as that of Mr. Welch who said on October 24, 1963: "I described John Foster Dulles as a Communist. I say he was a Communist. I'm willing to state so here that in my opinion he was always a Communist from the days that he was working for Edward Mandel House in 1919 as one of House's bright young men."

But they do believe such absurdities. They also believe those of the "tongue in cheek" variety. One such appeared in the July-August 1963 issue of "American Opinion," the official publication of the John Birch Society. This is the "explanation" by which they sought to explain why General de Gaulle, Mao, Khrushchev, Castro, and two African rulers were grouped around a red star on their cover: "You see, a Communist must, axiomatically, carry a card, or be a friend of Senator KUCHEL's, or some other giveaway like that. Why, we challenge you "extremists" everywhere to produce a single photocopy of the party card of even one of these noble gentlemen. There, you see. All you can offer is circumstantial evidence. Perhaps these men are just dupes, or opportunists, or fools. True, they may be a little socialistic; but so is President Kennedy. The real danger to this country is from people like, er, like us. * * *"

What a wonderful way to play the game of conspiracy? Soon, someone might ask, if I were a Communist and wanted to undermine the United States by casting doubt on the responsible leaders of the United States, would not I form a group and name it the John Birch Society? It is a dangerous game.

Perhaps it would be well for some to recall the words of J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who has frequently and correctly warned against self-appointed vigilantism: "Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting.

"Those persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

The fact remains that, rightly or wrongly, for good reasons or bad, some Americans are frustrated by the society in which they find themselves and the events which take place in the world about them. Sometimes their concern is valid. Other times it is not. But it does no good to try to preserve freedom in our land and abroad if in the process we turn ourselves into the totalitarian mentality we deplore.

III

What is the solution?

Most of us who have devoted our lives to politics at the national and State levels or who have studied it in an institution such as Princeton sometimes forget that we too often talk only to people like ourselves and that the average voter does not have the opportunity to acquire the same level of political information which we have. Sometimes he does not care, but even if he does care, he is occupied with a different type of work and other responsibilities which may prevent him from developing his interest to the extent he would like to.

Thus, the question for those who want to recreate a forward-looking and vigorous Republican Party is what do we do to raise the level of political information, understanding, and sophistication and thus fill the vacuum into which the pamphleteers of the right have poured their conspiracy theories of history, their hates and their all-too-simple solutions?

The answer is twofold. The Republican Party must be positive on the issues which confront our Nation at home and abroad and

it must develop the organizations and means to communicate these beliefs and to secure the active involvement of Republicans who have often not cared until it was too late. I believe issues and organization are interchangeable. We have heard too much in recent years about something being wrong with the sales technique. When the product is off base, all the sales technique in the world will not result in long-run victory.

But let us first consider organization and communication.

There is an urgent need for a continuing party conference to provide an outlet for the views of the rank and file and a free flow of communication and ideas between the Republican electorate and the Republican elected. The so-called Percy committee of 1959–60 and the Critical Issues Council headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower in 1963–64 are steps in this direction. This can be done through some existing Republican organizations or through the establishment of new ones.

Certainly, regardless of the ultimate success in reorienting some of the established party organizations there is a crucial need in Washington for an organization which will combine the efforts, functions, and spirit of such groups as the Committee to Support Moderate Republicans, the Ripon Society, the National Negro Republican Assembly, and similar organizations which have worked untiringly in the struggle to save the soul of the Republican Party.

We have said in reference to our own State that the rebuilding of the Republican Party must begin in the living rooms and the classrooms of California. Concerned Americans—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—should gather together to read and to discuss the books and statements by Senators CASE, JAVITS, and KUCHEL, Governor Rockefeller, Arthur Larson, and yes, Senator Goldwater, as well as others, both politicians and nonpoliticians. Then let each ask himself what the problems are that confront him as a citizen and then what is the appropriate solution which might resolve these problems. High school and junior college teachers should be invited to party-sponsored seminars on these international, national, and local issues, not to indoctrinate them but to inform them and to show we are interested in them.

A well-written newsletter which sets National and State problems in perspective with the emphasis on education rather than emotion should be distributed to those who have indicated an interest in responsible Republicanism. In California, for example, we have the names of at least 200,000 individuals who, in our telephone survey during the 1964 Republican primary, indicated that they supported Governor Rockefeller. These names include some in each of the almost 33,000 precincts in our State. Such an effort could be the basis for an organization which would return the Republican Party to the path of victory. This pattern could be duplicated in other States.

More effort has to be made to bring leading Republicans at the National and State levels into local communities and into the high school and junior college government and history classes of those communities. By 1966, 2.8 million young Americans, the initial wave of the "postwar babies," will reach the voting age of 21 for the first time. Next year, in fact, almost 1 million more young Americans will reach age 18 than have this year. The average yearly increase in America's teenage labor force in the 1960's will be almost six times the average yearly increase in the 1950's. These young people offer a great challenge and opportunity to the Republican Party if only we can put our house in order to take advantage of it. They are not wedded to the emotions of the past. They can be enlisted in a reasoned future.

In the more practical "nuts and bolts" sense (hopefully we will sidetrack the former and tighten the latter), responsible Republicans have a series of immediate organizational tasks ahead of them. Where moderate leadership exists in the Senate and House of Representatives it must be preserved and expanded, if possible, in the party caucuses which will meet on both sides of the Capitol prior to the opening of the 89th Congress.

At the national level, later in January, when the Republican National Committee meets in Washington, it is essential, from the standpoint of the future of our party, that the present leadership be removed and a forward-looking chairman and staff selected who are in the Republican tradition. The national committee's legitimacy and influence on the 1968 convention makes this imperative.

Serious consideration should also be given to the conduct and staffing of the senatorial campaign committee and the House congressional campaign committee. If these three units are to be merely hollow vacuums which sin by silence when extremists roam the land then neither the Republican Party nor our country will be well served.

If I were a Republican officeholder who had come here at the beginning of the Eisenhower administration in 1953, I would be less than happy to know that in the Senate we have gone from 48 out of 96 down to 32 out of 100 and in the House from a slim majority of 221 to a quarter century low of 140. I would think that it was time for a change. Indeed, to paraphrase the words of Brecht in his play "Galileo": instead of divine patience, I would think it was time to invoke divine anger.

All too often, until it has been too late, Republican officeholders—with the exception of Kuchel, a Rockefeller, a Case, a Cooper, a Javits, a Keating, a Scott, and a Milton Young of North Dakota—have let a handful of vociferous extremists who inundate them with vehement pen force them to sin by silence in the name of party unity. Some of those who should have known better will not be in the 89th Congress. Hopefully, others who by narrow margins or large margins were returned, will now know better.

Besides setting a new tone for the Republican Party, placement of these three party committees in the proper hands can go far toward assuring that in the congressional elections of 1966, more Republicans in the grand tradition of the party will have the opportunity to offer themselves for the House and Senate seats then being contested. Of the Democrats elected to the House of Representatives on November 3, 60 were elected with less than 55 percent of the popular vote. In such marginal districts, in the off year elections of 1966 without the benefit of Presidential coattails they are particularly vulnerable. With proper work at the national and local level, these 60 seats provide a great opportunity to strengthen the position of forward-looking Republicans in the House.

If effective organization in our country does exist, it exists at the State level and thus the tasks ahead of us in the 50 State parties are equally challenging. In California, for example, there are several Republican statewide volunteer groups: The Republican Women, the Republican Assembly, the United Republicans of California, the Young Republicans, and the California College Republicans. There are still others such as the Republican Alliance and Republican Associates which have strong chapters centered in various metropolitan areas. Other groups are in the process of being launched.

In recent years, first the Young Republicans and then the Republican Assembly were taken over by the rightwing with the active aid of paid organizers of the John Birch Society. In 1963, when we held off these negativists from taking over the Republican Assembly, they went out and organized the United Republicans of California (UROC). All three groups endorse candidates for statewide office. A fourth group, the Republican Women, does not endorse candidates. A fifth, the California College Republicans, was organized as a responsible alternative to the extremist take-over of the Young Republicans.

Thus, the first task is to regain, if possible, control of several of these statewide organizations. For example, if we are to try and take back the Republican Assembly, we must get responsible Republicans into the various local units by December 31 in order that the increased membership will be recognized at the annual convention in March. We are now engaged in that task. If successful, it will mean that one of the three major endorsing groups will at last be able to provide responsible guidance to the Republican voter at the time of the primary election. If we are unsuccessful—and this is possible with the continuance of almost two dozen full-time Goldwater headquarters around the State, the opportunity to create "paper" chapters, and the fact that our opponents will still have control of the "rule" book, then we will have to consider the advisability of creating a new statewide organization.

One could, at length, discuss many additional organizational approaches which must be undertaken if we are to attract intellectuals, new citizens, new voters, Negroes, Mexican-Americans, building trades workers, senior citizens, and so on, but a framework in responsible hands must first be provided. If Republicans ever again deserve to merit the faith of the people, we must enthusiastically welcome to our ranks men and women, young and old, of all faiths, of all races, from all walks of life.

Control of the various State Republican parties in the urban North and West is, of course, essential if the Republican convention of 1968 is not to repeat the tragedy of 1964. Despite the dour prognostications of election eve, the outlook is bright. The guidance and direction our State party organizations so sorely need can only come from the Governor's office. The Governor can daily work with Republican leaders and by personal effort attract new people to the ranks of the faithful. In 1964, Republican Governors of progressive mold were elected or continued in office in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. In the elections of the next 3 years great opportunities exist to continue Republican domination in most of these States and to win the Governor's chair in California, Kentucky, Minnesota, and New Jersey. Depending on the personality of the candidate and the issues raised, Republicans in these industrial States will have the chance to re-register those who are now Democrats or independents and to work toward a majority registration.

No one now knows who the Democratic candidate for 1968 will be. Should it be the present incumbent, I suspect that the supposedly overwhelming "mandate" he received on November 3 would readily evaporate with a responsible Republican candidate, 4 years of work, and 4 years in which the President eventually will have to say "no" to either Walter Reuther or Henry Ford or both.

But the question still remains, Do Republicans have anything to offer? Do we deserve to win? To deserve to win, Republicans must cope with the problems that confront most Americans and fashion appropriate solutions for them. In doing this, Republicans need not be as ebullient as HUBERT HUMPHREY whom the Wall Street Journal once described as having solutions for which there are no problems.

Serious problems do confront our Nation in the jungle warfare of South Vietnam, in the deteriorating NATO Alliance, in the financing of the United Nations, and in dealing politically and economically with Communist China. There are millions of fellow human beings who suffer from ill health and malnutrition. As difficult as these problems are, while generally continuing the bipartisan commitment begun under a Democratic President, Harry Truman, and a Republican Congress, and continued under a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, and a Democratic Congress, is it too much to expect to put some of the finest minds in the country who are Republicans to work on these problems? Perhaps, as in science, a "breakthrough" is in order by leapfrogging ahead of the inertia of ideas and practice which often builds up in the governmental mechanism.

In international affairs the Republican Party has never been like the proverbial ostrich with its head in the sand despite the outcries one hears from a few negativists in our party, who would repudiate the United Nations, repudiate mutual security and repudiate our various defensive alliances such as NATO. This small handful are the unwilling handmaidens of international totalitarianism. It was a great Republican, James G. Blaine, who as Secretary of State conceived of the Pan-American Union. It was a great Republican, William McKinley, who stated clearly that America had a responsibility to educate backward peoples and to help bring them into the 20th century. It was a great Republican, Theodore Roosevelt, who used the office of the Presidency to promote peace between warring nations such as Russia and Japan. It was great Republicans such as Wendell Willkie, Henry L. Stimson, and Herbert Hoover who clearly stated America's responsibilities in combating dictatorship whether of the left or of the right. It was a great Republican, Christian Herter, as chairman of a special committee in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, who recommended, along with another great Republican, Arthur Vandenberg, that the Marshall plan to aid wartorn Europe be enacted.

Republicans have an outstanding record of support in the U.S. Senate for a vigorous bipartisan foreign policy. Indeed, on several occasions in the last 4 years, it has been the Republicans under EVERETT M. DIRKSEN who have provided the main support in this area for the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Republicans stood by President Kennedy's commitment to stand firm in Berlin when his Senate majority leader was urging an "open city." Republicans supported foreign aid when various northern Democrats sought to slash it just as the program was finally becoming effective.

The record is clear. All four Senate Republican leaders—DIRKSEN, of Illinois (the minority leader), KUCHEL, of California (the assistant minority leader), HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa (the chairman of the Republican policy committee), and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts (the chairman of the Republican conference)—have supported all of the following bipartisan foreign policy initiatives: The United Nations loan, the establishment of the Arms Control Agency, the ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the authorization of educational and cultural exchanges, the continuation of mutual security and the ratification of both the Antarctic Treaty and Economic Cooperation Agreement which were submitted at the close of the Eisenhower administration.

A majority of Republican Senators supported these policies on each of these occasions, often by overwhelming majorities such as 2 to 1 for the U.N. loan, 4 to 1 for the Arms Control Agency, over 3 to 1 for the test ban, 7 to 1 for the Antarctic Treaty, over 14 to 1 for educational and cultural exchanges, almost 3 to 1 for mutual security, and over 3 to 1 for the European Economic Cooperation Agreement.

The 1960 Republican platform specifically endorsed each of these policies. Oh yes, I regret to note that the standard bearer of our party in the recent election opposed each of these policies when they came before the Senate on rollcall votes.

Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, in a speech in Springfield 6 years prior to his election in 1860, provided Republicans with a sound criterion as we seek to judge what programs are appropriate and inappropriate for government to undertake when he stated: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Progressive Republicans in Congress have kept faith with that principle. They have sought to attain human progress in our land always mindful of maintaining the appropriate relationship between the Federal Government and the States and the public and private sectors which would permit both, in a complementary way, to best serve the people's needs.

Progressive Republicans have also approached problems of domestic policy with a concern for the administrative and fiscal soundness of these programs. We are for human progress and fiscal responsibility, not merely for anything which is labeled "human progress," as are all too many northern Democrats. Progressive Republicans continue to recall Lincoln's words which he expressed in a letter to H. L. Pierce in 1859: "Republicans are for both the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict, the man before the dollar." A great Republican Governor of California, Hiram Johnson, expressed this another way when he said, "We are going to forget for a moment how to make men richer, and we are going to think how to make men better." That is our mission as we concern ourselves with people, not merely the pocketbook, with the many, not merely the few.

Let us remember that government is our government. Government—whether it is Federal, State, or local—is not an enemy or alien institution thrust upon the body politic. It is a necessary instrument through which the American people can resolve the unsolved problems which confront them in their daily lives and which confront us, as a nation, abroad. Yet, some in our society and in my party would have you believe that encroaching government is the major issue of our time. It need not be. When government becomes irresponsible and is no longer of the people, by the people, and for the people, then let us resolve to change those whom we have entrusted with the responsibility of governing, be they Democrats or Republicans.

The paucity of the argument was correctly noted in the Wall Street Journal in an editorial on November 13, 1964: "So far conservatives have not inspired greater support chiefly, we think, because they deal too much in abstractions and too little in specifics. They act on the premise that Jeffersonian warnings of encroaching government are such universal truths they will be recognized as overriding if they are repeated often enough."

Let us always remember too that it is a better life for each individual with which we are concerned. Government exists to serve people, not to be their master. In the long run, the Republican Party if it is to have a valid reason for existence must work for the public policies which will result in a better America, not only materially, but nonmaterially as well.

The Republican Party now is at the threshold and has an historic opportunity to come to grips with "specifics" in terms of programs which will truly develop this better America we seek. Such initiatives have been undertaken at the State and local levels as Republican Governors and mayors have grappled with the problem of urban blight, education, parks and recreation, and mass transportation. Such initiatives have also been undertaken by various Republican Members of the Senate and the House as they have sought to deal realistically, in the Republican tradition, with resolving problems that are meaningful to their fellow countrymen.

For example, the castastrophic rise in the cost of institutional health care daily plagues millions of our elderly Americans. In 1962, several Republican Senators under the leadership of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS set to work to do something about this plight which confronts many of our 18 million senior citizens. These Republicans did not approve of the administration's King-Anderson bill as it was introduced, yet, they saw a problem which demanded solution. The administration legislation only covered those over 65 who had been under social security. Two and a half million of our senior citizens were not eligible for social security, not through any fault of their own but because the law simply did not cover the occupations in which they were engaged. Thus, these Republican Senators drafted a proposal which would provide that all who were over 65 at the time of the passage of the legislation would receive the benefits with the difference to be made up from the general revenue. After a transition period, those who sought the benefits would have to have some social security credits.

These Republicans believed in the principle of contributory social insurance. They believed that the fiscally responsible way to finance the health care program was by having those who would eventually be eligible for the benefits in their retirement years put away the necessary funds, on an actuarially sound basis, during their working years.

But these Republicans also believed that the health care problems of our senior citizens would not be alleviated by merely providing for payment of some limited institutional care under social security, as the administration advocated. What was needed was encouragement for the private health insurance sector to complement the public program. At Senator JAVIT'S suggestion a private, independent committee, chaired by Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during the Eisenhower administration, was selected to study health care for the aged. After a year's study, the committee reported. As a result, six Senate Republicans perfected their original ideas and proposed a nationwide pooling of interested private health care insurance companies and providers of services, with exemption from the antitrust laws and Federal and State taxation on premium income, in order to meet the remaining health care needs of our senior citizens on a voluntary basis.

Earlier in 1962, these Republicans also advocated the establishment of a separate trust fund for the public hospitalization program so that there would be no danger of affecting the actuarial soundness of the regular social security retirement program; the use of private health care organizations to perform administrative services under the program; the utilization of State agencies to determine eligibility and provide consultative services; the possibility for the States to supplement the program; and the automatic accreditation of hospitals approved by the private professional group known as the joint commission on accreditation of hospitals.

These were constructive suggestions. After weeks of bargaining with the administration, our proposals were accepted and it was, in reality, a Republican-oriented bill that the Senate voted on in 1962 and finally passed in 1964. Still more remains to be done in reorienting this legislation to provide preventive care, the maintenance of nutrition and adequate shelter, and an emphasis on immunization and the early diagnosis of disease prior to hospital admission.

Similar Republican initiative has occurred in the field of Federal aid to education where Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER has improved upon the legislation originally authored by Senator Robert A. Taft. The Taft bill passed the Senate in 1949, but failed in the House of Representatives. No bill was to pass the Senate again until 1961 only to meet the same fate in the House.

The Cooper proposal would have provided a minimum base grant of $20 per cubic school child and then an equalization grant for those States, some 18 in all, where the level of precollege education is drastically in arrears compared with the rest of the Nation. This is the same approach that exists within many States, where the counties with a highly developed industrial base contribute funds, on an equalization basis, to the schools in those counties which are not as fortunate in having such an industrial base for taxing purposes.

In our 20th century technological society, education means jobs. Our Nation needs the most highly developed skills which can be developed. Improper education and continued illiteracy means that an individual will lack the opportunities which he otherwise might have had. With the increasing mobility of our people, what happens in Mississippi does affect us in California or you here in New Jersey. A lack of job opportunities can only mean an increased burden upon the local property taxpayer in additional welfare costs because one of our fellow citizens cannot carry his own load. More important, however, a fellow human being and our Nation have been the losers.

But still more must be done as we seek constructive alternatives and original initiatives. There is an urgent need for more thought to be given to the encouragement of science and creativity in our land. Both industry and skilled workers should be given an incentive to fashion with their brains, their hands, their money, and their faith in a better future for our people. Despite recent tax legislation, more incentive should be given to those who wish to provide new plant and equipment on one hand and those who are willing to take a risk and employ more individuals to do what needs to be done as we seek to expand our markets at home and abroad and as we seek to spread the benefits of American science, technology, production, and marketing throughout the world.

Let Republicans share President Eisenhower's concern, expressed so eloquently in his farewell address to the Nation when he warned of the dangers of a military-industrial complex, by assuring that the work of the scholar in our society is encouraged and that a higher proportion of Federal funds for basic research is given to the universities of this Nation as "seed" money where faculty committees, rather than officials far removed in Washington, can best determine how these funds are invested.

As we seek to build a better America educationally and scientifically for ourselves, we should recall that Republicans, individually and together, have an unprecedented opportunity in the history of mankind to serve our fellow man. In Africa, let Americans commit themselves to staffing the universities and educational institutions of those evolving nations and thus spread the values of a representative democracy and a free, competitive society. Republicans must never forget that in the worldwide struggle in which we are engaged against the forces of totalitarianism, whether it be Communist or Fascist, our country has an obligation to lead and to propagate and spread the fundamental values of a free society, not only in its economic and governmental aspects, but, more importantly, in its nonmaterial aspects as well. Thus, as we concern ourselves with material progress, let us always remember that esthetic improvement, whether in government architecture or support for the arts, is not, in the long run, incompatible with it.

While, as Republicans, we do not wish to dominate State and local government let us, through tax incentives and other financial and nonfinancial (such as planning) assistance, encourage them to deal effectively with the problems of urban blight, mass transportation, recreation, and air and water pollution which have plagued so many of our metropolitan areas.

Let Republicans work, as Senator CLIFFORD CASE has done, for the establishment of ethical standards to guide the conduct of public officials in the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Let us include officers of the judicial branch as well and let us also deal at long last in a realistic way with the vexing problems of financing and supervising the receipts and expenditures made in Federal elections.

Let Republicans take a new look at the relationship between existing Federal law and our private economy, its management, and its workers. Let us strive to bring our antitrust laws into relation with modern economic reality. Let us provide the incentive for management not merely to retool its existing plants, but rather to encourage investment in the development of new research and the products which derive from it. Let us revise our tax laws so that oppressive excise taxes for the consumer are removed as we seek also to provide additional incentive for those who have risked their brains and their wealth to add to our economic growth.

Let Republicans continue to urge the reinstitution of the collective bargaining policies established by the late Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, when he asked both management and labor to remember that there is a third chair at the bargaining table: the public. He saw the role of the Federal Government not as intervening willy nilly in all labor disputes, dictating a settlement or pulling either party's chestnuts out of the fire by permitting a back-door route to the White House, but rather as providing a climate for bargaining and thus encouraging labor and management to learn to live with each other the year round, not merely as a contract deadline grew near.

Let Republicans work for full parity and a fair return to our farm population by devising policies which will encourage the retraining and readjustment to life in urban America of the million and a half farmers who are barely managing to subsist on the farm.

Let Republicans also concern themselves with the plight of the migrant farmworker by striving not to encourage his nomadism from one part of our Nation to another as certain Democratic proposals would do, but to repeal the exemption in the law which prohibits a national agricultural minimum wage and thus apply at long last a national standard so that the farmworker can, with the industrial worker, receive a basic minimum for the difficult work he performs.

Let Republicans keep faith with the heritage of Theodore Roosevelt in reclaiming arid lands and while conserving our natural resources for the use of generations yet unborn, put to beneficial use on an integrated and cooperative basis an appropriate amount of our water and power resources to meet the agricultural, industrial, and urban needs of our society.

Let Republicans renew the historic commitment of the Republican Party to the quest for equal opportunity in our own land so that no one will join our party under the mistaken, misguided, or misinformed notion that we shall tolerate racial, ethnic, or religious bigotry. The Republican Party came into being as an instrument to make all men free and to enable them to fulfill their aspirations in a land of equal opportunity. Republicans in the Congress have been primarily responsible for the successful passage of civil rights legislation during the Eisenhower and Johnson administrations. In 1957, when President Eisenhower submitted the first comprehensive civil rights legislation to be approved in 80 years, it was 25 Republicans in the U.S. Senate who fought to retain the heart of that legislation—the so-called title III authority for the Attorney General to intervene and obtain a preventive injunction to get the disputes off of the streets and into the courts. Regrettably, only 13 Democrats voted with us on that occasion.

Similarly in 1964, after 2½ years of urging the Kennedy administration to submit needed legislation, it was Senate Republicans who sought to strengthen the House-passed civil rights bill. Senator Keating's proposal to assure the right to vote in State and local elections is still necessary as we witness the harassing practices engaged in by local officialdom in the South. Not only must we strengthen the provisions relating to job opportunity, but we must also deal effectively with the right of a person to purchase the home of his choice or live in the apartment of his choice without being the victim of discrimination.

Much work remains to be done at all levels of our society and in all of our States. For the question of human and civil rights is not merely one of law, but it is also one of morality and conscience—an endeavor in which all Americans, regardless of party, can fruitfully participate.

In this regard let us recall that it is the Republican Party which was conceived to serve the national interest, not a sectional interest or two sectional interests. Thus, in the South let Republicans resolve to appeal to the rising urban middle class of both races as well as to the long impoverished Negro farm dweller who has been denied a fair opportunity because of the county courthouse control exerted by the Democratic Party. We can do no less if we are to keep faith with the Republican heritage.

Finally, let Republicans recall that the two-party system in our land was not ordained for America in either the Holy Scriptures or the Constitution. If it is to be retained, it will be retained only because it has worked to meet the needs of our people and that it has meant good government and responsible government as two vigorous, competitive parties offer programs and ideas in their attempt to achieve a majority consensus. We must seek a broadbased party striving always to serve the national interest and not the special interest of any group or any section.

While American political parties are not organized on an ideological basis, and should not be, this does not mean that fundamental principles may not provide the basis for much of what we seek to do. The whole basis for the Republican Party has been a moral one: freedom of the individual and his equality of opportunity. That is perhaps our problem, yet most of us would have it no other way. Republicans came into being in response to a moral crisis. At times we have seemed self-righteous about it. Regrettably, at times, some Republicans have all too easily forgotten what the crisis was and what our response was.

Thus, in order to deserve to win the faith of the American people, let Republicans determine to set a new course in our land. As

we do, it is perhaps appropriate to take heart from the words uttered by a Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, after whom this school was named, when he said during his fight to see that America assumed her responsibilities in the world: "I would rather fail in a cause that someday will triumph than to win in a cause that I know someday will fail."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on December 8, 1964, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], delivered a most able address at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, assembled at Philadelphia, Pa.

The address contains so much valuable information on the agricultural program of our Nation that I think it should be included in the RECORD and made available to the public generally, so that all may learn more about the agricultural program.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE ALLEN J. ELLENDER, U.S. SENATOR, AT THE 46TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., DECEMBER 8, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to be with you today. The American Farm Bureau Federation, as the largest organization of its kind in the country, has a distinct and unique responsibility, not only to its members, but to the country as a whole. And I believe that through the years you have fulfilled that responsibility, with your programs of education and your participation in the development of policies on all important issues facing our Nation.

I have great respect for the American Farm Bureau and for your president, Mr. Shuman, a man whose ideals and principles are beyond reproach. Now let me hasten to add that I am not always in complete agreement with your policies. As a matter of fact—and Mr. Shuman will attest to this—I have vigorously opposed some of your recommendations. However, despite any differences of opinion, I nevertheless have the highest regard for your organization and for your president.

Actually our aims are not greatly different. I desire a prosperous agriculture—and you want a prosperous agriculture. I want our farm programs to provide the greatest of flexibility and freedom. You also wish flexibility and freedom to make decisions as you see them. I want a minimum of governmental interference—and you do too. In addition, I want all programs to reflect fiscal responsibility, and I am sure you are in agreement with me in that position.

We differ, it appears to me, primarily as to the manner of achieving our objectives, but I feel confident that even here we should be able to reach common ground.

And I would suggest that you give close attention during the days ahead to the farm programs now in effect, and that will be proposed in the near future. If you do, you will find that a radical change has occurred, and is occurring, in the fundamental philosophy underlying agricultural policies since the beginning of farm price support programs.

Agricultural legislation in this country has a long history. It actually began in 1839 when Congress appropriated the munificent sum of $1,000 to enable the Patent Office to distribute seeds, conduct investigations, and collect statistics. In 1862 Congress created the Department of Agriculture, and provided for the establishment of our State land-grant colleges of agriculture.

In 1887 the Hatch Experiment Station Act, providing Federal-State experiment stations to be operated as part of the agricultural colleges, became law. In 1914 Congress enacted the Smith-Lever Extension Act, which provided for a nationwide county agent system.

The Federal land banks were established by Congress in 1916, and in 1922, the Capper-Volstead Act, exempting cooperatives from the restrictions of the antitrust laws, became effective. In 1923 the Agricultural Credit Act, and 10 years later the Farm Credit Act, brought into existence the Federal intermediate credit banks, the production credit associations, and the 13 banks for cooperatives.

Briefly, this is the history of agricultural legislation prior to 1933. The philosophy underlying those laws is quite evident. It was felt that if farmers and their families were provided with additional opportunities, with access to science, research, credit, and the means of utilizing technological advances, they would be in a position to compete successfully with other segments of the American economy. In other words, Congress sought to provide farmers with the tools to help themselves.

Unfortunately, a protracted period of low prices for agricultural commodities during the 1920's and early thirties led farm leaders to petition Congress for more direct assistance.

I am sure some of you remember those years, when wheat prices were less than a dollar per bushel, with a low of about 32 cents in December of 1932; when prices received by farmers for both the 1932 and 1933 crops of corn averaged only 29 cents per bushel; when, in 1931, prices received for cotton averaged less than 6 cents per pound; and when hogs and beef cattle sold for less than 4 cents per pound. Prices of other commodities were equally low.

It was generally agreed at that time, based upon the experiences of the Federal Farm Board, that farm prices could not be improved unless some means could be devised to reduce production. To achieve that end, Congress, in 1933, authorized the first direct price-support operation, attempting to control production on a voluntary basis through incentive payments. A tax on the commodities to be benefited was imposed to meet the cost of the program, but the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional in 1936.

Nevertheless, farm price supports, essentially as we know them today, were on their way to become a permanent part of the price structure of agricultural commodities.

As a result of the adverse Supreme Court decision on the 1933 act, Congress passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which I fostered. This law provided for mandatory price-support loans for corn, wheat, and cotton at from 52 to 75 percent of parity and, when necessary, marketing quotas and acreage allotments on tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. Permissive price supports for other agricultural commodities were also authorized. Later, peanuts were added to the basics.

Through the years this act has been repeatedly amended. Beginning with flexible price supports, we moved to inflexibility, and back again to the original concept.

The basic philosophy of the 1933, and later the 1938 acts was to improve and stabilize farm prices and promote orderly marketing achieved through a system of price supports on the one hand, and production controls on the other. Improvement of farm income was also fundamental, but this was to come about through supports and controls—not by Government guarantees of income through direct payments. This philosophy was maintained until the cotton and wheat laws of 1964 were enacted.

Today, only the tobacco, rice, and peanut programs remain essentially the same. The present cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs are, in my opinion, vastly different from the original concept contained in the act of 1938. These changes have occurred for a number of reasons. One of the main reasons, I think, is that the requirements and characteristics of the different commodities were recognized as being incompatible with a single type program covering all commodities.

In 1958 Congress enacted a program dealing with feed grains, cotton and rice. While there were differences among feed grain producers as to the merits of this program, there were few objectors among the producers of cotton and rice.

I was not too happy with the feed grain program, because of the inflexibility in the price support determination. As you recall, price supports had to be set at 90 percent of the 3-year average, or 65 percent of parity, whichever was higher. In the absence of controls, and with production exceeding requirements, this formula left little room for the free play of market prices in guiding decisions of individual farmers.

As to the cotton provisions, Congress envisioned an expanding consumption brought about through a more competitive price, the idea being to increase acreage and lower price supports.

As most of you know, the Secretary of Agriculture was given considerable flexibility in determining both price support levels and acreage allotments. Supports could be set at between 65 and 90 percent of parity, and allotments established at any level above the minimum of 16 million acres, depending upon supply and demand. With lower price supports and more production, farmers' income would not have been materially reduced, and more cotton would have been available at a lower price. I am firmly convinced that had this law been allowed to operate as intended, cotton would not be faced with the problems it has today.

The cotton law that was enacted this year, with the support of virtually the entire cotton industry, introduced direct payments as a major feature for the first time. I opposed this bill very vigorously, because I feared the adverse effect of a direct payment program on the welfare and future, not only of cotton, but of all our major agricultural commodities.

I will not go into details of the program. Suffice it to say that this new law affecting cotton sets up three choices of allotments for producers, with as many different price levels.

In addition, there are two separate direct payments. The smaller is made to producers, and the larger—designed to make cotton available to domestic mills at world prices—is made to the trade. The law specifically states that this large payment will not be made to producers.

To put it plainly, the reason why this second payment is not made to producers is that the designers of the act feared public reaction and possible congressional limitation on the total amount of payments made to any one producer. I might add that the mills were also against being named recipients of payments for the same reason. I need only point out to you what happened as a result of the procedures put into effect to expedite the changeover from the old to the new cotton program. Through these procedures payments were made to the mills on the cotton used between April 11 and

August 1, the date the new law became fully effective. During this period total payments of $86.1 milion were made by the Government directly to the mills. In short order the list of the mills and the amounts of the payments received were publicized, and the echoes of the howls that went up from the mills can still be heard. The fact of the matter is that neither the millowners nor the producers want direct payments which can be totaled and brought to light for public scrutiny.

It is my view that the producers who advocated this new cotton law were very shortsighted. They were sold on the idea that the cotton industry was doomed unless domestic mills were permitted to buy cotton at the same price as that paid by foreign mills. It is true that mill consumption of cotton was trending downward, but it is likewise true that mill consumption of manmade fibers was increasing. For example, during the 1950–53 period an average of 9.4 million bales of cotton was consumed by mills. In 1960–63, however, this had dropped to 8.6 million bales.

While the amount of cotton used by mills was declining, that of manmade fibers was increasing. In 1952, the proportion of cotton used was 69.9 percent and of manmade fibers 22.9 percent. In 1963, cotton had declined to 60.2 percent, and manmade fibers had increased to 33.6 percent. I might mention that the use of wool fibers also declined from 7.2 to 6.2 percent during this period.

This same condition existed in foreign countries whose mills were buying cotton at free and competitive world prices. I will cite only one example, but there are many others. In Italy the proportion of cotton used dropped from 62 percent in 1952 to 44.4 percent in 1963, while that of manmade fibers increased from 19.1 percent to 38.3 percent.

There were a number of ways to meet this challenge, but such a drastic price reduction for cotton was not the proper way. It was not in the best longrun interest of farmers. Nor was it in the best longrun interest of the trade, because necessary adjustments within the industry under these conditions would be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

At the time the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was holding hearings, the proponents claimed not only that cotton would become competitive again, but that the Government would save money on this new program, and in addition, consumers would save millions of dollars a year through reduced prices for manufactured textiles.

The cost estimates, as prepared by the Department of Agriculture, indicated that total major expenditures for the new cotton program would amount to $448 million for the 1964 crop, as compared to $566 million under the old program, with price suports at 32½ cents per pound, and to $451 million under the old program, with price supports at 30 cents per pound.

Of course, this lower cost was predicated on a reduction in production in 1964 below requirements. However, the advocates of the plan were incorrect in their estimates as to production, as well as costs. On November 9, the Department estimated cotton production at 15.4 million bales. This is about 600,000 bales greater than estimated disappearance, and the program will cost in excess of $800 million when all costs are taken into consideration.

In only one instance were the planners correct. They estimated that with a direct payment of 6.5 cents per pound, domestic mills would increase their utilization of cotton by about 1 million bales. Department estimates now show that increased activity by the mills this year will result in a domestic consumption of about 9.7 million bales of cotton, about 1.1 more than last year.

However, the increased consumption came at the tremendous cost to the Federal Government of about $312 million. My own estimates indicate a cost nearer $350 million. In other words, it will cost the Federal Government from $300 to $350 for every additional bale of cotton that will be used above last year. This is especially startling when you consider the fact that an average bale of cotton this year is valued at about $117.50. Actually, it might have been cheaper to give the mills the additional cotton.

Now, how about savings to consumers? Well, there really is no way to make a determination at this time, but we do have data which is published by the Department on cloth prices, cotton prices, and mill margins.

These figures show that the average price of 20 types of cloth constructions in October of 1964 was ony nine one-hundredths of 1 percent below the price of 61.34 cents per pound in October of 1963. This is in spite of the fact that cotton prices to the mills, including landing costs and brokerage, are 8.31 cents per pound less than the 35.11 cents paid by mills in October of 1963.

And mill margins—which is the spread between the cost of a pound of cotton and its cloth equivalent—have increased 8.22 cents over the 26.23 cents in October 1963. I grant that there are differences of opinion as to the value of these figures in showing the true picture. But they have been published by the Department for many years and there have been no complaints heretofore. To be completely fair, I want to point out that the BLS wholesale index on yarns has dropped from 98.6 in March of this year to 92.7 in October, and the index on gray fabrics from 104 to 101.6 during the same period. From what I hear, mill profits are up considerably. Now, I have nothing against the mills, and I want them to have the most profitable operation possible, but not at the expense of the Federal Government.

The most important and far-reaching point of the new legislation is the fact that direct payments are being used for the first time to make cotton competitive at world prices.

This has a two-pronged effect. First, any material increase in price to the mills after 2 years of this low price will certainly cause an extremely adverse immediate, as well as long-run, effect on the consumption of cotton by mills. Furthermore, but more importantly, cotton farmers have admitted that they cannot profitably produce at world prices. So, the question is, where do we go from here?

In this connection, the USDA Advisory Committee on Cotton has recently met to study the current supply and demand picture for cotton, the 1965 program for cotton, and the long-range legislative needs for cotton. I might add that I have not had an opportunity to review their recommendations. But my guess is that they will probably be in line with the recently released recommendation of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission which was appointed by the President to review present and future agricultural policy. Essentially, the Commission's recommendation for cotton was to extend the present program.

Now, I do not mean to be overly critical of the President's Agricultural Advisory Commission. As a matter of fact, I sympathize with its members, considering the base from which they had to start. But it does seem to me they could have done a better job. There are a number of possible alternatives, any of which, in my opinion, appears more desirable than an extension of the monstrosity now on the books.

I apologize for having dwelt on cotton in such detail, because I know that not all of you here are cotton producers. Why did I do this? To make a point. And the point is that any legislation, ill conceived, scarcely studied, but ramrodded through Congress, is bound to cause disaster for one or more segments of the industry.

We already have examples of the adverse effects of this legislation. The Federal Government is out to the tune of about $800 million. The handlers of cotton are dissatisfied. The New Orleans Cotton Exchange has had to close its doors. The New York Cotton Exchange is struggling along in the hope that through some magic it may survive. The trade, the merchants, the marketing system as a whole are divided on the merits of this law, and last, but certainly not least, farmers are left with 23-cent cotton.

I would ask that in your deliberations on cotton, you face this issue squarely and come up with recommendations that will stand the test of meeting cotton's present problems. Come up with alternatives, if you wish, but come up with something realistic and acceptable.

Now I would like to talk about feed grains.

This program, also, expires with the 1965 crop and will have to be considered by Congress next year. If no action is taken, feed grains will come under the permanent law which provides for price supports at from 50 to 90 percent of parity, but in no event at a level which would result in the Government's acquiring additional stocks of grain.

Most of you recall, I am sure, that the feed grain diversion program was originally enacted in 1961, later reenacted and extended through 1965. This program was supposed to be of a temporary nature, pending enactment of a mandatory acreage allotment program for corn and other feed grains. Since the mandatory program failed to pass, Congress has extended again and again a program originally enacted for only 1 year, in the hope that a realistic program could be devised.

I must say that I favor mandatory controls for feed grains, if they are to be price supported. I believe our experience of the late 1950's shows conclusively that in the absence of controls and even with lower support prices, production of feed grains will increase. The record shows that in 1954, with the support price for corn at $1.62, production amounted to 2.7 billion bushels, and Government stocks amounted to 858 million bushels. Over the years the support price was being lowered, but both production and Government stocks were increasing. In 1960, with the support price for corn at $1.06 per bushel, production had increased by over a billion bushels from 1954, and Government stocks likewise had increased by over a billion bushels.

The feed grain diversion program was presented to Congress as an emergency measure that would reduce stocks, be less costly, and improve farm income. At the time we were faced with surplus stocks of 84.7 million tons.

In 1961, the first year of operation, a total of slightly over 25 million acres of feed grains were diverted from production, at a total cost of about $824 million. Production was lower in 1961 than in the year before by about 15 million tons. In 1962 production was reduced below 1960 by about 12.7 million tons, at a cost of about $872 million, and about 28 million acres were diverted. In 1963 production exceeded 1960 by about 300,000 tons and the cost was about $900 million, with 25 million acres out of production.

This year production, with slightly over 34 million acres diverted, is estimated at about 18½ million tons below 1960, but the cost will increase to about $1.2 billion. Altogether, this program will have cost the taxpayers about $3.8 billion during the last 4 years, for acreage diversion and price support payments. This cost does not include price support losses and related costs of about $1.4 billion. To summarize, we have reduced stocks from 84.7 million tons in 1960 to an estimated 58 million tons by the end of this marketing year, a difference of less

than 27 million tons, at a total cost of $5.2 billion.

Production and stocks have been reduced because of the program, but the cost has exceeded by far even the wildest estimates that might have been made. In my opinion this program, while popular with farmers, is far too costly to be extended again without change. Since our carryover of corn and other feed grains has been considerably reduced, it might be well for us to permit the permanent legislation to become effective.

No doubt there will be considerable pressure for an extension of the present feed grain diversion program. As a matter of fact, last month the USDA Advisory Committee recommended a 5-year extension of both the feed grain and wheat programs, apparently with no major changes. I presume the new program would embrace more fully the principle of direct payments. At any rate this seems to be the trend in the thinking of many agricultural leaders.

On the other hand, the President's Advisory Commission, about which I spoke earlier in connection with cotton, has recommended an extension of the present feed grain program with some adjustments.

First, the Commission recommends a long-range land retirement program designed to take marginal or submarginal land, now in crops, out of production. This program envisions about 40 million acres over a 5-year period. During the first 5 years when the program is being built up to 40 million acres out of production, costs are estimated at about $550 million per year. If no new land were added in the second 5 years, annual costs would average about $300 million.

The Commission cautions, however, that a long-range land retirement program in itself is not capable of making the proper adjustment in crop production.

The Commission estimates that under present conditions about 70 million acres would be required to prevent overproduction on the remaining land. Land retirement is likely to be slow moving because it appeals to only a small fraction of farmers at any one time. The program is not directed at particular crops that may be in surplus. And to increase the scale of the program by a large amount would sharply increase the per-acre cost and might severely depress local communities in areas where the retired land was concentrated.

This recommendation would really be separate from the feed grain program, but apparently is an integral part insofar as costs are concerned.

Second, the Commission recommends that wheat be included in the feed-grain program. A wheatgrower's acreage allotment under the 55-million-acre national allotment would be his base acreage for the feed grain program. A nonparticipant in the wheat certificate program could divert wheat acreage under the feed grain program and receive payments alined with those for feed grains based on wheat at feed grain prices.

Third, the Commission indicates that the feed grain program might be broadened to include soybeans.

The cost of the feed grain program? Well, they estimate that with corn prices at $1.10 and yields at 64 bushels, 18 million acres would have to be diverted at a cost of about $600 million annually. If yields were at 67 bushels, 25 million acres would have to be diverted at a cost of about $850 million annually. But while the long-range land retirement was being built up, annual costs might well be about $1.3 billion, somewhat higher than the current program.

It is interesting to note that the Commission's report to the President stresses farm income, both individual and total. This differs from early farm price support legislation, in that price stability and orderly marketing were the major goals of policy. Of course, farm income was also fundamental, but that came about through the use of supports and controls, and not through the use of Government funds as a supplement to income.

Besides the cotton and feed grains, the voluntary wheat certificate program expires with the 1965 crop. This program, widely misunderstood at the beginning, is now receiving considerable support among the rank and file farmers.

The acreage diversion program which has been in effect since 1962, coupled with the high level of exports, has been responsible for a substantial reduction in the carryover of wheat. From a high of approximately 1.3 billion bushels, the carryover of wheat at the end of this marketing year is now estimated at about 900 million bushels. Wheat is therefore in a more desirable position stockwise than in 1961.

I know that the official position of the American Farm Bureau Federation opposes both the voluntary and mandatory wheat certificate programs and that is your privilege. Notwithstanding your opposition, however, I feel quite certain that a similar program will be extended beyond 1965.

In a recent report from the Department of Agriculture, I noticed that almost 781,000 farms signed up to participate in the 1965 wheat program. That signup, of course, was limited only to winter wheat areas. In spring wheat areas, the signup will begin February 8. There are advantages to the program, and the large number of farmers electing to participate is evidence of this.

Furthermore, based upon the figures I have, program costs will be reduced materially. Payments for diversion are expected this year to be approximately $34 million, which is negligible compared to the feed grain program, and certificate costs will balance out with receipts from millers and exporters.

Naturally, in a new program such as this, some shortcomings, as well as inequities, arise, but I feel that these can be readily ironed out. I believe this program, with some modifications, could be made to work.

The wool program must also be considered by Congress next year. Since 1954 there has been a direct payment plan in effect for this commodity. Ostensibly, the purpose of the act was to achieve a 300-million pound domestic production of raw wool. The reasons for payments were twofold. First, a free market for domestic wool would make it competitive with foreign wool, and second, the payment would be an incentive to increase production. The act has not achieved its objective. Production in 1964 amounted to about 224 million pounds and the estimate for 1965 is 215 million pounds, notwithstanding the fact that payments since 1954 totaled $450 million, as of June 30.

To the best of my knowledge there is little unrest in the industry, except among the mills. They are suffering from the competition of imported woolen textiles just as the cotton mills claimed to have been suffering from competition of imported cotton textiles. The big difference, however, is that cotton textile mills were operating at an 8½-cent disadvantage as compared to foreign mills, while the woolen mill industry in this country can obtain its raw product at a competitive price, because wool is not price supported in the United States. It moves in the market free and at whatever price the market will pay, based purely on the supply and demand situation.

I don't know what the outcome in wool will be. I can only surmise that here too Congress will have trouble. In the end, I suppose there will be an extension of the present program, perhaps with some changes.

In addition to the foregoing crop programs, the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission has recommended changes in the tobacco, peanut and dairy programs.

As to tobacco, the Commission recommends poundage rather than acreage allotments; in peanuts it recommends a self-help plan, or assessments on farmers to cover the cost of diverting surplus peanuts to crushing for oil or meal; and in dairying it recommends a class I allocation plan in market order areas similar to that passed by the Senate last year. It also recommended that Public Law 480 be amended to authorize sales of all agricultural commodities under its provisions, rather than limiting sales to surplus commodities.

These are the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, not yet espoused by the President. I believe that the administration's position on all of these programs will more nearly approximate the recommendations of the task force headed by Under Secretary Charles Murphy, who is now working on a report to the President.

There seems little doubt that the administration will propose new legislation for most, if not all, of these commodities. By new legislation, I do not mean drastic changes from present programs, but rather some modifications in existing legislation.

Since all our major agricultural commodities will be considered in 1965, there is no doubt that a broad review of agricultural policy and programs will be made by congressional committees.

In anticipation of this, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have asked for recommendations from all of the land-grant colleges, as well as the major farm organizations and others, on agricultural policies for the years ahead. I am hopeful that positive, forward-looking programs will result.

I must confess that although I have given this subject intensive thought and study in recent years, I am not sure just what ought to be done. It would seem desirable to attempt to work out a program which would give full flexibility to producers, provide some price and income protection, reduce costs to the Government, and yet move away from governmental control or interference.

However, the direction in which legislation appears headed is that of direct payments to farmers in order to supplement their incomes. I have opposed this method ever since its inception, because I believe that it is unsound and not in keeping with good government. I believe that farm income, just as the income of a jobholder, ought to come from the marketplace. I know that farmers would not only be happier but would also be in a more independent position if their income were from the marketplace.

But there are the problems of price competition, overproduction, and reduced incomes on the one hand, and the unwillingness of many farmers to submit to controlled production and its attendant woes on the other. Unfortunately, we cannot have both high price supports and uncontrolled production, without excessive cost to the Government.

I agree wholeheartedly that Government interference must be kept to a minimum. On the other hand, if the Government is called upon to support the price of any agricultural commodity, then the Government should be protected from excessive costs.

Doubtless past programs have been extremely costly for many agricultural commodities, particularly those pertaining to wheat, feed grains, cotton, and dairying.

As of June 30 of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported that the price support program costs for feed grains, since 1933, totaled about $6.1 billion, for wheat about $4.8 billion, for dairying about $3.9 billion, and for cotton $2.1 billion. This includes losses and payments, International Wheat Agreement costs, and the special milk programs. It does not include administra-

tive, interest, and other such costs of the CCC which amount to $8.1 billion.

When all commodities and programs are considered, the total cost, since 1933, amounts to $41.8 billion, comprised of $20.3 billion program costs for all commodities, $8.1 billion for administration interest, and other costs, and $13.4 billion for Public Law 480.

There is no implication here that all Public Law 480 costs should be charged against farm programs. Quite the contrary. This program more and more is becoming an outright foreign aid program, bearing less and less resemblance to the original Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act enacted in 1954. On the other hand, there is little doubt but that price support losses, export payments, direct payments, and other such costs, which altogether amount to $20.3 billion, are a legitimate charge against the farm program.

It is startling to learn that costs of farm programs from 1933 to June 30, 1953, totaled only $2.9 billion, whereas the cost since 1953 amounts to $17.4 billion.

I hope that I am not misunderstood here. True, program costs are substantial, but they are not as high as some misinformed individuals might have you believe. For example, in a certain column published on November 25, I found this statement, and I quote, "We are paying $7 or $8 billion to farmers to shield some of them from the marketplace." An informed person would know that the $7 to $8 billion amount is even higher than the total budget of the Department of Agriculture. Further, all informed persons know that the Department budget contains a host of consumer benefit expenditures.

While I feel that even the exact costs of the program have been excessive, there is little doubt but that farm programs have been helpful, not only to agriculture, but to consumers, and the national economy as well.

How have farm programs helped American agriculture?

First, farm programs have been effective in improving and maintaining farm prices and income.

Second, through price stability farmers have been better able not only to plan land and capital acquisition, but also to secure additional credit requirements. Banks and other lending institutions give considerable weight to an allotment and to guaranteed price supports in the lending of their funds. Although I am not personally aware of any studies which fully substantiate this fact, I feel quite certain from my years of experience on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that many of our outstanding agricultural leaders would agree wholeheartedly with me.

And third, much of the science and technology now available to producers is the result of work by the Federal Government and our land grant colleges. Further, our county agents have been largely instrumental in disseminating the discoveries among farmers. Our agriculture could never have attained its high level of efficiency were these services not available.

In these, and in a host of other ways, our farm programs have been helpful.

Now, how nave our farm programs helped consumers?

Our abundant farm production indicates that nowhere else on earth do consumers have available such a varied and nutritious diet at such a small fraction of their income.

In the United States about 18½ percent of the wage earner's net pay is being spent for food. Britishers spend about 30 percent and Russians about 50 percent.

For an hour's pay our industrial worker can buy a good balanced meal for four persons. In Germany and England it takes 2 hours to buy the same meal, in Austria 4 hours in France 4½ hours, and in Italy more than 5 hours.

Furthermore. through our grading and inspection programs, American consumers are guaranteed the best and the most wholesome of food. But more importantly, because of our abundance, American consumers are not faced, ever, with the spectre of food shortages.

How have our farm programs helped the national economy?

Well, first, agriculture is the Nation's largest industry. The number of workers in agriculture exceeds the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, steel, and the automobile industries.

The assets of agriculture amount to $216 billion, equal to nearly two-thirds of the market value of all corporate stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Farmers have invested about $18 billion in cars, trucks, tractors, and other farm machinery. In 1963, they spent over $4 billion on operation and repairs on machinery, equipment, and other farm items.

In 1961, and I am sure it is higher now, farmers used enough steel products to make almost 5 million compact cars, enough rubber to put tires on more than 6 million cars, and enough electricity to power the six New England States. They used the equivalent of 15 million gallons of crude oil, and they spent over $1.5 billion for fertilizer and lime.

Further, it is important to remember that many thousands of small communities throughout the land depend almost entirely upon agriculture for their livelihood. This was forcefully demonstrated in instance after instance when communities virtually disappeared as a result of land being placed in the soil bank. The equipment distributors, those engaged in repair, the chemical and fertilizer handlers, and the retail and wholesale merchandise no longer had a customer.

Surely a segment of our economy as large and important as agriculture must remain strong if the rest of the economy is to prosper.

One last observation. All of our efforts would have been for naught had not American farmers the ability to apply and utilize the technology and information available to them. This is a success story in its own right, and in my opinion it is indicative of the high level of intelligence, practicability, and ingenuity of today's successful farmers.

I express the hope that your great organization will join hands with the Members of Congress and others in providing agriculture with a sound and realistic program that will benefit all mankind.

SENATOR NELSON'S WISCONSIN TRAILBLAZING ON CONSERVATION NOW PAYING OFF FOR NATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Nation was aroused by President Johnson's eloquent plea in his state of the Union speech Monday night for a more beautiful America.

Knowing President Johnson as we all do, this pledge to beautify America, will soon be translated into specific proposals to be considered by Congress.

The assault on America's natural beauty has already ripped deep, ugly scars in our countryside. Much of our limited fresh water is already polluted. Even the air we breathe has been poisoned by indiscriminate, unnecessary waste pollution.

Thanks to the trailblazing success of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], when he was Governor of Wisconsin, the Nation has a proven blueprint on how the Nation can preserve its scenic beauty practically, economically, and without invading the rights and freedom of American property owners.

The Gaylord Nelson conservation program in Wisconsin is a $50 million 10-year plan. It is based on a sparkling new park system and an ingenious use of easements. It has won enthusiastic, bipartisan approval throughout Wisconsin.

Recently, U.S. News & World Report, in a characteristically clear and convincing analysis of the President's proposal for a more beautiful America, paid tribute to Wisconsin and to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. In 1961, I recall that when the then Gov. GAYLORD NELSON succeeded in winning passage of this legislation, I predicted that this Wisconsin idea would become a model for America. U.S. News & World Report concisely describes the Wisconsin program and its relevance to our national problem.

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

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

WISCONSIN'S BEAUTY PLAN—AN IDEA THAT WILL SPREAD

Several features of the emerging plans to give the United States a face-lifting got their first big tryout in Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin approach is of interest to landowners, including golf clubs and other organizations, who own natural beauty spots they would like to preserve if they could stand the costs.

Starting in 1961, Wisconsin adopted a 10-year program to clean up and expand its parks, scenic highways, forests, lakes, and other natural resources.

A novel feature was the purchase of scenic easements and public easements—agreements with landowners that enable public agencies to preserve beauty spots and make them accessible to limited public use.

In return, the landowner gets a payment in cash; or the landowner may get certain tax reductions through lowered assessments, for example.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who as Governor of the State pushed the 1961 plan into being, says the idea of easements may be the biggest contribution to preserving America's beauty in many decades.

"Most people have an instinct to preserve beauty," Senator NELSON says. "They want to help, but many also want to hold on to their property and pass it on to their children. The easement idea gives them a chance to do something for their country and maybe solve some of their own problems as well."

The easements device grew out of Rockefeller Foundation studies. The State of New York in 1960 passed a law authorizing scenic easements. Wisconsin was the first State to apply the principle on a large scale, however.

THE WHEREWITHAL

To finance its beauty plan, the Wisconsin Legislature voted a 1-cent-a-pack tax on cigarettes. This is expected to provide $50 million in the program's first 10 years.

The money is to be divided generally along these lines:

For scenic rights along 3,000 miles of State highways: $2 million.

For public easements on farms and other tracts useful for parks, fish and game developments: $6.5 million.

For 25 new lakes: $1.5 million.

For nine new State parks, plus open spaces near cities, State forests and wildlife and fish areas: $24 million.

For park improvements: $14 million.

By November 1964, the Wisconsin Conservation Commission had bought 87,000 acres of land at an average of about $100 an acre. It had taken easements on 9,000 acres at a cost of about $23 an acre.

The easements cost the taxpayers about one-fourth as much as the purchased land, and the acreage involved remained in a tax-paying status. This is a key point in many localities, which resent State and Federal agencies' gobbling up land resources.

The Wisconsin State Highway Commission, meanwhile, has bought 262 easements along the Great River Road beside the Mississippi River at a cost of $116,000. Easements also are being purchased on other roads.

CLEANING UP TRASH

Wisconsin has adopted some strict laws against people who litter roads, parks and streams with trash.

Senator NELSON thinks roadside incinerators or mammoth trash bins, perhaps at filling stations, are the only answer. Built-in trash containers in cars also would help, in his opinion.

A sizable Federal program to finance scenic easements is another necessary step, Senator NELSON believes. Last September he urged the Government to put up $10 million a year from general appropriations to be matched by the States for purchase of scenic easements along Federal highways.

IN THE CITIES

Senator NELSON also urged that up to a billion dollars a year be made available for cities and States to use in cleaning up their parks, employing jobless youths.

More than 450 mayors and other officials endorsed that idea. There are other signs that voters around the country feel it's time to push a clean-up-and-preserve-America campaign, in line with President Johnson's theme.

Three years ago the voters of New York States voted a $100 million bond issue for a program to buy land for parks and open spaces.

In December, Nassau County, on the fringe of New York City, employed a scenic easement for the first time.

One large estate owner gave the county an easement for a nature-study area. This qualifies as a contribution under the income tax laws, and a tax-assessment reduction is involved.

Minnesota last year became the first State to apply for scenic-easement funds under the interstate-highway program.

It all adds up to a ferment of State and local activity aimed at hanging on to what is left of America's beauty.

"If President Johnson does nothing more than give us a symbol of national leadership and interest in this effort, it will be a help," said one State conservation official.

ARTHUR KROCK, GENTLEMAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, while the Senate was in adjournment, Arthur Krock observed his 78th birthday. It is a little late to wish him a happy birthday. But it is never too late to pay tribute to this distinguished journalist. I know of no newspaperman who better fits the description, "A gentleman and a scholar."

Insight and integrity, candor and clarity, these are the qualities that mark an Arthur Krock column; plus, of course, a total lack of pretentiousness. Arthur Krock has been writing for the New York Times for many years. In all those years he has never failed to deliver the brand of journalism that we have grown to expect of him.

I invite the attention of Senators to a very fine birthday tribute paid to Mr. Krock by Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, and ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Trohan's article printed in the RECORD.

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

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

ARTHUR KROCK, GENTLEMAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, November 15.—In the restless ecstasy of digging into the past, keeping pace with the present, and prying into the future that constitutes the work of conducting a news column, there is seldom time to yield to a sentimental gesture, no matter how deserving it may be. It is, therefore, all the greater a pleasure to salute a valued and distinguished colleague on the occasion of his 78th birthday tomorrow.

He is Arthur Krock, a gentleman of the old school and a newspaperman in the finest traditions of what had long been considered a profession, but which has been made a trade union in the last three decades. If it is a profession, he has lent it his integrity, and if it is a trade, he has raised it by honored service.

Krock began his career as a reporter in Louisville in 1907, became a Washington correspondent in 1910, and returned to Louisville to become an editor for a number of years. In 1923 he became assistant to the president of the now defunct New York World and in 1927 he joined the New York Times, becoming its Washington correspondent in 1932 and serving until 1953. He has continued his column since he relinquished direction of that newspaper's Washington bureau.

His reflections are a way of life

For many of its readers and for those of other papers his reflections and observations have become a way of life. For newspapermen in Washington and around the country his writings have been shafts of enlightenment on complex problems of the day and flashes of verbal lightning to be envied and emulated.

There was a piece he wrote so long ago that he must have forgotten it about a village festival on the deep and dark Saguenay River in Quebec that Robert Louis Stevenson would have envied. There was a tale of the American visit of Lyndon Baines Johnson's camel driver, in the manner of the Arabian nights, that Mark Twain would have relished.

This is by way of saying that the gentleman can write, perhaps in the measured balance of the 19th or early 20th century, rather than in the flippancy and intimacy that characterize so much of the efforts of toilers in the vineyard today. For this he deserved praise, no doubt, but the monument he has erected for himself will, like that of Horace or Shakespeare, outlast brass.

His greater contribution is honor. In his long years of service as a newspaperman, Krock has shared thousands upon thousands of confidences and broken none. He has been asked for advice and given it honestly and freely. He has been generous in lending his name to help writers, young and old. He has not profited from his confidences, advice, or help in memoirs which would be a great contribution to the history of our times.

Earns Pulitzer Prize many times

Twice he was awarded the Pulitzer Prize, although he earned it many times. Yet, this was not his greatest contribution to the newspaper business. It was the inspiration and example he set for others that must not be forgotten.

Krock was not one to don a powder blue shirt for television cameras on press conference days. He was not one to identify himself with assumed modesty. He had no more love for the press conference and its posturing than he did for the news handout and its administration line.

Krock sought out the newsmakers and the news on his own. He can turn out a news story as clear, factual, and polished as any news gem, which he did on the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And he can lead you to the heart of any foreign or domestic problem to give it perspective and meaning.

It is a happy birthday for us, Arthur, because we are better for your being with us.

THE COLD WAR GI BILL IS MORE DESIRABLE THAN EVER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson's two praiseworthy purposes to aid education as well as to increase employment, as disclosed in his state of the Union message, will be materially advanced by the enactment, in the 89th Congress, of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH'S GI bill for the selective service draftees. This is similar to, though less extensive than, the bills enacted first in behalf of the World War II veterans, and second in behalf of Korean war veterans. The experience with these two important and desirable acts clearly showed that their benefits far exceeded their costs.

Now, there is an additional reason for this legislation which did not exist in previous Congresses. Entitled to such assistance are not only the cold war draftees but also the participants in our undeclared war in South Vietnam. Already our American dead there exceed 350, and the number of injured—to date undisclosed—is far larger.

Senator YARBOROUGH'S bill had 39 cosponsors in the 88th Congress, of whom I was proud to be one. I shall, of course, cosponsor it again. I understand it will be Senate bill 9.

An excellent article by the distinguished and dynamic senior Senator from Texas appears in the current issue of Harper's magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled: "A Fair Deal for the Cold War Soldier," by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, which so cogently sets forth the desirability of the pending legislation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A FAIR DEAL FOR THE COLD WAR SOLDIER

(By Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH)

(A proposal to extend the old GI bill of rights to the new crop of veterans—not as a giveaway, but as a sound national investment—by the newly reelected Senator from Texas, who has sponsored laws for conservation, education, and the Peace Corps.)

Not long ago I talked with a young ex-serviceman who is working as a truck driver

to support his family while he attends night school.

"At the rate I'm going, I'll be 40 when I graduate," he said. "I suppose that isn't really 'old' but my value—and the degree's—will certainly have decreased by then—if I manage to stick it out. And I'm not sure I can."

This man is one of 3 million forgotten American veterans. By 1973 there will be 5 million in the same position. All of them had the bad luck to serve in the Armed Forces after the benefits of the World War II GI bill of rights and the Korean bill had run out.

To give these young veterans a fair shake, I have proposed a cold war veterans readjustment bill. In the 88th Congress, this bill was cosponsored by 39 Senators, and we had hoped it would be enacted into law last June—on the 20th anniversary of the Omaha Beach landing. (In the same month and year, 1944, the original GI bill was passed.) When Congress adjourned in October, the bill was still pending on the Senate Calendar. It had been there for over a year. For the bill to pass in the 89th Congress, when it is reintroduced, it will be necessary for a great many Americans to demand it—in the name of both justice and good sense.

This is no bonus or giveaway program, for the GI bills have proved among the best investments our Government ever made. The record speaks for itself.

Almost 8 million veterans received training under the World War II bill and thus acquired a median of 12.2 years of school compared to 9.6 years for nonveterans of their age. These veterans have been earning from $2,000 to $3,000 more a year than the less educated nonveterans. Assuming—as we properly may—that at least half of this added income is due to better education and training, then the GI bill should be credited with giving the Government an extra $1 billion a year in taxes. By 1970, in fact, the men we educated will have fully repaid the cost of the bill by their additional taxes, and it can be regarded from there on as one of the Government's few profit-making ventures.

The GI's also proved admirable loan risks. Defaults amount to only 0.02 percent of the more than $56 billion loaned or guaranteed on veterans' homes and businesses, and this small loss has been more than offset by the Government's $118 million profit in interest payments.

Some 3 million additional veterans received schooling under the Korean GI bill, making a total of about 11 million Americans whose educational level has been raised under these 2 laws. In the process we have added to our supply of sorely needed professional people some 625,000 engineers, 375,000 teachers, 165,000 natural and physical scientists, and 220,000 workers in medicine and related fields. Not surprisingly, many more in the veteran group educated under the GI bill hold professional and managerial jobs, and unemployment is far less of a problem to them than to equivalent nonveterans.

The Nation, in effect, created a new source from which to draw its leaders. At this writing, such leaders include 2 Cabinet officers—Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—7 Governors, at least 47 Congressmen, and 9 Senators. Indeed, about a thousand of the men listed in the 1960–61 "Who's Who in America" owe their educations to the GI bills. If the pattern holds, 12 to 15 percent of the book's total listings in the 1980's will be veterans who benefited from the program. And as World War II and Korean servicemen mature they are likely to assume still more important positions of leadership.

In contrast, our cold war veterans are often lucky to get any jobs at all, and it is the Government itself which seems to block their path. It keeps them out of the labor market for 2½ years, on the average, and then sets them loose in the civilian economy to catch up as best they can with the thousands of young men—56 percent of those eligible for the draft—who were never in uniform.

Since the Korean GI bill lapsed on January 31, 1955, more than 2½ million men have been discharged from active duty only to find themselves untrained, unemployable, and unable to compete for scarce jobs. Increasing automation promises to make their plight still worse. In 1963 alone, more than 210,000 veterans received unemployment compensation in excess of $96 million—that is, $2 million over the figure for 1962. We can expect to reverse the trend only by investing in their education.

The bill we have proposed aims to train today's veterans so that they can stay off the unemployment rolls. Specifically, it offers men who served in the military for more than 180 days between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, 1.5 days of educational assistance for each day of active service—with a limit of 36 months of schooling. Its estimated $289 million annual cost will be entirely self-liquidating since well-trained veterans will pay higher tax bills.

Despite the fact that the initial cost of the bill would account for only three-fifths of 1 percent of all military expenses, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense oppose the measure. Current in-service courses, so their argument runs, offer the same benefits and may encourage young men to enter the Armed Forces, while postservice educational programs are more likely to lure them to leave. The Defense Department has not, however, come up with evidence that GI bills lower reenlistment rates.

Fighting for the bill are, among others, the AFL–CIO, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the National Farmers Union, and more than half a dozen veterans' organizations. What they want is not a rash and extravagant experiment; it is a program which has proven its value for our Nation in general and for the men who defend the United States in particular. I think they ought to get it.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. TAYLOR, JR.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, members of the Virginia delegation in Congress are going to miss an old and faithful friend from the Press Galleries of the House and Senate this year.

I refer to Frank E. Taylor, Jr., of the Associated Press, who began a well-earned retirement on January 1. Mr. Taylor had a long and honorable newspaper career, but we will remember him best for the nearly 20 years he has served as Virginia regional correspondent for the Associated Press here at the seat of Government.

During a part of his service in Washington he also reported news of interest to West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky and Indiana.

Mr. Taylor was born December 8, 1899, near Pendleton, S.C., and worked on the Birmingham Age-Herald and the Columbia, S.C., Record before joining the Associated Press at Richmond, Va., in 1928. He was transferred to Washington in 1945. He was married in 1937, and the Taylors have two children. The family home is in McLean, Va.

Frank is one of the most modest, unassuming men I have ever known, but I do not want him to leave without letting him know the high regard in which he has been held by those of us with whom his work brought him into frequent contact. I wish Frank and Mrs. Taylor many years of health and happiness.

BRIDGES EAST AND WEST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently, on December 8, 1964, while Congress was in recess, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] delivered a speech entitled "Bridges East and West" at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Tex. I have never read a more impressive statement outlining the goals, methods, and policies our Government should have in mind in our dealings with the Communist world.

Senator FULBRIGHT spoke convincingly of the failure of military conflict in the past, and of the dangers which general war now poses:

> We have reached a point in history in which no rational man can conceive of war as a useful instrument of national policy * * *. I believe that we must pursue a policy of building bridges of accommodation with the Communist world, not because this approach is inherently more desirable than one of total victory for American interests, but because there is no acceptable alternative in the nuclear age. The usefulness and desirability of a clear and quick victory over all our adversaries can be debated, but such a debate must be academic because the option of complete victory does not exist. The choice before us in our relations with the Communist world is not between victory and defeat but between mutual accommodation and mutual annihilation.

The Senator from Arkansas carefully explained the assumptions upon which he would build his policy toward the Communist bloc:

> The key assumption of a policy of building bridges to the Communist world is that the Communist countries are susceptible to external influence and to internal change. I think the assumption is eminently sound. If the determination of the Communists to destroy us is indeed as permanent, monolithic and unalterable as some of our people seem to believe, then they have achieved a constancy of will that no movement or nation or individual has ever before achieved.
>
> It is nonsense to suppose that the character and objectives of communism are unalterable. Change and the susceptibility of change are practically a law of human life, and however much the Communists may imagine that they have altered or conquered human nature, it is a demonstrable fact that they have not. Even the dreariest of Chinese or Soviet fanatics is a human being as well as a Communist * * *. Great changes have in fact taken place and are continuing to take place in the Communist countries.
>
> Far from the monolith of Stalin's time, the Communist bloc—if it can still be called a bloc—presents the world with a panoply of change proceeding at widely varying rates.
>
> A highly diversified situation calls for highly diversified policies. This, I think, must be the key consideration in the Western effort to build bridges to the Communist world.

Senator FULBRIGHT has many worthwhile ideas to offer, but the most important service his speech renders is

placing the problems of our time in better focus. As he noted near the conclusion of his speech:

What is called for is a sense of historical perspective in meeting the crises and tensions of the moment—a perspective from which we will perceive that the doctrines and the causes that arouse men to violence are transitory, that more often than not they fade into irrelevance with the erosion of time and circumstances.

In order that every Member of Congress may read this remarkable address, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BRIDGES EAST AND WEST

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex., All-University Convocation)

I am honored to be with you today at this great university in one of the Nation's great cities. Like so much of our country, Dallas is a growing and changing community and the growth that is taking place here is healthy and sound and constructive.

As a citizen of a neighboring State, I am proud of the development of Southern Methodist University as one of the Nation's leading institutions of learning and of the development of Dallas as one of the Nation's handsomest and most prosperous communities. As a member of the Democratic Party, I am filled with admiration for the excellent judgment shown by the citizens of Dallas in last month's election. And as an American, I am proud of the efforts that have been made here in Dallas in the last year—efforts that, in Mayor Jonsson's words, are building a community "balanced in human and spiritual values as well as economically."

It cannot truthfully be said that war is never profitable, but it can be said that its costs have almost always exceeded its rewards and that in our own time a general war would result in such mass destruction that, as President Kennedy once put it, the survivors would envy the dead. We have reached a point in history in which no rational man can conceive of war as a useful instrument of national policy. Unfortunately, however, men are not always rational and the fact that war is insanity does not mean that it is impossible or even unlikely.

It follows, I think, that one of the guiding principles of our foreign policy must be the accommodation of conflicting interests in the world by means other than military conflict. We should be under no illusions about the fact that accommodations without conflict mean a peace without victory, or at least without the kind of total victory for American ideals and values that was discussed so much in the recent election campaign. Great nations do not as a general rule surrender their interests and ideologies to other great nations without being compelled to do so. If it is agreed that neither the West nor the Communist nations are able to coerce the other into submission, then it should be clear to both sides that the condition of their survival is the acceptance by each of certain conditions and arrangements in the world that it will find distasteful. The challenge of statesmanship is to devise compromises that respect the vital interests of both sides while requiring concessions that, however distasteful, are at least tolerable.

I believe that we must pursue a policy of building bridges of accommodation with the Communist world, not because this approach is inherently more desirable than one of total victory for American interests but because there is no acceptable alternative in the nuclear age. The usefulness and desirability of a clear and quick victory over all our adversaries can be debated, but such a debate must be academic because the option of complete victory does not exist. The choice before us in our relations with the Communist world is not between victory and defeat but between mutual accommodation and mutual annihilation. If there was ever a time in our history when it was open to us to seek a universal victory for American ideals and institutions—and it may well be questioned that there was—it is clear beyond doubt that that time has passed and that for as far into the future as we can see we shall be living in a world of diverse and often conflicting interests and ideologies.

I do not think there is reason for despair in this state of things. Compromises often turn out to be very much more tolerable than they seem when they are being made and victories even more often turn out to be bitter disappointments. There are two reasons, I think, why the fruits of triumph so often turn to ashes in the victor's hand.

The first is the inescapable limitations of human nature. Man is by far the most generously endowed of God's creatures, but for reasons known best to Himself, the Almighty endowed us liberally with technical and scientific skills but only modestly with the qualities of wisdom and farsightedness. A total victory is really too great a responsibility for any man or any nation. Men are simply not equipped to decide each other's fate, and when they try to do so, the chances are very great that, however good their intentions, the result will be something between tragedy and futility.

Democracy itself is built on this view of human nature. Democratic procedures are based on the assumption that no man has access to absolute truth and that no man, therefore, must be allowed to impose his will upon all others. The genius of democracy is that, unlike other political philosophies, it acknowledges the limits of human wisdom and understanding.

Viewed from the perspective of man's moral and intellectual shortcomings, the shattered hopes and lost victories of the recent past seem somewhat less surprising. A great deal of intellectual energy has been expended in an effort to understand how and why the victory of 1918 was followed in only 20 years by another global conflict and how and why the total victory of 1945 turned almost at once into the cold war that still engages us. These baleful events might well have been avoided, or at least alleviated, by different policies and different decisions at critical moments, but perhaps the basic cause of our disappointments lies in the very totality of the victories we won. Signaling as they did an opportunity to reshape the character of international relations, the victories of 1918 and 1945 were lost largely, I think, because they created opportunities that could only have been realized by the application of far greater wisdom and far greater vision than any of us possesses.

The second reason why great military triumphs so often fail to realize their promise lies in the character of conflict itself. War is not merely a method of resolving disputes that preceded it; it is not, as Clausewitz thought, a mere extension of politics. International conflicts, especially sustained international conflicts, have an evil dynamism of their own. The original causes of modern warfare are soon lost in a maelstrom of passion and destruction; new ambitions are aroused and new forces are released that change the character of the conflict and largely determine its outcome and aftermath.

Peace settlements in this age of national and ideological conflict are made by angry and agitated men. Nations are profoundly altered by conflict, and whatever their motives for entering a war, they are likely to come out of it embittered, vindictive and physically and morally exhausted, with far more extensive and far less realistic ambitions than those which drove them into war. Reason and wisdom are fragile human qualities, easily consumed in the passions of national conflict. One of the tragedies of modern warfare—perhaps the greatest tragedy—is that it puts men most completely at the mercy of their emotions at precisely the moment when they are most desperately in need of their reason.

On November 29, 1917, the Daily Telegraph of London published a letter by Lord Lansdowne about the damage to be wrought by the war then in progress. His prophecy, which was scornfully rejected at the time but tragically vindicated in the outcome, is even more compelling for our own time. "We are going to win the war," he wrote, "but its prolongation will spell the ruin of the civilized world, and an infinite addition to the load of human suffering which already weighs upon it. Security will be invaluable to a world which has the vitality to profit by it, but what will be the value of the blessings of peace to nations so exhausted that they can scarcely stretch out a hand with which to grasp them?" [1]

We Americans are more susceptible to excessive idealism than to vindictiveness. We have a tendency to turn conflicts for the defense of our interests into crusades for the regeneration of mankind. In 1917, we went to war to defend our maritime rights and ended by conducting a crusade to make the world safe for democracy. In the Second World War, we remained neutral while most of Europe and much of the Far East were overrun and entered the war only when our own territory was attacked, but then we prosecuted the war to the unconditional surrender of our enemies.

In both World Wars we dreamed great dreams about a new era of world peace under world law. In both instances we were disappointed, largely, I believe, because our hopes soared beyond the limits of our capacity. In both instances, the price of unattainable aims was the loss of lesser prizes that were well within our grasp. I believe that America and the free world would be safer and happier today if we had not tried to outrun history in 1919 and again in 1945 and had tempered our idealism by combining it with more modest and traditional objectives. "The wicked are wicked, no doubt," wrote Thackery, "and they go astray and they fall, and they come by their deserts; but who can tell the mischief which the very virtuous do?" [2]

Every society has its shortcomings of style and character. Ours, I think, is the mischief of too great virtue, of idealism insufficiently tempered by the sobering wisdom of experience. It is this crusading tendency, so noble in intent, so potentially destructive in its consequences, that we must guard against in our relations with the Communist world.

The point that I wish to stress is that in this nuclear age we must learn to live in an imperfect world. We must scale our ideals to the limits of external reality and to the limits of our own capacity. We must recognize, in the words of the old maxim, that "the best is the enemy of the good." We must acknowledge, however, regretfully, that it is not open to us to remove the threat of communism from the world, but that it is open to us to build bridges to the Communist world and in so doing to influence the course which it follows in a direction compatible with our own safety and with the peace of the world.

The building of bridges is a modest and limited enterprise. In no sense is it to be taken as a harbinger of general reconciliation between the free world and the Com-

[1] Lord Newton, "Lord Lansdowne: A Biography" (London: Macmillan, 1929), p. 467.
[2] William Thackery, "The Newcomers," ch. 20.

munist world. Such a reconciliation is unlikely to occur in our lifetimes, not because we would not like it but because the differences are too great to be eliminated by any process more rapid than the evolution of history.

The building of bridges means nothing more than the opening of normal contacts and communications across a chasm of misunderstanding. It is most unlikely to result in the early resolution of such fundamental issues as the division of Germany, the nuclear arms race, and Chinese Communist aggression in the Far East. And, it should be emphasized, a program of limited accommodations with the Communist world can be only one part of the grand strategy of American national security. The other bases of our national security are the maintenance of the world's most powerful nuclear deterrent force and the maintenance and sustenance of a vigorous Atlantic Alliance. These, I think, are the three bedrocks of our security: none would be an adequate policy by itself and each contributes to the effectiveness of the other.

There is all but unanimous agreement among the American people on the need for military strength and the value of the Atlantic Alliance. It is on the third element of our national security policy—the need for building bridges to the East—that we often find ourselves divided. It is important to emphasize, therefore, that the purpose and effect of limited accommodations with Communist countries are exactly the same as those of our nuclear deterrent and of the Alliance: to reduce the Communist appetite for expansion and thereby to increase our own national security.

The key assumption of a policy of building bridges to the Communist world is that the Communist countries are susceptible to external influence and to internal change. I think the assumption is eminently sound. If the determination of the Communists to destroy us is indeed as permanent, monolithic and unalterable as some of our own people seem to believe, then they have achieved a constancy of will that no movement or nation or individual has ever before achieved.

It is nonsense to suppose that the character and objectives of communism are unalterable. Change and the susceptibility to change are practically a law of human life, and however much the Communists may imagine that they have altered or conquered human nature, it is a demonstrable fact that they have not. Even the dreariest of Chinese or Soviet fanatics is a human being as well as a Communist, subject to one degree or another—however little he may like it—to the same weaknesses, the same hopes and the same temptations that characterize all human life. In a way which the leaders of the Communist world would probably be the last to understand, they themselves as well as their peoples are connected with us by unalterable bonds of a common human nature. This common humanity can be a powerful and constructive instrument for change in the hands of those who understand it.

Great changes have in fact taken place and are continuing to take place in the Communist countries. On the whole there has been a tendency toward more liberal—or less dictatorial—domestic policies and more conservative—or less aggressive—foreign policies. Our policy should take close account of the nature and extent of these changes and of the diverse character of the world's Communist regimes. They range from China at one extreme, which hangs back in fanaticism and an aggressive foreign policy, to Yugoslavia at the other extreme, which has ceased to be a member of the bloc and pursues policies which are often friendly and seldom harmful to the West.

The Soviet Union stands approximately midway between the Chinese and Yugoslav extremes. During the period of Khrushchev's rule the apparatus of police terror was dismantled and after the great Cuban crisis of 1962 the regime adopted a policy of limited accommodations with the West. The new regime of Brezhnev and Kosygin has somewhat tempered the competition in insults with China but otherwise seems to be maintaining the Khrushchev policy of "goulash" communism at home and generally prudent policies abroad.

The area of most rapid, although widely varying, change in the Communist world is Eastern Europe. Even aside from Yugoslavia, which is far in the vanguard and cannot be considered a member of the bloc, the winds of change are being felt in most of the states which we have considered satellites of the Soviet Union. Poland has enjoyed a considerable measure of independence in its internal affairs since Gomulka's successful defiance of Khrushchev in 1956. Hungary has progressed considerably since the brutal suppression of its revolution in 1956 and the Kadar regime has won a measure of public acceptance by raising living standards and tolerating limited popular liberties. Except for the release of some political prisoners, Rumania remains a Stalinist dictatorship in its internal life but has openly defied the Soviet Union in pursuing an independent foreign economic policy. Czechoslovakia, which until recently was one of the most compliant satellites, is now beginning to stir in its internal life. Only East Germany and Bulgaria remain Stalinist dictatorships almost wholly under Soviet domination, while backward Albania has broken with the Soviet Union and become a Chinese Communist satellite.

Far from the monolith of Stalin's time, the Communist bloc—if it can still be called a bloc—presents the world with a panoply of change proceeding at widely varying rates. This situation presents the West with interesting and important opportunities to influence events in the Communist world in a direction favorable to Western security and interests. As the Communist states become less like each other, they become more like the rest of the world, subject to traditional aims and ambitions, to traditional pressures of nationalism, and—most important for our purposes—to traditional forms of external influence.

A highly diversified situation calls for highly diversified policies. This, I think, must be the key consideration in the Western effort to build bridges to the Communist world. Our purpose is not simply to advance some vague purpose of greater international understanding but to influence the pace and character of change in the Communist world in such a way as to discourage aggressive and expansionist policies toward the free world. To do this, we must differentiate carefully between one Communist country and another, rewarding those which show a greater inclination to confine the practice of their ideology within their own frontiers and to enter into friendly relations with the West and withholding our rewards and, when necessary, applying sanctions against those which continue to pursue expansionist policies.

There can be no such thing, under current world conditions, as a single American policy toward communism or toward the Communist bloc. An appropriate policy toward Yugoslavia must be different in certain respects from our policies toward Poland or Hungary, substantially different from our policy toward the Soviet Union, and radically different from our policy toward Communist China.

Yugoslavia is a Socialist state which permits its people considerable liberty, engages in experimental and pragmatic internal economic practices, and pursues a neutralist foreign policy which is free of Soviet control and not unfriendly to the West. Yugoslavia also exerts considerable influence on the Soviet bloc states of eastern Europe, who admire Yugoslavia's progress and envy her independence.

These are compelling reasons for a friendly American policy toward Yugoslavia. Except for a few outstanding issues, our relations are in fact cordial and constructive. I visited Yugoslavia a few weeks ago to attend the signing of an educational exchange agreement and I am confident that the exchange of students and scholars will make for an even better understanding between the two countries.

From the point of view of our own national security, there are two important objectives to be served by a policy of friendly cooperation with Yugoslavia. The first is to strengthen Yugoslavia itself, with its sizable territory, developing economy, and substantial army, in the pursuit of its independent national policies. The second reason for good relations with Yugoslavia is its unique position as a bridge between East and West. When we engage in cordial political relations with the Yugoslavs and accord them most-favored-nation treatment in trade, we are demonstrating to the other Communist states of Eastern Europe in the most persuasive possible way that there are attractive rewards to be gained by the adoption of friendly policies toward the West.

Poland and Hungary represent a lower gradation in the evolution of Communist states. Poland, like Yugoslavia, receives most-favored-nation treatment in trade with the United States and is permitted to buy surplus food products under Public Law 480. Poland, however, has regressed somewhat in the last few years toward more passive acceptance of Soviet leadership and, for this reason, I would think that no new American initiatives are in order for the time being. As to Hungary, I think it is time for the United States to take cognizance of the Kadar regime's progress and internal liberalization by reestablishing the full diplomatic relations that were suspended at the time of the revolution and perhaps as well by opening discussions for educational and cultural exchange.

Rumania has refused to subordinate its economy to an overall plan for the bloc and the United States, quite wisely, has encouraged this defiance by concluding a trade agreement with Rumania. As to the other countries of the bloc, they have not yet progressed to a degree that would warrant new American policies in trade or in other fields, and, indeed, just as independence is encouraged by rewarding those who practice it, it must also be encouraged by withholding concessions from those who do not.

Twelve years ago the Eisenhower administration came to power proclaiming a policy of liberation for Eastern Europe. That policy was a failure. When the workers of East Berlin rose in 1953 and again when the Hungarian people rebelled against their Communist rulers in 1956, the United States could not provide assistance beyond words of sympathy and concern. Despite the brave words of Secretary of State Dulles, the iron curtain was not rolled back in the 1950's except for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria, which was not accomplished by forcible liberation but by years of painstaking negotiations that finally produced the Austrian state treaty.

The liberation policy of the 1950's failed because it purported, in its ill-defined way, to roll back the iron curtain by forcible means of one sort or another. It therefore came up against the realities of the nuclear age. When Eisenhower and Dulles were put to the test of using force to realize their declared objective, they recognized, quite

wisely, that no policy can be sustained when its likely result will be the nuclear incineration of the world.

The changes that have taken place in Eastern Europe in the last few years have opened a new and far more realistic possibility for its gradual liberation. That possibility lies in the policies which we are now pursuing and which can be built upon and expanded in the years ahead. Just as the Soviets have sometimes profited by infiltrating and dividing free nations, we now have an opportunity to influence events in the countries of Eastern Europe in a way that will promote their liberty and our security. The skillful use of trade and diplomacy and educational and cultural exchange can do far more to bring about the liberation of Eastern Europe than all the brave and hollow words that used to be uttered about rolling back the iron curtain.

It is not possible in a few words to outline a long-term policy for the Soviet Union. Broadly speaking, our Government has recognized—and I hope will continue to recognize—that the Soviet Union of Brezhnev and Kosygin is a markedly different country from the Russia of Stalin, posing the West with markedly different challenges and opportunities from those of 12 and even 5 years ago.

It is not to be expected that we will soon find it possible to build bridges to the Soviet Union comparable to those which can be built, say, to Yugoslavia or Poland or Hungary. The Soviet Union is second only to the United States in power and wealth, and it is the only nation in the world that poses a major military threat to the United States. Its policies are more moderate and more reasonable than they were a decade ago, and that is to be welcomed and encouraged. Unlike the nations of Eastern Europe, however, the Soviet Union has the power and the will to expand its influence whenever the opportunity arises. Accordingly, our policy toward the Soviet Union must be based somewhat less on measures of influence and accommodation and somewhat more on the other two major components of American security policy, the nuclear deterrent and the vitality of the Western Alliance.

The fact that the opportunities for building bridges are smaller in the case of the Soviet Union than they are in the case of Eastern Europe does not mean that they are unimportant. On the contrary, significant progress has been achieved and significant opportunities remain for limited accommodations between the Soviet Union and the West. The partial nuclear test ban treaty, the agreement not to put nuclear weapons in orbit around the earth, the sale of American surplus wheat for gold, and the cultural exchange program have all contributed to an improvement in relations and to a substantial reduction in the danger of war.

I do not think that we will soon solve the problems of Berlin and of a divided Germany, and I am absolutely certain we will not soon achieve the "general and complete disarmament" that both sides are so fond of talking about. I do think, however, that useful opportunities will continue to arise in such fields as commerce and cultural relations, starting with a treaty for the establishment of consular relations that will be put before the Senate early in 1965. I believe that we should pursue these opportunities patiently and persistently because, modest as they are, their cumulative effect is the gradual lessening of the danger of war, which is not a modest achievement but a very significant one.

It is not really useful to argue over a hard policy versus a soft policy in our relations with the Soviet Union. Implicit in the eternal and fatuous debate between hawks and doves is the assumption that our policy must be based solely on military power or solely on compromise and conciliation. This is nonsense. A wise and farsighted policy is one which is tough in response to provocation, as in the case of the Cuban missile crisis, conciliatory in response to demonstrations of cooperative intent, as in the case of the test ban treaty, and unerring in its dedication to the peace and security of the free world.

The instruments of policy should not be confused with the goals of policy. The nuclear deterrent, the Western Alliance and measures of East-West accommodation are not ends in themselves but instruments of policy. The task of statesmen is not to choose one or another for all purposes and for all time but to decide in each instance which instrument of policy or what combination of policies is most likely to contribute to the security of the United States and of the free world.

The aims of our policy toward the Soviet Union are necessarily limited. They are limited because we are neither strong enough nor wise enough to eliminate all evil from the world and to bring about universal peace and justice. The issue between the Soviet Union and the West is not communism versus capitalism, but the universal and unlimited aims of Soviet policy. In the words of the French journalist and scholar Raymond Aron: "Should the Soviets ever recognize that their regime is only one of a number of possible ways of organizing industrial societies, the majority of democrats—while continuing to regard certain practices of the Soviet regime as deplorable, inefficient or inhuman—would no longer feel obliged to maintain an attitude of active hostility to the Soviet Union." [3]

China, with its ideological fanaticism, expansionist ambitions, and relentless hostility to the United States, poses a challenge of a different nature for American policy. It is to be hoped that in time, perhaps in 10 or 20 years, the Chinese Communist leaders, like the Russians before them, will become somewhat less fanatic and somewhat more realistic in their view of the world. When they do—if they do—it will be wise and desirable to try to build bridges between China and the West. In the meantime we can make it clear that they can have peaceful and even cordial relations with the West whenever they abandon their policies of aggression and subversion.

Until they do, however, our policy must be one of containing Chinese power just as we contained the power of Stalinist Russia. To put it another way, until China shows a far more cooperative disposition toward the free world, we shall have to base our policy on diplomatic, military and economic measures against Chinese Communist expansion, while withholding proposals for accommodation. Specifically, I think there is nothing to be gained at present either by according diplomatic recognition to Communist China or by acquiescing in its admission to the United Nations.

Wisely or not, we have withheld recognition and opposed the Chinese Communist admission to the United Nations for 15 years as expressions of our disapproval of their regime and its policies. Having withheld recognition as a mark of our disapproval, we cannot now accord it without having it taken as an expression of approval and acceptance. Since we do not and cannot approve of the present policies of the Chinese Communist regime, I do not think we should take a step which would convey the impression of approval, even though it should not have that effect. As to Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, I think we must expect it sooner or later, but if it occurs before Communist China alters its present policies, I would expect the American vote to be cast in opposition.

There is little to be pleased with in the current situation in the Far East and little to be optimistic about in the prospects of an aggressive Communist China arming itself with nuclear weapons. But, as George Kennan wrote recently, "we must not make the mistake of taking any of this as absolute and unchangeable. These, too, are only men. They once had mothers and childhood and affections. They are, today, what circumstances have made of them. It is circumstances which will determine what they, or their successors, will be in 10 or 20 years' time * * *. Neither these men in Peiping nor the regime over which they preside are immune to the laws of change that govern all human society, if only because no single generation, anywhere, ever sees things exactly the same as the generation that went 10 years before it." [4]

These, I believe, are some of the ways in which bridges can be built between East and West. The purpose of these bridges is to open channels of communication across the chasm of misunderstanding that divides the human community and to break through some of the prevailing myths of international relations, of which the most dangerous is the belief that different political philosophies cannot survive together in the same world, that sooner or later one must prevail over all others.

Just as the medieval Christians could not bear the existence of heretical sects and alien religions, the extreme ideologues of our time have persuaded themselves that life is intolerable unless it is governed everywhere by uniform standards and values. This view is held as a kind of revealed truth, certainly not as an inference from history, which, far from suggesting that there is anything "natural" about uniformity in political ideas, leads us to the conclusion that if there is any "law" of historical development, it is a law of infinite variety, especially in men's ideas about their own nature and their relations with other men.

The crusading spirit is not a characteristic of mature societies but of unstable and politically primitive societies. The mature nation, like the mature man, is sure of its values in a way that welcomes but does not require imitation by others. The mature nation, like the mature man, is more interested in solving problems than in proving theories, more interested in helping people to be happy than in forcing them to be virtuous, and at least as interested in hearing the ideas of others—and perhaps learning and benefiting from them—as in preaching and spreading its own ideas.

I do not know whether the ideological and national animosities of our own time will erode away in the decades and centuries ahead. I do believe, however, that the lessons of the past offer grounds for hope that they will, if only we will let them. What is called for is a sense of historical perspective in meeting the crises and tensions of the moment—a perspective from which we will perceive that the doctrines and the causes that arouse men to violence are transitory, that more often than not they fade into irrelevance with the erosion of time and circumstances. Only from such a perspective can we hope to build bridges that will stand—bridges that will bring a divided world together in a reawakened awareness of its common humanity, in a reawakened understanding that the common hopes, common interests and common dangers that unite men are far more important than the ideologies that divide them.

---

[3] Raymond Aron, "Coexistence: The End of Ideology," Partisan Review, spring 1958, p. 230.

[4] George F. Kennan, "A Fresh Look at Our China Policy," New York Times magazine, Nov. 22, 1964, p. 142.

THE OAHE IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, farmers in Brown and Spink Counties of South Dakota yesterday voted on establishment of irrigation districts in their counties under the Oahe irrigation project planned for my State. The vote was 5 to 1 in favor of proceeding with the project—an overwhelming approval on the part of those who will be directly affected.

The vote was 222 to 48 in favor of a district in Brown County and 330 to 79 in favor in Spink County.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the RECORD a short statement I have just made for news services in my State on the results.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGOVERN

The 5 to 1 vote in favor of the Brown and Spink County districts Oahe subconservancy district project is good news for all South Dakota. It is an endorsement of the most important economic project in the State's future. The directors of the district, and the voters, have my heartiest congratulations on the results.

I am especially pleased with the size of the majority. It will considerably improve our case for authorization of the Oahe project when it comes up in Congress. There can now be no question of overwhelming local approval. I am sure that as the benefits of the project become available, even those now hesitant about endorsing it will agree to its wisdom.

MEETING THE AUTOMATION CHALLENGE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, an article in the January 12 issue of Look magazine outlines why there is much hope that the country will successfully cope with the problems brought by automation.

The author, Look Senior Editor T. George Harris, describes how individuals and companies are reacting to automation.

"A mighty tide of human resources is rolling out to buck the challenge of automation," he says.

The article also serves to underline the need for the greatest possible understanding of automation if individuals are to make the best possible adjustment to its impact.

Although some companies and workers are dealing with automation effectively, there is still a lack of proposals to meet the problems it causes, the article points out.

In addition, misunderstanding about automation tends to produce a nail-biting reaction by some people which can cause obsession with unreal problems at the same time that real problems are at hand.

In order to achieve the broadest possible understanding of automation, and to encourage new approaches to meeting the impact of automation, I introduced a bill during the last Congress providing for a White House Conference on Automation.

This tested method of gathering information about a general problem, and generating understanding about it at the same time, is well suited to the automation problem, in my opinion. I plan to introduce, in the current session, a similar bill calling for a White House Conference on Automation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Look article entitled "Automation—We Can Handle It," be printed in the RECORD.

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

AUTOMATION: WE CAN HANDLE IT

Automation booted Romie G. Seals out of his job last year, but it couldn't knock him down. In his final week on the line at Lockheed's Van Nuys, Calif., plant, this 35-year-old metalworker took a smoke break to talk about men, machines, jobs. He knew the facts and what to do about them.

"You're competent today, and you're obsolete tomorrow," he said. "Our economy is changing. Automation's coming in. It would be stupid to try and stop it. We're living in a fast world. We've advanced 30 years' worth in 5 years."

So how can a man beat a machine, any more than the horse could beat the car? "It comes down," Seals answered, "to your ability to take in new information." He nodded at a technical manual. "I'm studying the hell out of titanium now."

He had become, he knew, an unknown part of a well-known statistic—one of another 38,000 men and women who every week lose their jobs because of automation. But he was also the living solution to that statistic. He was a man-sized sample of the guts and brains that carry most of the robot-bumped thousands on to better work. They, and their children, are racing the robots, and they are winning.

Seals felt pride. Just as an old-fashioned spike driver on the railroad had confidence in his muscles, this man had confidence in his brains. Born in St. Louis, a Negro, he had taken in enough information over the years to move up through aerospace metals to junior engineer, at $3.27 an hour plus fringes. His talent had never failed him. Then automation caught up with him by one of its convulsive twists inside the flexible structures of the economy. Computer-guided missiles, hundreds of them stored in silos and submarines, had automated the weapons of war and led to cuts in defense contracts. A big, efficient missile plant 500 miles away ran short of work and gobbled up the Van Nuys production of missile-tracking consoles. Seals, with gifted 11-year-old daughter Lynda in school, did not care to move.

So he studied instead, job hunted, made out fine 3 weeks later as an analytical chemist at a metal-plating shop. And 4 months after that, using his fresh titanium know-how, he was back with Lockheed in another plant at higher pay.

Today, Seals pushes his study further out ahead of his current job. It's a natural thing to do. In the aerospace industry, each big company runs an educational department that is really a private college hidden inside the factory. Seals is taking Lockheed's cryogenics course to find out what metals do at low temperatures out in space. Off the job, drawing the standard tuition subsidy from his company, he invests his private time toward a metallurgy bachelor of science at UCLA.

"You either stay on the merry-go-round, or you fall off," he says. "You have to look upon education as a permanent profession."

Most articles and books on automation tell only about the helpless victims, and imply that we are all on the way to futility in 38,000-a-week batches. This fearful notion oozes around us. In months of research on automation application and theory, spliced into 10 years of reporting here and abroad, I have often shared the dread of landslide unemployment. Yet it is a rank superstition that any competent economist can disprove.

You can't really shake it, though, until you go into many U.S. plants and offices to watch able men and women take on ever-new work as if they had done it all their lives. Only when you know that most of them are winning, and how, do you see the real reason why something can and must be done for those not yet equipped to win. Otherwise, they and their children will be left behind in a permanent submachine caste.

A worker like Romie Seals may seem an exception to any rule, even for a futuristic industry. Hogwash. Look around you. The work force is not amass of inert, uneducated wage slaves clumping in and out of iron factory gates to earn last week's groceries. The full-time U.S. worker belongs to a force such as history has not seen before. He has an average family income of $7,458, has savings stashed away in his owned home, and can rely upon unemployment compensation to help bridge him over to another job. Car-mobile and competent, he belongs to an army of talent that strengthens itself on each struggle.

Do you know the American worker's education level? Among the 71 million men and women who work for pay—counting coal miners and sharecroppers, too—the average formal education is that of a college freshman. One day, we'll be a nation of salaried sophomores. Compared to my generation, who went to work at war's end, the new job applicant has 40 percent more, and better, schooling. A mighty tide of human resources is rolling out to buck the challenge of automation.

The function of education is specific, and it is essential to the fast changes of an automated economy. The studied capacity to take in new information provides that newly essential skill—skill at changing skills. "We've got to hire men who can move," says one shop-trained personnel expert, "from one specialty to another."

The strains of constant change test the older workers more than the young. A veteran machinist at Lockheed had to hunt longer than most for new work. "It's worse than being a cherry picker," he said. To understand the plight of these men, we need to know the basic workings of automation.

LITTLE BLACK BOXES START IT ALL

What is it? As a tool for more efficient production, it is but the latest item in the inventory of technological improvements since the hoe. The term automation was coined in the fifties to describe new factory equipment fitted with electronic controls. In their little black boxes, the controls feed back information from electronic sensors that, like a machinist's fingers and eyes, check the work and make it right. Next, bigger black boxes were built to supervise the little ones. Some of the biggest boxes, even full-sized digital computers, now slave on line night and day to run continuous-production plants that spew out chemicals, synthetic textiles, oil products and metals. These fully automated factories don't even leave many buttons for a man's thumb to push.

Going further, Chrysler, American Airlines and other firms operate networks of black boxes that pick up information input from many distant places. Swapping facts with each other, checking infallible memory banks, the robot nets can help men run vast production and distribution systems at high efficiency, low labor cost. The electrons cut into paperwork that, ever rising, would otherwise choke the phone company, big banks and other giant organizations. The robot nets handle your airline reservations and grab your checks by their squatty little numbers.

In short, automation produces more for less. One result: A transcontinental phone call that once cost $16.50 now costs $1. A refrigerator that cost the average worker 178 hours of pay in 1949 now costs him only 76.

Some of our 20,000 computers do a variety of nonproduction chores to speed up economic and technical advance. The research lab computer organizes information, points to new theories and products. Business computers keep track of consumer goods inventories well enough to reduce the erratic surges and cuts that once made postwar recessions so drastic. Government computers spot overall economic trends in "real time" (jargon for "fast enough to act upon"), so that public and private decisions can keep production high and steady.

If you add all such activities to your broad definition of automation, you end up talking about most of the causes behind the technological revolution now shaking sizable sections of U.S. industry. You might as well take them in a bundle. These causes combine to bring constant changes in many kinds of jobs. Nor is the shuffle apt to stop. We are in the era of radical change.

General Electric Co., wired in with new technology, trains executives to expect the incredible in everyday business. They are not disappointed. One of their products is a monster robot that walks like a man. In a routine training film, "The Winds of Change," GE compares the forces at work in our society with a Florida hurricane.

Some thinkers panic. They fear that electronic "brains" will outsmart men. Relax. From recent brain research, we know that any computer's "synthetic intelligence" is crude stuff beside the poetic waves now dancing in your skull.

The real problems arise from changes so ordinary we hardly notice. For instance, take the rise of the working woman. That girl, by sheer weight of numbers, has become the most important new labor factor of the automation era. Why? Prepared foods and squads of electronic domestics—at-home technology—have freed our wives from centuries of menial duty. Leaving stove and broom, the girls have been flinging themselves upon the general labor market in such numbers as to take over three out of every five new jobs.

They are job jumping from kitchen to office. Though most become perpetual privates in the white-collar ranks, their work makes the electronic era possible. Without our 25 million skirted nine-to-fivers, we would now suffer from an acute labor shortage, not unemployment. With them, about half of the U.S. families benefit from a second cake-winner and have more to invest in the home's main product—the educated child.

It is such ordinary, taken-for-granted actions, repeated in the lives of millions, that add up to the radical changes in our way of work and life.

Companies, unions, and workers have built new labor relations devices to stablize themselves in a shifting world. Labor expert A. H. Raskin points out the labor contract trend inspired by automation: Management is moving toward an effective promise to insure many a worker a lifetime job. But it may not be the same job for life. Companies provide the worker with job security in return for the right to change ancient work rules, and management ends up with a profit incentive to develop the employee's potential for job jumping.

How? The answer is hidden in a secret affair between business and education. Old-line companies, from Southern Pacific Railroad to Procter & Gamble, use a heady variety of programs, from Harvard School of Business scholarships to training films, to home employee talent. The habit spreads. Campbell Soup runs an in-plant high school. President W. B. Murphy even promotes his soups by operating a management school, free of charge and free of plugs, for supermarket clerks.

The total business involvement in learning, ever greater but little noted, is hard to estimate. One reason: Hardnosed executives don't know how to explain serious investment in the economy's most important resource, the able worker. But every year, about 8 percent of all major company employees go into formal job training.

Sign of the times: At many a factory gate, you see men come early to work with lunchbox in one hand, textbook in the other.

Most have figured out the double meaning of automation. On an existing job, it cuts the number of workers and often lowers the skills required. It's easy to punch a button, but many workers have to move on. Shock waves of change set off by big new tools force dozens of job jumps and a general upping of the demand for noggin skills.

This trend has a built-in accelerator. The closer you get to the technology of the future, the more clearly you see how it demands more, not less, from men. For this reason, the aerospace industry, daily dependent on new know-how, previews the shape of things to come in other industries. At North American Aviation, the firm that will put a scientist on the moon, President J. L. Atwood heads an institution of higher learning. One plant looks like a corporate campus laid out around a modern cloister. Well, shades of Oxford, that's what it is. Inside the missile shops, 102,000 employees last year took 1,154,000 hours of study, and in 2 recent years, 3,000 blue-collar students rose to white-collar ranks.

There's more. Like a sensible corporation in any industry, North American pays tuition costs for employee study in the many colleges of California's educated economy. Last year, 9,500 of its working scholars completed 14,000 courses, won 171 bachelor's degrees, 91 master's and 13 Ph. D.'s. Old-style vocational courses give way to something more practical—general education.

As automation snowballs, so does education. The more you have, the more you get. You build it up in a working career. Columbia University's Jacob Mincer measured the Nation's annual investment in further education of men and women on the job. He found the outlay on the college-bred worker about as high as the national expenditure each year on the next crop still sprouting on the campus. His research indicated that, in spite of Government and business subsidies, the workers themselves shoulder the main cost of study, largely through deferment of the pay they would otherwise earn on study time.

They get it back later, with dividends. University of Chicago economists have started the systematic study of "human capital," which they define as the health, knowledge and mobility of workers. Our haphazard investment in ourselves, it turns out, now returns a better profit than Wall Street's calculated investment in production machines—and does more to aid the economy's growth.

The present stage of technology puts a premium on the improvement of human resources. That's why the distribution of knowledge has become American capitalism's only basic industry. Public and private, it now accounts for 33 percent of the gross national product.

Ralph Helstein, poetry-quoting union chief, fears automation, but sees its promise. "In the thirties, we thought it would be enough to change material conditions," he says. "Now, we know we were wrong. The work of the next generation is to find out what it means to be a human being."

UNREAL FEAR, REAL NEED

Harvard labor economist John Dunlop, expert on industry's jerry-built teaching system, believes, that it must expand fast to meet the needs. In testimony before Senator JOSEPH CLARK's Subcommittee on the Manpower Revolution, Dunlop urged practical moves to inspire "vastly greater dedication by private groups and individuals."

But when I asked for specific proposals, he had surprisingly few to offer. Searching for some, IBM has put up $5 million for study of what automation does to people. Research may overcome the intellectual community's fear of machines. "We're scaring ourselves to death," said economist Clark Kerr after he read one nail-biting forecast. "If we become obsessed with the unreal problems, we can't respond to the real ones."

The real problems come in three shapes, all forbidding. But not one of the three comes without a proven answer that can, with enough effort, be made to fit. Let's list them, then take each in turn:

1. The problem of full employment. The economy has to be healthy to grow jobs faster than machines can cut them down. Right now, it also has to produce an annual bonus of job opportunities to make room for the first litter of postwar babies. They are coming of age to go to college or hunt work in half again the previous numbers. "We will see if the economy can reproduce jobs," says population expert Phil Hauser, "as fast as people reproduced people after the war."

2. The problem of structural unemployment. As automation strikes some workers, but opens up jobs for others, we have able-bodied men without work—and work to be done that they don't know how to do. The basic answer lies in job-jumping education, and in reasonable protection for the worker who can't jump. Unions, business, Government, and independent institutions can put out a stronger hand to help struggling individuals.

3. The special problem of the hard core, and the school dropouts forever recruited into it. Long-term unemployment is coming down, but young people are still being added to the hard core. High schools have sharply raised standards to train their graduates for the new world of work. However, many slum kids, lacking the family resources of the middle-class work force, don't have what it now takes. Result: In our recent years of prosperity, teenage unemployment has hung high near 15 percent—30 for Negro youth—though it has lately turned down. So far, only local communities have found answers big enough—locally—to clean up the Nation's worst scandal.

The three problems are stated above in the standard terms used by both businessmen and Government officials. These two groups of leaders, reaching a rare concensus, now share a resolve to expand economic opportunity and to help would-be workers take advantage of it. Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz talks of the determination he finds among businessmen and in community organizations. "If we can identify the nature of the poverty situation," he says, "we've got a lot of allies."

The agreement on principle began to shape up in 1963 when the late President Kennedy confronted the automation crisis. Labor leaders and some Labor Department officials believed that industry's efficient new machines had changed all the economic rules. Business expansion, they argued, would only bring on more automation, speed up the job-kill. Kennedy rejected this dogma. In proposing the tax cut, he bet that more automation would expand the private economy fast enough to create more jobs than would be killed.

He was right. The tax cut, passed after his death, shifted the U.S. system into high. In the past year, it created 1.4 million more jobs than it lost. The gross unemployment rate, which had hit 6.7 percent in 1961, backed down toward 5 percent. In boom areas, business now recruits and trains workers once marked "unemployable."

More tax cuts will follow. To make room for more people, the economy of the sixties has to grow jobs half again as fast (17.2-percent rise) as it did in the recession-racked fifties (12.9 percent).

As the country got moving again last year, it left behind the rumble of talk about landslide unemployment. It was always a rumble without a cause. If all the new technology coming into use were about to make people obsolete, this danger would show on a simple economic indicator. The labor-productivity index compares our total output with the hours of human labor that produce it. That index has long been rising, about 2.6 percent a year, because of our ever-better tools and skills. In the recent automation surge, the index has risen about 3.5 percent a year, not enough to justify anybody's fear that the machines are taking over. We can continue to absorb the annual increase by consuming more, working less.

THE SINS OF THE PAST

So the tax cut proved that Government has the fiscal and monetary tools to keep total employment high in the automation era. But the second big problem, structural unemployment, needs to be worked on in a thousand ways—and has been.

The most painful blows have hit specific groups of workers in traditional industries: coal, steel, meatpacking and docking. Years ago, in these citadels of early industrialism, the muckrakers found men and women exploited in degrading indignity. Unions sprang up to fight for better pay and conditions. But the work hardly changed enough to exercise a man's better talents, or to equip him for moves into new fields.

Today, automation helps wipe out the man-ruining jobs of old, but it also strikes a blow at men left helpless in them. The social evils of the past deepen the troubles of the present. Only 111,000 now go down into the soft-coal pits. Machines go. But no decent society can ignore the aging exminers left beside Appalachia's idle tipples.

The big unions have been in the middle of battles to protect their members. On their bargaining table, automation has been the only serious issue for years, and it drove them to slugfest strikes in steel, rails, newspapers. In the quiet periods between strikes, however, unions and companies have upheld the U.S. tradition of trying anything that works. Examples:

The west coast's longshoremen swapped the featherbeds on the dock for "a bite out of the machine": a well-financed guarantee that they will retire in dignity on automation profits. Kaiser steelworkers won protection from automation layoff and downgrading, plus instant slices out of future economies. Meatpacking unions at Armour & Co., about to walk out over automation plant closings, settled for a fund to develop techniques for aiding layoffs into new work.

The Armour fund's social workers learned from failure the urgent need for new approaches. In an Oklahoma City shutdown, they could do little for laid-off butchers, many of them Negroes with no other skill. But by the time a Fort Worth abattoir closed, the researchers had come up with ways to retrain and place almost any worker who had the confidence to try something new. Fund researchers now can cultivate an all-important "sense of mobility" in the low-skill employee if they can get to him before the shock of layoff knocks him flat.

Bernard Haldane, reemployment expert for several companies and New Jersey's State employment service, uses depth interviews to dig out forgotten talents, turn them into new careers. The new economy demands reinvestment in people.

Hundreds of managements, pushed by unions or fearing low morale, have perfected an ever-wider range of protections: supplemental unemployment compensation (in one-third of all labor contracts), attrition-only reductions, work spreading, early retirement, paid-for moves, subsidized education. Alert personnel men shifted their departments into reverse gear: Instead of hiring, they placed their layoffs in job-growth industries.

Arthur W. Brown of Standard Oil (New Jersey) summed up the new goal for automation-hit industries. "The challenge employers face," he said, "is to develop * * * a program which will provide the work force with a stairway to other work, instead of a back door to retirement."

Isolated company and union actions may sound like pathetic gestures, too feeble to matter. That is only because it is hard to add up the sum of many different accomplishments. University of California's Robert Aaron Gordon tried. By a close check on unemployment records in all industries, he proved that experienced blue-collar workers withstood the 1959–62 unemployment surge better than previously believed. Though hurt, they actually closed part of the job-security gap between themselves and the white collars. What the figures mean: The private management-labor policies have created a huge, flexible program that protects millions from sudden damage, and helps others into new work or the first stages of retirement.

Pittsburgh steelworker William H. Kerfoot, 58, was one of the first to try out his industry's new long-vacation scheme—13 weeks every 5 years. Look Senior Editor David Maxey spent a restful week with "Murphy" Kerfoot to see how he liked leisure. Mainly, Maxey and Murphy whiled away the days at the Dravosburg volunteer fire department, which doubles as a refreshment and pinochle department. "I'll tell you the truth," Murphy soon said, "I'm ready to go back to work now. You work 40 years, you sort of get in the habit.

"The best advice I could give anybody going into the mill is: Don't, unless you've got a good education," he said. "With automation, there'll be good jobs for technicians, but that's about it."

Why? The total number of factory blue-collar jobs, with lower demands for education, has not declined, no matter what you hear. Amid structural shifts, this total has fluctuated around 12 million for 15 years. However, by failing to grow with the population, the blue-collar regiment has taken a relative decline, until it now includes only 19 percent of all workers. The high school dropout's difficulty: He's part of a bigger nation, but able to work only in trades that have not grown.

Automation has built an ironic twist into the cliche about the factory worker's son who goes to college. That dream has become a necessity. Those who used to be bosses and boss-helpers—the technicians, managers, and clerks—are now the working majority. Since 1956, more than half the employed have been wearing white collars. If you can't fit into one, you can't go where the action is.

IRREGULARS VERSUS ROBOTS

The plight of the young inspired the Federal poverty program. Basically a package of education projects, it will train a few hundred thousand people stuck in the hard core. But the program's best effect, already visible, will be to provoke private and independent groups to action.

Everywhere you go now, the work is getting underway, often by expansion of earlier efforts. Labor unions, long suspicious of the formal education kick, have begun to try it. The United Auto Workers teach design molding to ex-mechanics. Out in southern California, a machinists union local even cultivates highbrow aspirations in union-hall classes. Textbook title: "Oedipus—Myth and Complex." Those same machinists run courses on tape-controlled tools. Their electronics branch put education on the bargaining table. Its members demand a new kind of 40-hour week: 32 hours of work, 8 hours of company-taught courses. The 32–8 demand would sound silly if many members were not already spending hours in such courses.

Unlikely volunteers, even the League of Women Voters, are on the prowl for solutions to employment problems. Behold, the Junior League dips its manicured nails into this grimy chore. In Indianapolis, the debutantes seek out money-short Negro mothers, uniform them, coach them, find them jobs as maids. Partly because the pretty girls are at it, the business leaders of the city are organizing a total attack upon poverty. With unemployment down to 2.3 percent there, these men believe they can do something for most of the 5,000 souls left in the local hard core.

The civil-rights movement has turned decisively from marching to teaching. The Urban League, now four times its 1961 size, has aided more Negroes into good jobs than all Federal training programs put together, CORE, the courageous sit-in force, has turned to the tougher task of improving the skill and confidence of job applicants. Alongside CORE comes none other than the National Association of Manufacturers with its own $5 million war on poverty. NAM expects, among other stratagems, to make industry less finicky about formal education requirements.

The whole ragtaggle machinery of U.S. institutions—government, independent, private—now throws its weight against what looked not long ago like a job too big to try. As fast as a new group discovers that automation unemployment is not a form of incurable cancer, things begin to happen.

Will the robots defeat this army of irregulars? The doomsday school says yes, definitely. Robert Theobald, author of "The Challenge of Abundance," has transformed automation fear into a political movement of ad hoc intellectuals. He warns that the robots will soon crank out a terrible overabundance of consumer goods and wipe out wage-paying jobs. If so, capitalism is kaput.

The one salvation, in Theobald's bold theory, is to break the old-fashioned connection between work and income. How? By automatic Government "wages" to nonworkers. A crusader with a flashing eye and fervent voice, Theobald does not believe, as I do, that his scheme would freeze the human problem where it is—instead of developing each man's talent by its economic use.

The theory of overabundance cannot be tested in a real, still-hungry world. For a working model, you have to go to science-fiction writers. In Frederik Pohl's "The Case Against Tomorrow," millions of reproducing robots distribute a surfeit of all the food and luxuries yet dreamed of. To keep demand up, the lowest human classes, guaranteed the highest income, are forced to consume piles of steak, sports goods, martinis. Work is related to income, but inversely. Pohl's land of ultimate abundance is an upside-down utopia where scarcity runs scarce and cornucopia turns into carcinoma.

The story's clarity spotlights the flaw in the overabundance theory. Material resources, even robots, are by nature finite; man's wants, given a little practice, are infinite. This nation, if it never does anything else, has proved that everyman's animal hunger for food, clothing and shelter is but the down payment on the civilized appetite.

We don't yet know many of the new goods automation will offer. Right now, we have an almost unlimited appetite for better education. Computers and video tapes can relieve teachers of rote work, let them search out each pupils' gifts. The whole education business, organized like an old-fashioned factory, will have to transform itself to meet the specific new needs of young and old.

We don't even know what automation's deeper dangers will be. At the dawn of this new age, we are like the average American in the early 1900's. He had heard about Ford's auto and the Wright boys' flying gadget. He could grasp a mechanical feat like the horseless carriage on a racetrack. If he happened to be a blacksmith, he could worry about his horseshoe trade. But he was blind to the dimensions of horror, and hope, about to drive and fly upon him. He never dreamed of bombers over London, the three-car family, or tourist jets to Florence. If he could not imagine a smogbound Los Angeles freeway at rush hour, he never suspected that his family would take off from the old hometown in mobile, one-generation units.

We can now see, looking backward, that the car and the airplane did more than replace the horse and the train. Yet both of these inventions had limited use. They were transportation. By comparison, the electronic-control device is already a family of instruments—from automated plants to research computers—and capable of broader, deeper imprint upon the family of man. The steam engine, which set off the first industrial revolution, is far less revolutionary than the computer, which has launched the second.

Such a powerful, all-purpose tool properly compels concern. "If America does not handle the second industrial revolution any better than England handled the first, then the West—and the world—will suffer for years to come," says Sir Leon Bagrit, an Englishman among the elite designers of advanced control systems.

History haunts him. He recalls how 18th-century businessmen in his country, eager for steampower profits, sent 10-year-old children into the coalpits and sweatshops. Their descendants still suffer the scars of that cruelty, which generated a reaction called Marxism. Sir Leon fears that modern business will, in ruthless use of its brave new tools, bring on forced idleness for millions and a whole new variety of inhumanities.

Beyond this tangible danger, which we can handle if we will, lies a prospect so startling that it shocks, and lifts, the soul. The system that we are shaping, and that is shaping us, does more than pile up an abundance of goods. We seem to be driving ourselves, at electron speed, toward a society in which robots are the slaves and man works at the difficult arts of civilization. If so, America may at last build what it promised itself 178 years ago: a nation in which each sovereign citizen pursues to the limit his human potential.

MORRIS E. JACOBS—KNIGHT OF ST. GREGORY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the highest Catholic award ever given to a person of the Jewish faith, the Papal Honor of Knight of St. Gregory, has been conferred on one of Omaha's outstanding civic leaders and philanthropists, Mr. Morris E. Jacobs.

The career of Mr. Jacobs, who rose from a newsboy on the streets of Omaha to the presidency of a nationwide advertising firm, would be remarkable from any standpoint.

To him, the word "interfaith" is more than a term; it is a way of life. He is associated chairman of the American Jewish Fund-Raising Campaign and a member of the National Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee. He is a trustee of the American Fund for Israel Institutions.

And at the same time, Mr. President, he is a member of the board of regents of Creighton University in Omaha and has served as general chairman of that Catholic institution's multimillion-dollar fundraising campaign. He is also a member of the Board of Lay Trustees of St. Joseph's College in Indiana.

He has long been one of the most ardent supporters of Boys Town and it was he who suggested the name for this world-famous institution which has been known as Father Flanagan's Home for Boys. He played a leading role in raising funds for a Catholic school adjacent to the Capehart Housing at Offutt Air Force Base, headquarters of the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. Jacobs has served in virtually every important civic activity in Omaha, bringing to the task boundless energy, great creativity and unquenchable enthusiasm. He is an active member of the board of Clarkson Hospital in Omaha, supported by the Episcopal Church, and he serves as an officer of the Young Men's Christian Association.

In 1952, Mr. Jacobs was the leader in the statewide campaign for an amendment to Nebraska's constitution to establish a State board of education and was elected as one of the first members of the board.

At the national level, he serves on the board of governors of the United Services Organization, Inc.—the USO—and he is a director for the Board of Fundamental Education and a member of the National Committee for the Support of Public Schools. He was general chairman of the 50th anniversary celebration for the Missouri School of Journalism.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to call to the attention of the Senate, this account of one man's dedication to the cause of helping others, a dedication that leaps the barriers of race and religion and serves as an inspiration to all of us.

INAUGURATION OF GOV. ROBERTO SÁNCHEZ OF PUERTO RICO—TRIBUTE TO OUTGOING GOV. LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I had the honor to attend the inauguration of the new Governor of Puerto Rico last Saturday. He is a distinguished man who, I am sure, will make a great leader of that Commonwealth.

The outgoing Governor, Luis Muñoz Marín, who was Governor for 16 years—in fact, ever since Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth—is one of the great men of this era. His leadership has contributed to stable, independent, progressive government; a leadership I may add, which is rare throughout the world. There is a scarcity of such talent and character as those embodied by Governor Marín.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks an editorial entitled "It's Just Beginning To Sink In," published in the San Juan Star of Sunday, January 3, 1965.

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

IT'S JUST BEGINNING TO SINK IN

Luis Muñoz Marín is no longer the Governor of Puerto Rico. It will take some getting used to for those of us who were privileged to observe from a relatively intimate vantage point the public life of this unusual man. When he walked out of La Fortaleza one day last week in his shirtsleeves, without previous announcement that his official duties as Governor were ended, he left behind a legacy of human betterment of incalculable worth in the aggregate of its influence here and elsewhere. This was a rare man indeed who was stepping down from the highest office that his people could grant, after 24 years of leadership that transformed an island beggared by adversity and weighed down by self-pity and hopelessness into a society of hope and vigor and confidence and attainment. It was this uncommon man who voluntarily stepped down, relinquishing the power and authority of his high office to a younger man when he felt he had taught his people how an elected Governor should act, and now wished to set an example of how a former Governor should act. The lessons in democracy which he taught by his example as Governor were many and fundamental to the democratic way of life. We found on many occasions that he deserved criticism, in our opinion, and on others that he earned public praise. We were often wrong, but he never quibbled or used his position to strike back, to belittle, or to denounce. It was the nature of the man and a tribute to his position as he saw it to let the nature of fact and fiction strike its own balance which, he knew, it would in time. To a group at La Fortaleza one night he explained it this way, when asked why this writer criticized his administration so often. "He does criticize me more often than any other newspaperman in Puerto Rico, and sometimes he's mistaken. But he also praises me more often than any other newspaperman in Puerto Rico, and he doesn't know how often he's mistaken." For us that quote always epitomized the mature statesman who understood the responsibility of public office in a democracy and the role of the press in a free society to serve as the link between the people and those they entrust with the management of their business.

When the only elected Governor in 16 years leaves office it is natural that his name and the governorship become synonymous to many people. Every citizen of 30 was only 14 when Muñoz Marín became Governor for the first time, and, obviously, those who are younger today have even less reason to associate the word "governor" with any other name than "Muñoz." It would not surprise us if many youngsters for awhile will think of Gov. Roberto Sánchez as "the new Muñoz." That he cannot be and we know he is realistic enough not to pretend to be another Muñoz, for one century rarely produces two of that kind. Governor Sánchez will, we feel confident, make his own mark with his own personal traits and capacities, and be his own man. None should expect him to be anything else, certainly not a Muñoz Marín. The characteristics of a Muñoz Marín are as extraordinary as they are unlimited in their scope to fit the need of the moment. We recall his pacing the living room of his Mayflower Hotel suite the night before he was to testify before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in Washington on the bill to authorize the people of Puerto Rico to draft and adopt their own constitution, and to later accept or reject a congressional act which established the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States which we call commonwealth. We asked him questions which we believed the committee would ask. One was, "what are you going to call this new political concept?" He replied, a "commonwealth." And added, "Estado Libre Asociado in Spanish." But why not "Associated Free State" in English, we asked, "because it translates into that?" "They (the committee) may not understand that," he said. "They may see a connotation of something

like the Irish Free State." And, with finality, he said: "They will understand 'commonwealth.'" And so they did the next morning, with nods of approval from the Senators at the hearing table, and understanding. So we are a commonwealth. Since then, we asked ourselves many times what might have happened had this statesman not thought out every angle in detail.

We have watched this man walk into the office of the President of the United States several times and come out with far-reaching changes in national policy toward Puerto Rico which, at the moment, seemed less than transcendental but with time became part of the ever-changing relationship that has evolved into the present and still developing scheme of association. At times a White House visit would appear to be nothing more than a casual paying of respects, until one day, shortly after, there would come an Executive order from the White House to all departments of the Federal Government and then it would dawn on us that Muñoz had been there and that what he had talked to us about earlier as a possibility some day had come to pass. It was the same with Members of Congress, chairmen of committees, and individual Senators. Muñoz would "drop in" to say hello, nothing more. But a seed would be planted, a thought expressed, a little enlightenment provided, and we knew that we could anticipate the falling into place of the pieces that would make up the whole, a bill already drafted which would be introduced later when the atmosphere was likely to be receptive and "understanding" relatively widespread where it counted most.

We have seen Muñoz as the genial host to Congressmen visiting La Fortaleza or at Trujillo Alto for a "social evening," not 1 minute of which would be wasted. And then we would ride back to the hotel with the Congressmen, often Republicans, who would start pumping us on "what we can do for Puerto Rico," and suggesting something that had sneaked into their consciousness from somewhere which, to them, at times seemed to be brilliant ideas that just naturally came to mind. But we knew from whence they sprang for, we too, the press, found ourselves putting down words we thought original until it occurred to us that once more the master persuader had planted conviction where doubt had dwelt before.

Puerto Rico will never have another Muñoz Marín, nor will it know fully what he has meant to every living man, woman, and child of this island, or to those still unborn. None can know such a thing for it is beyond the available methods of assessing a man's contributions to his fellowmen. For him, we know his rewards surround him on every side, in every lighted home that was once a hovel, in every child whose belly is no longer bloated from hunger, in every smiling face of healthier children, and in the surge of hope that permeates a once deadened atmosphere. We wish him Godspeed in retirement and many years of fruitful happiness in the manner of his choosing and a heartfelt thank you, Don Luis.

WILLIAM J. DORVILLIER,
Editor-Publisher.

ORDER FOR JOINT SESSION TODAY WITH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess at 12:45 p.m. today, subject to the call of the Chair, and proceed as a body to the Chamber of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSIONS OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Pursuant to the previous order, at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes, the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of attending a joint session for the count of electoral votes.

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

RESULTS OF COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and myself, as tellers on the part of the Senate, and Representatives BURLESON and CORBETT, as tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, I report the results of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning January 20, 1965, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

The undersigned, B. EVERETT JORDAN and CARL T. CURTIS, tellers on the part of the Senate, OMAR BURLESON and ROBERT J. CORBETT, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1965.

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President		For Vice President	
		Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas	Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona	Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota	William E. Miller, of New York
Alabama	10		10		10
Alaska	3	3		3	
Arizona	5		5		5
Arkansas	6	6		6	
California	40	40		40	
Colorado	6	6		6	
Connecticut	8	8		8	
Delaware	3	3		3	
District of Columbia	3	3		3	
Florida	14	14		14	
Georgia	12		12		12
Hawaii	4	4		4	
Idaho	4	4		4	
Illinois	26	26		26	
Indiana	13	13		13	
Iowa	9	9		9	
Kansas	7	7		7	
Kentucky	9	9		9	
Louisiana	10		10		10
Maine	4	4		4	
Maryland	10	10		10	
Massachusetts	14	14		14	
Michigan	21	21		21	
Minnesota	10	10		10	
Mississippi	7		7		7
Missouri	12	12		12	
Montana	4	4		4	
Nebraska	5	5		5	
Nevada	3	3		3	
New Hampshire	4	4		4	
New Jersey	17	17		17	
New Mexico	4	4		4	
New York	43	43		43	
North Carolina	13	13		13	
North Dakota	4	4		4	
Ohio	26	26		26	
Oklahoma	8	8		8	
Oregon	6	6		6	
Pennsylvania	29	29		29	
Rhode Island	4	4		4	
South Carolina	8		8		8
South Dakota	4	4		4	
Tennessee	11	11		11	
Texas	25	25		25	
Utah	4	4		4	
Vermont	3	3		3	
Virginia	12	12		12	
Washington	9	9		9	
West Virginia	7	7		7	
Wisconsin	12	12		12	
Wyoming	3	3		3	
Total	538	486	52	486	52

B. EVERETT JORDAN,
CARL CURTIS,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.

OMAR BURLESON,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

Lyndon B. Johnson, of the State of Texas, has received for President of the United States 486 votes;

Barry M. Goldwater, of the State of Arizona, has received 52 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

Hubert H. Humphrey, of the State of Minnesota, has received for Vice President of the United States 486 votes;

William E. Miller, of the State of New York, has received 52 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January, 1965, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the morning hour tomorrow, on the convening of the Senate, during which time bills may be introduced, resolutions submitted, and other routine business transacted, statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on December 28 a comprehensive article written by the well-known, able, and accurate reporter, Mr. John D. Pomfret, was published in the New York Times. The article was an analysis of the action of the various States dealing with the question of reapportionment.

Mr. Pomfret very properly summarized this analysis by saying that the States were accepting the Court's decision on apportionment, that the populous areas of the Nation, and particularly the suburbs, were gaining in the legislatures. He summarized this by stating:

> Perhaps the most noteworthy fact about what has happened since the Court's decision of June 15 is the sheer volume of activity. It indicates that most States are prone to accept eventual compliance as inevitable despite efforts currently being made to upset the decision by a constitutional amendment.

This summary is particularly important in view of the proposed constitutional amendment that was introduced in the Senate this morning by my junior colleague, the distinguished minority leader Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

I believe this analysis, covering all 50 States of the Union, or, rather, covering the developments over the country, should be studied by the Members of this body, and by the general public. I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the New York Times of Monday, December 28, 1964, by John D. Pomfret, entitled "States Accepting Court's Decision on Apportioning," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATES ACCEPTING COURT'S DECISION ON APPORTIONING—POPULOUS AREAS OF NATION, PARTICULARLY THE SUBURBS, GAIN IN LEGISLATURES—RURAL POWER DECLINING—PLANS FOR REDRAWING LINES OFTEN STIR DISPUTE—EFFECT ON PARTIES UNCERTAIN

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 26.—It has been a scant 6 months since the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 6-to-3 decision, laid down its historic rule that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of population.

But the one-man, one-vote ruling, as it has come to be called, has already had a broad impact across the country. Its ultimate consequences on State politics and policies are yet to be fully measured.

Perhaps the most noteworthy fact about what has happened since the Court's decision of June 15 is the sheer volume of activity. It indicates that most States are prone to accept eventual compliance as inevitable despite efforts currently being made to upset the decision by a constitutional amendment.

TENNESSEE CASE FIRST

Some of the activity occurred after the Supreme Court's first historic decision in the reapportionment area, on March 26, 1962. In a Tennessee case known as *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Court ruled that the Federal courts were free to examine the constitutionality of State legislative districts. Previously the Court had taken the view that it would not enter the political thicket of districting.

The Court did not give any hint in *Baker* v. *Carr* of what standards should be used to determine whether State legislative districts were constitutional.

More particularly, it did not rule on the constitutionality of the so-called Federal system under which many States apportioned one house on the basis of population and the other on geographic standards, just as, in Congress, the House of Representatives is apportioned by population and the Senate is apportioned on the basis of two Senators for each State.

Cases to clear up the question were quick to develop, however. And in its decision of last June 15, written by Chief Justice Earl Warren, the Court found inequities in districts in six States—Alabama, New York, Colorado, Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware. The Federal system in the States was swept aside by the decree that in both houses of State legislatures the districts must be substantially equal in population.

THE SITUATION TODAY

A survey by New York Times correspondents discloses this current situation:

In four States reasonable compliance has been achieved by the legislatures without litigation, or is expected to be achieved soon.

In six, reasonable compliance has been achieved by the legislatures in the face of a suit or a court order.

In one, action has been taken with respect to one house and a suit is pending with respect to the other.

In three, State or Federal courts have carried out the reapportionment.

In two, action has been taken by the legislatures but is being challenged in court as inequitable.

In two, there has been no action and no suits, but action is in the making.

In 18, legislatures are meeting or soon will meet under court orders to reapportion.

In four, there has been no action, but suits have been filed to force reapportionment.

In two, court action is being threatened to force reapportionment.

In eight, court action has either been inconclusive or no suits have been filed, and there appears to be a disposition to resist action. Six of these States are in the South.

THE CONVENTION PLAN

The plan to upset the Supreme Court's ruling involves an effort to invoke for the first time a constitutional clause that directs Congress to call a constitutional convention upon petition by two-thirds of the State legislatures.

To date, 16 of the required 34 State legislatures have petitioned Congress for a constitutional convention the purpose of which would be to adopt an amendment allowing one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

Advocates of the one-man, one-vote doctrine consider it extremely unlikely that petitions from 18 additional legislatures can be obtained. But they are fearful that a blitz is being planned by advocates of the so-called Federal system.

The blitz would be staged in the opening days of 1965 sessions of many legislatures and would be designed to win approval of the petition before new legislators, many of them Democrats carried in by the Johnson landslide, acquired the parliamentary acumen to block it.

Time, however, appears to be on the side of those who favor the one-man, one-vote rule. Despite widespread opposition to the Supreme Court's ruling, its supporters believe that many legislatures that have acted, or have firm plans to act, would be reluctant to undo what they have accomplished after so much study and haggling.

THE BIG ISSUE

Indeed, reports from Times correspondents indicate that the big issue now is most often how reapportionment shall be accomplished, not whether it will be. The arguments are over the location of boundary lines, not over whether the number of people inside them should be nearly equal. And the air is full of partisan political cries of gerrymandering.

In some States, planned or accomplished reapportionment has worked to the advantage of the Republicans. Any precise assessment of the political effects in party terms is made well-nigh impossible by the dimensions of the Johnson landslide, which brought Democrats victory in many districts that in more normal elections would almost surely go to Republicans.

One thing is axiomatic, however, and was noted by almost all the correspondents. This is that reapportionment is giving the more populous areas a bigger voice in State legislatures. Often, however, the chief beneficiaries are not the central cities but the fast-growing suburbs.

Since these are frequently Republican in complexion, reapportionment in many instances appears to be a matter of taking away rural Republican votes in the legislature and adding suburban Republican votes.

THE FUTURE

But even where this is the net result, the shift away from rural domination, which has characterized most State legislatures for years, to a bigger voice for the cities or their suburbs, may significantly shape State policies into the indefinite future.

Although there has not yet been enough legislative experience to warrant firm conclusions, it appears reasonable to expect that the overall effect will be to direct vastly more attention to the problems of urban areas and, in the South, to foster a more moderate, less intransigent outlook on racial issues.

There follows a summary of the apportionment situation in each State. "Electoral percentage" figures indicate the smallest percentage of the population that mathematically could now elect a majority of the members in each house. Experts regard this as the best test of the representative quality of legislatures.

A low percentage indicates that the inhabitants of sparsely populated rural areas could elect a majority in that house.

A high percentage does not necessarily reflect big-city domination. Rural and small-town representatives can retain control by systems of alliances, domination of key committees and of committee-appointing machinery, and parliamentary skill.

New England

Connecticut

The main issue here is the house, which is apportioned by townships rather than population.

Political and legislative leaders of both parties have agreed on the mechanics for calling a State constitutional convention September 13, 1965, to be followed by a popular referendum on whatever reapportionment plan emerged from the convention.

Meanwhile, leaders are continuing discussions on a temporary plan that would be in effect until the permanent plan was adopted. A three-judge Federal district court has given the legislators until January 30 to act on the temporary plan. If they fail to do so, the court will impose its own plan now being drafted by a special master, Morris Davis, director of the Yale University Computer Center.

Any reapportionment based on population is bound to help the Democrats. Electoral percentages: senate 32, house 12.

Maine

The legislature has not waited for litigation, even though the State's districts were among the country's more representative on the basis of population. The electoral percentages were 47 in the senate and 40 in the house before the voters approved a constitutional amendment in 1963 to make the house more representative.

On the basis of the amendment, the legislature reapportioned the house. Although this left the electoral percentage at 40, both political parties agree that the reapportionment of the house was fair and that no changes are required in the senate.

Massachusetts

The house reapportioned in 1963 in the face of a suit. The realinement was the first since 1945. It cost Boston four seats in the house. The senate was last reapportioned in 1960.

Both houses are expected to be reapportioned next year, and every 5 years from now on. There are no suits pending, but if next year's action costs Boston some more seats some kind of battle is anticipated. The electoral percentages are 45 in the house and senate.

New Hampshire

The voters November 3 ordered reapportionment of both the house and the senate. The 24-member senate, heretofore apportioned on the basis of direct taxes paid, will be alined on the basis of population for the first time.

The house districts ostensibly were already based on population, but twice as many voters were required for additional seats than for the first. This favored small towns over cities.

Under the voters' action, reapportionment of both branches is mandatory in the coming legislative session. The Democrats are expected to be the gainers. Present electoral percentages are 45 in the senate, 44 in the house.

Rhode Island

On November 3 the voters elected delegates to a State constitutional convention that convened December 8. Modernization of the State's 122-year-old constitution is expected to include some action on reapportionment. This will be subject to ratification by the voters.

Litigation has focused on the house, where 47 percent of the population can elect a majority. Thus far there has been no challenge to senate districts, fixed in the State constitution, although the percentage for control is only 18.

The State supreme court ruled on July 24, 1962, that the house should be reapportioned. The legislature did so, but the measure was vetoed in 1963 by Gov. John H. Chafee, Republican, on the ground that it violated the State constitution's prescription of at least one house seat for each city and town. The measure had combined the 11 smallest towns into 4 representative districts.

In 1964 the legislature passed substantially the same bill, but some changes tacked on by the senate meant that it had to go back to the house for concurrence. The bill died with adjournment of the legislature after the Governor had said he would veto it again.

The Federal district court was asked to halt the 1964 elections, but refused on the ground that the Supreme Court had told lower courts not to interfere with election machinery already in motion. The court also noted the then pending referendum in which the voters subsequently voted to have a constitutional convention.

Vermont

Last July 10 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ordered reapportionment of both houses of the legislature by April 1, 1965. The legislature will convene January 6 for its regular biennial session, but is limited under the court order to action on reapportionment.

Gov. Philip H. Hoff, Democrat, wants the court order amended to allow action on appropriations so that State services can be operated past June 30, when current appropriations expire. Meantime, he and others have appealed the court order to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The State now has a 246-member house with 1 member for each city and town. This system has stood unchanged since 1793. The electoral percentage in the house is 12. The State's 30 senators are elected on a rough population basis from the 14 counties. The electoral percentage is 47.

A reapportionment commission is expected to recommend a shift in the senate from a county to a district basis and to submit three or four proposals for meeting the one-man, one-vote standard in the house. There may be resistance to action in the house, where there is considerable sentiment for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution permitting one unit of a legislature to be alined on a basis other than population.

Middle Atlantic

Delaware

The legislature's reapportionment of both houses in 1964 is being challenged by the Republicans in Federal court on the ground that the Democratic majority gerrymandered the State.

Their plea that the court forbid the November 3 election was denied, but the court said that if a detailed study showed that the one-man, one-vote standard had not been complied with, a new election would be held later.

The Democrats say that the districts are equal in population within 15 percent, but the Republicans contend the disparity runs as high as 46 percent.

The Republicans have cited as proof Democratic gains in the legislature. The old house was composed of 24 Democrats and 11 Republicans; the new, 30 Democrats and 5 Republicans. The old senate had 10 Democrats and 7 Republicans; the new, 13 and 4. The Democrats attributed these gains to the Johnson landslide.

The electoral percentages have been estimated at 52 for the senate and 45 for the house, although these figures have been strongly disputed.

New Jersey

The State supreme court ruled November 25 that apportionment of both houses of the legislature was unconstitutional.

It directed that a temporary plan for compliance with the one-man, one-vote ruling be adopted by statute to cover the 1965 elections to the legislature and that a constitutional change be effected before the 1967 balloting.

The senate, anticipating the court's action, on November 16 adopted a weighted voting system under which each member was given votes in proportion to the population of his county.

The State supreme court declared this invalid December 15 on the ground that the weighted voting system could not be adopted as it was, by a simple change in the senate's rules. The court did not rule on the constitutionality of the system, but it expressed strong doubts on this score.

A bipartisan 12-man commission was created by the legislature November 30 to submit plans for revising the State's congressional and legislative districts to the legislature by February 1. The electoral percentages are now 19 in the senate, 51 in the house.

New York

The Republican-controlled "lame duck" legislature, which will yield to Democratic majorities in both houses on January 1, passed an intricate series of reapportionment bills 2 days before Christmas.

A Federal court order requires the State to reapportion by April 1, 1965.

The Republicans drew up four bills and passed each succeeding one as an amendment. Each is more favorable to the Republicans than the one before. Thus the court can strip away one or more layers of law until it finds one acceptable.

Democratic leaders in the legislature, dissatisfied with all four bills, plan to put through their own reapportionment plan when they gain control next month. This undoubtedly will be vetoed by Governor Rockefeller, however, leaving it up to the courts to decide on the ultimate plan.

The Supreme Court, in its historic decision of June 15, specifically declared: "Neither house of the New York Legislature is apportioned sufficiently on a population basis to be constitutionally sustainable."

In the senate, for instance, 38 percent of the voters can elect a majority under present districting. The electoral percentages under the new law—the fourth bill passed—are 49 for the assembly and 50.9 for the senate.

Pennsylvania

The State supreme court has given the 1965 legislature, which convenes January 5, until September 1 to reapportion both the house and the senate. In its order of last September 29, the court said that should the legislature fail to enact "a constitutionally

valid plan" by then, the court itself would "take such action as may be appropriate in the light of the then existing situation."

Since the house is controlled by the Democrats and the senate by the Republicans, many observers expect that it will be difficult and perhaps impossible to reach a bipartisan reapportionment agreement.

A now invalid reapportionment action by the legislature last January 9 did, to some extent, correct disparities, but it was taken within the framework of the State constitution, which says that every county is entitled to a representative and that no county may have more than 8 of the 50 senators. The present electoral percentages are 43 in the senate and house.

Border

Kentucky

After Republicans filed suit in Federal Court to force redistricting, but before a final decision, the legislature passed the first reapportionment act in 20 years. It raised the electoral percentages from 42 to 45 in the senate and from 34 to 47 in the house. No suit has been filed against the new act.

Maryland

The legislative council, a between-sessions study arm of the legislature, has recommended a plan to reapportion both houses.

The plan would give the Baltimore area, which has about 76 percent of the State's population, 75 percent of the seats in the house and 60 percent in the senate. The area now has 55 percent of the house seats and 34 percent of the senate's.

Reapportionment watchdogs have failed to get the Maryland Court of Appeals to take definitive action on the U.S. Supreme Court's order to revise the legislature. But the court said that a lower court should "take affirmative action" if the legislature failed to enact a constitutionally valid apportionment plan before the 1966 primaries.

Figures compiled by the Maryland Fair Representation Committee show that about 35 percent of the population can now elect a majority of the house, 14.2 percent a majority of the senate.

Missouri

The legislature will meet January 6 for the first time since the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote decision. It is expected to take up the problem of malapportionment, which is particulary acute in the house.

Under a formula designed to favor rural areas, the house electoral percentage is 20. The senate, apportioned on a population basis, has an electoral percentage of 48. A suit in Federal district court to force reapportionment of both houses has been heard and a decision is being awaited.

The State's Governor-elect, Warren E. Hearnes, Democrat, has said he favors creation of a 10-member bipartisan commission to submit to the legislature a redistricting plan for the house, but opposes changing the senate unless the court orders it changed.

Oklahoma

The State's first completely reapportioned legislature in its history will convene January 5, with rural domination broken. The new electoral percentages are 49 in the senate and house. Before reapportionment, the percentages were 25 and 29, respectively.

The realinement was accomplished under a decree of a three-judge Federal district court, which had declared the May primary elections void and vacated all legislative offices effective November 18.

A new legislature was elected November 3 using the court's reapportionment plan. A new appeal from the court's order is pending before the U.S. Supreme Court.

West Virginia

Under pressure of a State supreme court order, the legislature passed an apportionment act in 1963. The act raised the electoral percentages from 40 to 45 in the house and 41 to 44 in the senate. The main effect was to increase urban strength in the legislature.

Although the Democrats made gains in the legislative elections November 3, the indications were that this was more because of the Johnson landslide than reapportionment. There is no current pressure for further realinements. The legislative districts will probably remain as they are until after the 1970 census.

South

Alabama

A joint study committee of the legislature is to supply reapportionment recommendations in the forthcoming legislative session. A three-judge Federal court is retaining jurisdiction in the situation until it can see what the legislature does.

The elections November 3 were held under a court apportionment decree that made a temporary apportionment out of features of discarded legislation. The net effect was to raise the electoral percentages from 26 to 43 in the house and from 25 to 28 in the senate.

Arkansas

A reapportionment suit is pending in Federal district court but has not yet been heard. The legislature will convene in January for the first time since the Supreme Court's decision.

There are no plans for action and Gov. Orval E. Faubus, Democrat, has said he thinks the legislature ought to wait for further action by the courts. The electoral percentages are 14 in the senate, 33 in the house.

Florida

The U.S. Supreme Court has declared invalid some slight apportionment changes made by the legislature on February 1, 1963.

The incoming Governor, Haydon Burns, Democrat, has said he wants to wait until after the regular legislative session next April and May before taking up the problem. He hopes the Federal courts will go along.

The electoral percentages are 15 in the senate, 30 in the house.

Georgia

Immediately after *Baker* v. *Carr*, a Federal court ordered that at least one house of the legislature be reapportioned. The legislature revised the senate districts to make them almost exactly equal in population.

On June 30, the Federal court ordered the legislature to reapportion the house before 1966. This must be done during a 45-day session opening January 11, with special elections later in the year, or the legislature will be unable to transact business legally thereafter.

A legislative study committee has held hearings. The principal dispute centers on how large the new house should be. The electoral percentages are 49 in the senate, 22 in the house.

Louisiana

The legislature reapportioned the house at a special session in 1963, but made no significant change in the urban-rural balance. The realinement of the senate is being studied by a joint legislative committee.

There is a possibility that reapportionment of the senate will be taken up in the May legislative session, but the general feeling is that nothing will be done until the next regular session in 1966.

A suit to force reapportionment is pending in Federal court, but the plaintiff is not pushing it at the moment. The electoral percentages are 33 in both houses.

Mississippi

After a State court invalidated the apportionment that had existed for 70 years, the legislature in 1963 put the house on a population basis and the Senate on a combination of population and area. Electoral percentages were raised from 35 to 37 in the senate, and 29 to 41 in the house.

No action has been taken by the legislature since the one-man, one-vote decision. No suits are pending.

North Carolina

The problem here is the house, last reapportioned in 1961. Under the State constitution, each of the State's 100 counties has a seat and 20 more are allotted on the basis of population. The electoral percentage in the house is 26. No suits to force revision are pending, however.

The senate was reapportioned in a special session in 1963. The electoral percentage was raised from 37 to 47.

South Carolina

The legislature has taken no action. When it gets around to it, the process is expected to be difficult, especially in the senate, where each county is allotted a seat. The senate is dominated by rural elements.

The electoral percentages are 23 in the senate and 46 in the house, which is apportioned on a population basis. Gov. Donald S. Russell, Democrat, may urge an official study of the situation by the legislature when it convenes January 12. An ad hoc committee named by the Governor last spring has met once and asked the State attorney general to study the situation, but there has been no report.

No suits have been filed.

Tennessee

The legislature is under a Federal court order to reapportion both houses along one-man, one-vote lines by June 1 or have the court do the job. The legislature convenes January 4.

The court acted within the framework of the original *Baker* v. *Carr* case. The legislature has already been reapportioned twice since the Supreme Court ruled in that case. The electoral percentages have been raised from 29 to 40 in the house and 27 to 45 in the senate. Reapportionment is working to the advantage of the Republicans.

Texas

A three-judge Federal court in Houston ruled 2 weeks ago that the Texas Legislature must revise boundaries of its house and senate districts by August 2.

The court retained jurisdiction of a suit filed by a group of liberal and moderate Democrats. This means the court can put its own redistricting plans into effect if the legislature fails to act or if it adopts a plan unsatisfactory to the court. The court said it would insist upon redistricting, either by the legislature or by the court itself, before the 1966 elections.

The electoral percentages are 30 in the senate, and 39 in the house.

Virginia

The legislature earlier this month, at a special session, effected reapportionment ordered by a Federal court.

At the same time, it adopted resolutions asking Congress to call a convention to amend the Constitution so as to permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on factors other than population and to deny Federal courts jurisdiction in State apportionment cases.

The reapportionment action raised the number of urban seats in the 100-member house by 8 and in the 40-member senate by 3. But rural and conservative forces will still control the all-important legislative committees and the machinery through which the committees are named.

The old electoral percentages were 41 in both houses and presumably this month's action increased them.

Middle West

Illinois

Failure to redistrict the house last year brought into play a State constitutional provision requiring that under those circumstances the house be elected at large. This was done November 3, with the election of 118 Democrats and 59 Republicans.

Another attempt will be made in 1965 to reapportion the house on a population basis as required by the State constitution. The constitution allocates 18 senate seats to Chicago, 6 to suburban Cook County and 34 to the rest of the State.

The electoral percentage in the senate is 29 and an attempt may be made to redistrict it, too, in the legislative session beginning in January. But it is questionable whether the Republican senate majority and Gov. Otto Kerner, a Democrat, will be able to agree on senate boundaries.

Indiana

Suits are pending in Federal and State courts to force compliance with the one-man, one-vote mandate. Faced with the possibility of Federal court action, the legislature reapportioned in 1963. Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, Democrat, vetoed the act, but the State supreme court ruled that the veto was too late.

The 1963 act raised the electoral percentages from 35 to 42 in the senate and 38 to 48 in the house.

Both houses of the new legislature, which convenes January 7, are dominated by Democrats. It is expected to reapportion itself again on the one-man, one-vote standard of the U.S. Supreme Court and the State constitution, which provides for redistricting every 10 years on the basis of the latest census.

Iowa

After the voters in 1963 rejected a proposal that would have put the senate on a population basis, but would also have lowered the electoral percentage in the house from 27.4 to 27 by giving each county one seat, a Federal court ordered the legislature to reapportion.

At a special session last February, a temporary plan was passed, raising the electoral percentages from 36 to 39 in the senate and to 44 in the house. The State AFL–CIO has brought a suit asking a Federal court to review both the temporary plan and a proposed permanent plan that would put the electoral percentages at 37 in the senate and 45 in the house.

Kansas

Under pressure from the State courts, the legislature reapportioned the senate before the one-man, one-vote Supreme Court decision. The action raised the electoral percentage from 27 to almost exactly 50.

The house was not changed, however. The State's constitution provides for 1 seat for each of 105 counties, with 20 more seats apportioned on a population basis. The electoral percentage in the house is 19.

The legislature is expected to take up reapportionment again after it convenes in January. State and Federal court suits seeking the reapportionment of the senate on a population standard have been filed. A decision from the State supreme court is expected early in 1965, in time for the legislature to comply with whatever ruling it makes.

Michigan

After a bipartisan commission failed to agree on reapportionment, the State supreme court adopted a Republican-sponsored plan as most nearly consonant with the mandate of the State constitution that the house districts be based on population and the senate districts be based 80 percent on population and 20 percent on area.

After the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling in June, however, the State court threw out its earlier decision and adopted a Democratic-sponsored plan apportioning both houses on the basis of population alone. In the November 3 election, partly as a result of this reapportionment, the Democrats took control of both houses of the legislature for the first time since 1934.

A Republican-oriented group is asking the State supreme court to review its adoption of the Democratic-sponsored reapportionment plan, charging that the plan is "partisan gerrymandering." Gov. George Romney, Republican, has called the plan "vicious gerrymandering" and has pledged a fight against it.

Under the old alinement the electoral percentages were 29 in the senate, 44 in the house. Now it takes slightly more than 50 percent of the voters to elect a majority in each.

Minnesota

A Federal court this month declared unconstitutional a reapportionment law of 1959 and ordered the 1965 legislature to reapportion itself on the basis of the 1960 census. The present electoral percentages are 39 in the senate, 35 in the house.

Nebraska

A Federal court in July ordered the 1965 legislature to reapportion on a one-man, one-vote basis. The Nation's only one-house legislature redistricted the State in 1963, under an amendment to the State constitution adopted in 1962 providing that 20 to 30 percent consideration be given to area.

Although this raised the electoral percentage from 37 to 44, the Federal court held that this was not sufficient.

North Dakota

When the legislature convenes January 3, it will be operating under a Federal court order directing that it reapportion itself within a reasonable time or have the court do the job. Action in 1963 raised the electoral percentage in the house from 35 to 42, but left the senate percentage at 32.

Ohio

The Republicans, with their margin next year sharply cut in the house and reduced to a tie in the senate, acted this month to put to a referendum May 4 a constitutional amendment setting up a new system of apportionment for the house.

The legislature was operating under a Federal court mandate to act within a reasonable time.

The proposed amendment calls for house districts with "substantially" equal populations and puts the job of drawing the lines in the hands of an expanded State apportionment board composed of State officials and legislators. The board would apportion after each Federal census.

The present electoral percentage in the house is 29. In the senate, which is not involved in the proposed amendment, the percentage is 45.

South Dakota

No action has been taken, and the prospects for any in the 1965 legislature are considered negligible. The electoral percentages are 41 in the senate, 39 in the house.

Wisconsin

The State supreme court reapportioned both houses of the legislature May 14. The court took the case at the request of Gov. John W. Reynolds, Democrat, after he had vetoed Republican-sponsored reapportionment bills passed by the State legislature, then controlled by Republicans.

The electoral percentages before the court acted were 43 in the Senate, 40 in the House. Now they are 48 and 45, respectively.

Mountain

Arizona

No action yet, but the 1965 legislature is under a Federal court edict to reapportion or have the court do it. A legislative council and a Governor's committee are studying the problem. The electoral percentages are 13 in the senate, 46 in the house.

Colorado

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision last June struck down a so-called Federal plan adopted by referendum in November of 1962. This plan reapportioned the house on a population basis, but allowed geographical representation in the senate.

Last summer the legislature enacted a new plan, putting representation in both houses substantially on the basis of population—the electoral percentages are theoretically 50 plus in both houses—and dividing larger counties, which had elected legislators at large, into districts.

The State constitution says that counties shall not be divided into districts. The Federal court ruled that the new plan complied with the State constitution, but the State supreme court ruled on July 17 that it did not. The State court deferred the effect of its decision to give the 1965 legislature a chance to act on this feature of the plan.

Idaho

The legislature is under a Federal court order to reapportion within 30 days after the end of its regular session, which starts January 4. Reapportionment of the house, under pressure of a State court suit, raised the electoral percentage in 1963 from 33 to 44. The senate figure remained at 17.

Montana

With electoral percentages of 37 in the house and 16 in the senate, the legislature has not yet taken action. Nor have any suits been filed. Reapportionment, however, is to be a major item of business when the legislature convenes January 4.

A Governor's commission is expected to make recommendations on which it is hoped the legislature can agree, thus avoiding a long battle.

Nevada

Two suits are on file in Federal courts and a hearing on one will go ahead June 23 if the legislature, which convenes January 18, does not act by April 15. Electoral percentages are 36 in the senate, 8 in the house.

New Mexico

A State court has ruled invalid a weighted voting system adopted by the legislature for the house in November of 1963. The 1965 legislature may act, although there appears to be considerable sentiment favoring delay to see whether the Federal Constitution cannot be amended to allow States to apportion one house on other than a population basis.

Utah

The Legislative Reapportionment Act of 1963 has been held invalid by a Federal court, but a legislative council subcommittee on reapportionment was unable to agree on a new plan. The council thereupon ordered that bills embodying a number of plans be prepared for submission to the 1965 legislature.

Among the difficulties are provisions in the State constitution that the senate have no more than 30 members, with a representative from each of 29 counties, and that the house have no more than 90 members. The Federal court said that State constitutional provisions in conflict with the one-man, one-vote ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court were invalid.

The 1963 act raised the electoral percentages from 21 to 25 in the senate and from 34 to 38 in the house.

Wyoming

A Federal court November 24 struck down the 1963 reapportionment of the senate and warned that it would reapportion the body unless the legislature acted before the 1966 elections.

The 1963 act reduced the electoral percentage in the senate from 28 to 24 while raising that of the house from 36 to 47. A special session of the legislature, called while the suit was pending, was unable to reach agreement last July.

Pacific

Alaska

Gov. William A. Egan, Democrat, will reapportion soon on the basis of recommendations from the State reapportionment advisory board, which favors dividing the State into 20 districts, each electing one senator and two house members.

A threatened suit was not filed because the Governor called the advisory board into session. Electoral percentages: house 47, senate 42.

California

The main focus of controversy is the senate, which is based more on area considerations than population. A Federal court suit in Los Angeles, which city would stand to gain heavily from reapportionment on a population basis, seeks an order directing realinement of the senate on a population basis.

The problem is expected to be the first order of business when the legislature meets January 4. Electoral percentages: house 45, senate 11.

Hawaii

A special 30-day session of the legislature last summer tried and failed to come up with a reapportionment plan for both houses. The main problem is the senate, which is apportioned on a geographical basis.

Now a suit is pending in Federal court. The electoral percentages are 38 in the house, 18 in the senate.

Oregon

Voters in 1952 passed a constitutional amendment reapportioning both houses on a population basis. No suits are pending. The electoral percentages are 48 in both houses.

Washington

A Federal court has directed the 1965 legislature to reapportion and to take up nothing but routine housekeeping chores until it does.

The Governor-elect, Daniel J. Evans, Republican, organized a committee to study the problem in November, but the Democrats refused to cooperate, contending that reapportionment was a legislative problem.

The court acted after the 1963 legislature wrangled at length but did nothing. Electoral percentages are 38 in the house, 36 in the senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is one correction which I think should be made. That is the statement of Mr. Pomfret that 16 of the required 34 State legislatures have petitioned Congress for a constitutional convention, the purpose of which would be the adopting of an amendment to allow one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

Mr. Pomfret is a very able reporter. But, as I see the situation, this statement is in error. The petition which the 34 State legislatures have addressed is primarily based on the original decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Baker against Carr, the so-called Tennessee case. That decision declared that one house should be apportioned roughly on the basis of population. It was not addressed to the consequences of the Alabama decision and other decisions which stated that both houses should be apportioned on the basis of population. Therefore, I submit that the petition of these various State legislatures is not addressed to the constitutional amendment now before this body, as introduced by my colleague [Mr. DIRKSEN], nor is it before the House as introduced by Representative MCCULLOCH. Furthermore, I believe the history of these amendments is that the language in the petitions must be identical. I believe this is not the case in the so-called Ripper amendments advanced by the State legislatures in the period when they did not quite know what was happening or what the contents of these petitions actually were.

In any event, once we have organized the Senate, and once the Committee on the Judiciary has been appointed, I think we should have very thorough hearings on the Dirksen amendment, and it should be thoroughly debated.

There is no intention on the part of those of us who believe that a legislature should be apportioned according to population, to filibuster any constitutional amendment. But we do believe that it deserves at least a thorough consideration, as did the proposal of President Roosevelt in 1937, dealing with the composition of the Supreme Court. It deserves very careful consideration before we blast at the fundamental principles of the American Government.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as we all know, the Committee on Rules and Administration has been conducting an investigation for approximately 15 months. I do not think that the Committee on Rules and Administration was ever set up as a permanent investigating committee, although, sometimes it seems that it might have been.

In the first place, we did not have a sufficient staff to do the type of work we were engaged in. We were able to select some very fine personnel who have done an exceedingly fine job. Those people have other things to do. Some of them want to go back to their homes. They have stayed much longer than they intended to stay.

The hearings which we have conducted so far comprise over 2,000 pages of testimony. There have been 77 sessions. I believe the committee has done a magnificent job.

We have no intention of quitting this investigation until we have completed the task in which we are engaged. I do not know just how long that will take us. We intend to finish it. We intend to do a thorough job and bring out all the facts necessary to complete this investigation.

Last year the Senate voted on and adopted a resolution to establish a select committee, a permanent committee to investigate all things pertaining to the Senate, employees, and so forth. That committee ought to be activated as soon as practicable. At the conclusion of our work, and when we make our report, it is our intention to turn over to that committee all records and information that we have gathered. We shall cooperate with the new committee in any way possible. That is what we have done from the very first day that we started this investigation. We have turned over or made available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the Department of Justice, and the Internal Revenue Service, all the information gathered day by day. Some people have been in our office today looking over our files.

We have assisted them and cooperated with them in every way possible. We intend to do that with any agency of the Government which might want information from our committee files.

In the early part of this session the select committee authorized by Congress ought to be activated at as early a date as possible and ought to have any additional information that might come before the Senate.

I want it thoroughly understood that the Committee on Rules and Administration is not a permanent investigating committee.

A CONFUSION OF TONGUES—ADDRESS BY CHARLES E. WHITTAKER, FORMER JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on October 23, 1964, Associate Justice Charles E. Whittaker, who is retired from the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered the principal address at the southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association. The address is entitled "A Confusion of Tongues." It is a splendid analysis of the manner in which our Nation has departed from a government of laws and self-government by the people through the process of usurpation in the form of judicial interpretation and construction. It is the type of address which should bring Americans up sharp and particularly those of us who have official responsibilities for the preservation of our constitutional system. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD.

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

A CONFUSION OF TONGUES

(Address by Charles E. Whittaker, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States (retired), before southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association, Atlanta, Ga., Oct. 23, 1964)

I have consented to speak to you, briefly, about the U.S. Constitution, its origin, evolution, and present status.

You will, of course, recall from history that State governments—those of the Thirteen Colonies, which later became States—existed for a good many years before the necessities of their conditions, including particularly their physical and economic vulnerability, virtually compelled them to join in the formation of an overriding sovereign union, which they named the United States of America.

Originally, all of the power to govern was deemed to be vested in the people themselves, and they exercised those powers through their respective State governments which they created and alone controlled. Be-

ing historically aware of, and having themselves actually suffered from, the deeds of despots committed in their exercise of general governmental powers over the populace, the colonists so highly prized the virtues of their newly and painfully acquired local self-governments that they were resolutely determined to retain them.

But, although their valiant joint and united efforts in waging their Revolution against the English crown had recently resulted in victory, they were each left individually weak, isolated and, singularly, vulnerable to attack. In those circumstances, their domestic tranquillity and general welfare imperatively required that they confederate, in some measure, for their common defense, for the preservation of their newly won liberties, and for the promotion of their economy by regulating imports, exports, and commerce with foreign nations, with the Indian tribes, and among the States themselves.

They concluded that those purposes could be accomplished only by the formation and creation of a national sovereign, specifically invested with those powers, to rest as a capstone over, but not otherwise to diminish or disturb, the people's existing local State governments or their full and free control of them. And so to those ends, that is to say, in the founders' words, "to insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and [to] secure the blessings of liberty," the people, acting through the Original Thirteen States, created the National Government and conferred upon it—some of them most reluctantly, because of their keen awareness and fears of the historical tendencies of national sovereigns to invade and usurp the functions of subordinate local self-governments—the quite specific, yet very limited, powers which they found necessary for those purposes. And to assure, as best they could with words—then, as now, the only means of expressing and communicating thoughts and ideas—against the exercise, or attempted exercise, by the National Government of any powers not so delegated to it, the people, in explicit emphasis of those limitations upon national power, expressly provided, in the 10th amendment, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In this way two layers of separate and independent sovereignty were created; namely, first, the respective States, in whom were reposed and reserved all general powers of government; and, second, the overriding National Government of the Union, possessing only specific but limited powers. Hence, there were thus created, and have since existed, dual but independent sovereignties, operating simultaneously in the same physical area. This philosophy of government has become known as our duality or our federalism. Naturally, the founders, in their wisdom and experience, knew that with two separate but independent sovereignties operating in the same physical area at the same time, there would likely be occasions of conflict of authority which would have to be resolved, and for their peaceful and lawful resolution they provided, in article VI, clause 2, that: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land." This meant, and still means, of course, that if, when both sovereignties are acting within their supposed authorized scope, conflicts of authority occur, State laws must give way to the national ones as the supreme law of the land.

Recognizing that changing conditions that would be met in the development and growth of the country might require, for its better government, amendments of the Constitution, Congress expressly provided, in article V, that the Constitution might be amended in respects approved and proposed by the two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress, or by conventions, and submitted to and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Mindful of the means and processes by which encroaching erosions and usurpations had been practiced throughout history by overriding sovereigns upon subordinate or local self-governments—and of the vulnerability of local governments to those means and processes—such men as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Penn solemnly alerted the people to be watchful against those means and processes, and warned that they tend to be destructive of liberties. In his Farewell Address, Washington said:

"The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon us all. * * * If in the opinion of the people the constitutional powers be thought in any particular wrong, let (the Constitution) be corrected by amendment in the way the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

To our great glory and benefit—and I should add, to the envy of the world—our system of government has worked well. So well indeed, that under it, we have made the greatest civil, social, and economic progress of any nation the world has seen. Yet, in recent years, we have seemed to be under unusually great stress, and often distress, and, in very recent times, to be suffering a rash of organized disobedience and disorder.

It may be well to remember that our Government is only about 175 years old and is, therefore, quite new as time is measured in history. It is still referred to around the world as the great American experiment.

It can hardly be denied that, for some years, our system of government has been challenged—until recently, quite covertly—by the advancement, and in some cases the adoption, of political and social philosophies that are foreign to its concepts and which have, in important particulars, succeeded in changing its complexion.

Doubtless you, just as I, were taught as toddlers around parental knees, and ever since, that our Constitution was an inspired document, whose concepts were next to Holy Writ, and, until amended by the people in the manner it prescribes, imposes upon us a sacred obligation of complete and honest obedience to its terms.

With all this in our background it surely is not amiss to note, as R. G. LeTourneau reminded us in March of 1963, that the average age of the world's great governments has been 200 years; that those governments progressed through this sequence: (1) from bondage to spiritual faith, (2) from spiritual faith to great courage, (3) from courage to liberty, (4) from liberty to abundance, (5) from abundance to complacency, (6) from complacency to apathy, (7) from apathy to dependence, and (8) from dependence back again to bondage. He also reminded us that Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," isolated five basic reasons why that great civilization died out. These were (a) "the undermining of the dignity and sancity of the home—the basis of all human society, (b) higher and higher taxes to fund the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the people, (c) the mad craze for pleasure, (d) the building of great armaments for the defeat of an external enemy when the real enemy was within—the decay of individual morality and responsibility, and (e) the decay of religion; faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life and its power to guide the people"—which, some thoughtful persons believed, resulted, at least partially, from what they saw as the departure by some of its ministers of its creeds and pulpits for the highly divisive forum of the political platform.

Whether we are experiencing or threatened with parallels are matters upon which your analyses and conclusions will be as good as mine, and those matters I leave to you. But whether we have kept faith with the Constitution, and have heeded the warnings of George Washington and others of our Founding Fathers to be vigilant in protecting our fundamental law against the pressures of erosion and usurpation, are matters I will speak upon briefly.

I believe we ought to be able to agree that words—though not ends in themselves—are our only tools and means of communicating thoughts and ideas. Hence, plain and unambiguous words surely should be taken and adhered to in their commonly accepted sense, for otherwise the result must necessarily be the loss of all means of communicating with certainty; and all documents, however carefully prepared, would result in mere scraps of paper. This, carried to an illustrative extreme, would even make it dangerous for a borrower or a lender to sign or accept a simple promissory note.

Despite this simple grammatical fact, and notwithstanding plain words of the Constitution (when, indeed, they are plain, clear and unambiguous—as, unfortunately, is not always the case) and the warnings of Washington and others, it cannot be, and indeed is not, any longer denied that there has been, particularly in the last three decades, a different kind of fidelity—if fidelity it has been—to the meaning of the plain words in the Constitution by some than by others of us.

Throughout the period just mentioned, it was thought, charged and protested by many, who may be identified as "strict constructionists," that our Constitution was being gradually, but steadily and continuously expanded and changed by the definitional and interpretative processes in both the legislative and judicial departments of the National Government in usurpation of the right of the people only to amend the Constitution and then only in the manner specified in its 5th article, and in derogation of the 10th amendment which provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Until rather recently, those who supported what they called a policy of liberal construction vigorously denied that the Constitution was being changed or, in effect, amended in those ways; but since recently the cumulative effect of those definitional and interpretative actions has become so evident, in composite, as to be clear beyond rational dispute, it is now rather freely conceded, even by the liberal constructionists, that a number of very substantial and far-reaching changes in the meaning of the Constitution have evolved from those processes. And so today hardly anyone, familiar with the subject, denies that the meaning of our Constitution has actually been changed, and in effect amended, in substantial particulars by the definitional and interpretative processes and is no longer a document of the meanings adopted by our forefathers, as from time to time amended by the people in the manner it provides.

But, while making these admissions of the obvious, the liberal constructionists are not apologetic. Instead they seek to defend and to justify. They argue that such changes of the Constitution were both necessary and good for our Nation—in other words, that the ends attained have justified the means employed. They say that the Constitution was framed and adopted when our society was new and its economy was simple—the horse

and buggy days—and that, if it was adequately to serve the needs of a growing economy, it could not be held in a straitjacket but had to be kept abreast of the times, and that this could timely and efficiently be done only by treating the instrument as a living document of sufficient elasticity to permit its constructional expansion to cover the ever-changing needs, as they have viewed them, of a rapidly expanding population, an ever more complex economy. They, of course, make no mention of the obvious fact that these changes were not brought into existence by amendments of the Constitution by the people in the manner it designated.

I have been asked, many times, how these changes in the Constitution were brought about. Just how were they brought about? The answer is not a mystery. In retrospect, it is quite clear that they were in large part, at least, brought about by a legislative definitional process, aided and supported by a judicial process of interpretation—not strictly of the provisions of the Constitution, but rather of legislative definitions of constitutional concepts.

And I believe that—without reference to any recent Federal legislative or judicial actions, definitions or interpretations, which, because they might be thought to be involved in current political debates, I naturally wish to avoid—a simple concrete example from the relatively distant past will suffice to demonstrate how that process has operated to change in meaning, and, in effect, to amend, the Constitution.

By article I, section 8, clause 3, of the Constitution, commonly known as the commerce clause, the States and the people granted power to the Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

For no less than a century and a quarter, the phrase "commerce * * * among the several States," as used in the Constitution, was uniformly believed by the people and held by the courts to embrace only that which had actually been introduced into the stream, and was in the flow, of commerce between the States. Thus, in seeming accord with the accepted meaning of its plain words, the phrase "commerce * * * among the States, was expressly and repeatedly held not to embrace those multitudinous local activities that are involved in producing the products of the field or factory—that production and manufacture were not commerce even though the products, or some of them, might eventually move, or indeed, might earlier have moved, in commerce among the States, and were, therefore, not activities subject to the regulatory power of Congress.

But in the latter portion of that period, the legislative department advanced, and the judicial department sustained (without any loud public protest—and most constitutional lawyers still think correctly), the concept that whatever really and substantially burdens or affects commerce among the States falls within the powers "to regulate commerce among the States" and hence is within the power of Congress to regulate under the commerce clause; however the principle that local production and manufacture is not commerce was repeatedly reannounced and stoutly maintained.

During the teens, some Federal officials and liberal constructionists, evidently chafing under the strict constitutional limitations upon Federal powers over State and local activities and seeking an expeditious way to vest in the Central Government an effective control over those activities, advanced not a constitutional amendment but the interpretative concept that the constitutional phrase empowering Congress "to regulate commerce * * * among the several States" ought to be held to include the power to control whatever is involved in the production of goods in the fields and factories.

The fallacies and dangers of that emerging philosophy of construction were promptly demonstrated by many startled persons, including President Wilson who protested in these ringing terms:

"May it—Congress—also regulate the conditions under which the merchandise is produced which is presently to become the subject matter of interstate commerce? May it regulate the conditions of labor in field and factory?

"Clearly not, I should say; and I should think that any thoughtful lawyer who felt himself at liberty to be frank would agree with me. For that would be to destroy all lines of division between the field of State legislation and the field of Federal legislation.

"If the Federal power does not end with the regulation of the actual movement of trade, it ends nowhere, and the line between State and Federal jurisdiction is obliterated."

Despite the clear and overpowering logic of that protest, and the many similar ones, that emerging new philosophy of construction was not thereby ended but rather was only temporarily driven underground.

That philosophy was again openly renewed under stress of the great depression of the 1930's. The Chief Executive, in the evident belief that Federal power to control the conditions of production in the fields and factories was necessary to revive the Nation's depressed economy, sought not an accommodating constitutional amendment, but instead prevailed upon Congress to enact the Wagner Act which, by resting upon Congress commerce powers, sought to control conditions of labor used in producing goods in fields and factories on the ground that such labor so affected commerce as to be a part of it.

In that act, the term "commerce" was conventionally defined, but the reach of the act was attempted legislatively to be extended to activities "affecting commerce," which phrase, in turn, was there expansively defined to include those activities which "tended to lead to a labor dispute," and which, Congress said, might in some way burden or obstruct the free flow of commerce among the States.

The constitutionality of that act was assailed in the Supreme Court in the Jones and Laughlin case in the 1936 term. Under the depressed conditions of the times and pressures of the then current "court-packing" attempts, the Supreme Court held the act to be constitutional. It turned its decision not on any interpretation of the words of the Constitution by which Congress had been empowered "to regulate commerce * * * among the States," but rather upon the congressionally created concept of "affecting commerce," and upon Congress expansive definition of that phrase in the terms stated. It held, in essence, that those recurring local activities which bear a close relationship to interstate commerce may, in some way, affect commerce—which it felt the activities involved in that case did, as nearly any imaginable transaction or occurrence would—and, in consequence, it upheld the act as within the reach of congressional power.

The opinion was written by the most able and universally honored Chief Justice Hughes; and although it represented a demonstrably precipitous change from the views he had numerous times, and only recently before, expressed on the subject, he was rather widely applauded at the time for that decision upon the ground that it may have saved the Court from further Executive attack and attempts to pack it—sometimes referred to as the "stitch in time that saved nine."

However that may be, it can hardly be denied that the decision did not turn upon an interpretation of the words of the Constitution empowering Congress "to regulate commerce * * * among the States," nor upon any other words in the Constitution itself. Rather the decision turned upon an interpretation of Congress expansive phrase "affecting commerce" and of its definition of that phrase.

It is also clear, and worthy of minute notice, that the Court's crucial phrase—"a close relationship" to interstate commerce—embraced a relative conception of uncertain degree, requiring ad hoc determinations in each case, which necessarily must be as variable as the notions of men, including judges, as to whether a particular activity does or does not bear a sufficiently close relationship to interstate commerce to meet that announced vague conception; and thus, in practical effect—at least in borderline cases—the vital and momentous question of Federal power over local activities was left to a vague rule of men rather than to a definite rule of law.

Even if the last stated conclusion can be doubted, there can be no room to doubt that the opinion in the Jones and Laughlin case was a sharp break with what had been regarded as fundamental in the past, and it opened the gates to such a vast expansion of Federal power over local activities as left the States, just as Woodrow Wilson warned it would, without any line between State and Federal jurisdiction. And, in the light of the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution, the Federal Government was thus given, in practical effect, power to control all local activities which, in its view, bear a close relationship to interstate commerce, and it seems that nearly every transaction, however local in itself, may be said to do so.

If the latter statement seems extreme, let it be remembered that this doctrine has been applied to sustain a Federal statute imposing criminal penalties upon a farmer for growing wheat on his own farm to be fed on the same farm to his own livestock. It would be a little difficult to imagine an activity more local than that.

These are the ways and means by which the meaning of the Constitution has been changed—specifically, these are the ways and means by which the repository of general governmental powers was changed from the people and their respective States to the Federal Government.

Whether these and like changes in the Constitution were, as the liberal constructionists claim, both necessary and good for the Nation may well be very seriously doubted, but even if, in any view, it can honestly be said that those changes were necessary and good for the Nation, it is obvious that they were not made by the people—they were not made by any amendment of the Constitution by the people themselves, or in the amending manner specified in the fifth article of the Constitution. Rather, it appears that they were made by what George Washington called usurpation which, he said, "is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Although our forefathers had learned from experience and had warned us, we have had painfully to learn for ourselves, that true liberty cannot be preserved alone by words or declarations, but, rather, as the late and lamented judge, Learned Hand, in the reflective wisdom of experience and full maturity, some years ago reminded us: "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can do much to help it."

Surely love for our Constitution and for the liberties its plan and words attempt to secure to us is not dead in the hearts of a large majority of the American people. Though it may seem to be dormant in the hearts of some of us, it is in our blood and, by patriotic arousal and determined effort, it can be revived.

Surely we must make that effort with resolution, and with faith in the fact that

kites rise highest against the wind. What a shame it would be to fail, but how much more the shame to fail even earnestly to try.

The strength, or weakness, of America lies not in its farms and forests, its factories and fortresses, nor in the glorious achievements of its past generations, but it lies in the patriotic character, strength, determination, and faith of its present people who now control, and must be responsible for, its destiny.

I close in the eloquent words of a great American patriot, the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

"Let us hope that this Nation will continue to be a rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to restore faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. May we sustain our two mighty symbols—the cross and the flag. The one based on those immortal teachings which provide the spiritual strength to preserve the cause of right and justice; the other based on an indomitable will that human freedom shall not perish from the earth."

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the previous session of Congress a great and wonderful colleague of mine, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and I discussed on the floor of the Senate time and time again the United States outlawry in South Vietnam.

Time and time again we pointed out that the United States was acting in South Vietnam completely outside the framework of international law. We pointed out that the State Department had been unable to submit a single tenet of international law to justify unilateral American military action in South Vietnam.

Up until the moment I now speak, the State Department has yet to produce a single tenet of international law to justify our unjustifiable and illegal course of action in South Vietnam.

Since the previous session of Congress, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have not remained silent on this subject. I am not so sure that we were not the only two Democrats who in the recent campaign discussed the subject matter openly and frequently in the campaign. I was given speaking assignments in 14 States during that campaign and was very proud to be of service to my great President and Vice President. But many times in those meetings the issue of South Vietnam was raised, and I did not duck the issue, although it was perfectly obvious that during that campaign little was said by the candidates on either ticket about the subject matter of South Vietnam.

The only time the President of the United States discussed it was in the speech he delivered in the East, where he discussed it briefly. I shall shortly introduce his remarks in the RECORD. But, Mr. President, I intend to continue to discuss it, because in my judgment it is the major, No. 1 issue which confronts this country at this hour.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless there is a successful solution to the crisis in South Vietnam, I am satisfied that the unilateral military action of the United States in South Vietnam will be the primary cause of leading Asia into a massive war. We would be whistling in the graveyard, or engaging in empty-headed, wishful thinking, if we thought that a massive war in Asia would stop there. I am satisfied that it would lead to a nuclear war, out of which there would come no victor. This I have stated many times.

This administration continues to argue that we shall lose prestige if we change our course of action in Asia.

I point out to the President of the United States that we have no prestige left in Asia because of our shocking course of action in South Vietnam.

What do prestige and face have to do with the United States doing what is right? Nothing. If our course of action in South Vietnam is wrong—and I am satisfied that it is completely wrong—the sooner we right it by taking the right course, the better for the future of this country.

Are we not going to learn from history? There were those in France who argued for years that France could not and should not get out of Indochina because she would lose face. After 240,000 casualties, the French people gave the French Government its answer, and it made very clear to that French Government that it had better change its course of action in Indochina. As all Senators know, it did.

There was worked out the Geneva accord of 1954, which the United States did not sign, and which John Foster Dulles persuaded the first American puppet in South Vietnam—President Diem—not to sign.

They divided Indochina into four parts; namely, Laos, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and South Vietnam.

Today, France is hailed around the world for her international statesmanship in following the course of action she took.

There were those in France who said that France would lose face and prestige if she changed her course of action in Algeria. In that instance, the leaders of the French Government came to recognize before it was too late that France was wrong in Algeria. De Gaulle, to his everlasting credit, righted France's wrong course and proceeded to change the French course of action in Algeria.

Since when has the United States reached such a hypocritical position that it is going to run away from the right and continue doing wrong?

The face savers are dead wrong in their arguments about American policies in South Vietnam, on the ground that we cannot change our course of action because we would lose face.

The sad and ugly reality, Mr. President, is that the face savers in South Vietnam are in fact warmongers. They are the ones who wish to rationalize and alibi the unjustifiable killing of more and more American boys.

Mr. President, I am for substituting each and every one of them for drafted boys in South Vietnam who fight in the jungles of Vietnam for a cause that is unwarranted because it is outside the framework of international law. It is one thing for us to sit in the comfort and security of the Chambers of the Senate and the House of Representatives and wave that flag into tatters. That action is nothing but paying disrespect to that flag while American boys are being killed in the jungles of South Vietnam. The duty of our Government is to get back within the framework of international law, to seek an honorable and negotiated settlement of that war over there, preserve the peace, and stop threatening the danger of leading us into a massive war in all of Asia.

As I said to the Secretary of State yesterday, and I repeat today, a continuation of the State Department policy in South Vietnam is certain to lead to a massive war in Asia; and that massive war in Asia will be a nuclear war. Neither the United States nor any other country would be a victor in such a war.

Mr. President, I plead and pray that the leadership of my Government will no longer seek to alibi and rationalize an illegal course of American action in South Vietnam. I plead and pray that the leaders of my Government will seek to apply the existing framework of international law and its procedures to the war in South Vietnam.

As I said to the Secretary of State yesterday, when a question was raised as to what I would have the United Nations do, my answer is, "Take jurisdiction."

What a question to ask the senior Senator from Oregon. What would I have the United Nations do? Take jurisdiction under the provisions of the charter to which the signature of the United States is attached.

The sad fact is that the United States has run out on the United Nations. The sad fact is that the United States, more than any other nation in the world—and, sad to say but true, more than Russia—is undermining the United Nations by its course of action in South Vietnam.

As I pointed out in my Syracuse University lecture, which I shall shortly ask to have printed in the RECORD, article after article of the United Nations Charter calls for the submission to the United Nations for jurisdiction of allegations concerning violation of international treaties. It calls for some other things, and offers two alternatives. But I stress this point first, because I wish to warn the present administration that if it follows its present course of action in South Vietnam, in my judgment, it will go out of office the most discredited administration in all the history of this Republic, because across this land, at the grassroots of America, increasing tens of thousands of American people are asking the question, "Why unilateral U.S. military action in South Vietnam?"

At long last there is hope now that we shall have a debate in the Senate on South Vietnam. All of last year the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the senior Senator from Oregon did their best to get a debate in the Senate on South Vietnam, and we were met with silence on the floor of the Senate, but pats on the back in the cloakroom.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to a debate on the floor of the Senate. The American people are also entitled to the lifting of the rules of secrecy by the State Department and the Pentagon in regard to the war in South Vietnam, for American boys are dying. The parents of those boys—the boys fighting over there—and every citizen in this country are entitled to have the truth about what is going on in Asia; and I charge on the floor of the Senate today that the administration is not giving the American people the truth about what is going on in Asia. Read some of the remarkable accounts and responses of the Pentagon and the State Department. Newspaper correspondents report allegations concerning violations of the borders of North Vietnam, violations of international law in Tonkin Bay, and violations of international law in Laos. What is the response of the State Department and the Pentagon to these reports?

"No comment."

I trust that our Nation is not yet a police state. But those are police state tactics, Mr. President. As I said a few moments ago, in discussing a bill I introduced in the Senate, in a democracy there is no substitute for a full public disclosure of the public's business. The war in South Vietnam does not belong to the President of the United States. It does not belong to Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State. It does not belong to McNamara in the Pentagon, or to Adlai Stevenson in the United Nations, or to Maxwell Taylor in South Vietnam. It happens to be the problem of the American people. They are entitled to have the facts and all the facts in regard to it.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I state to the American people today one of my great concerns. I have not been here for 20 years without gaining a pretty good intuition as to what is going on. But I am satisfied that we have Government officials who are more interested in concealment than in telling the American people the facts. I am satisfied that plans are underway for an escalation of activities in Asia that are bound to lead to a major war in Asia. While I might disagree with our Secretary of State on many things, I have a great admiration and respect for him. As I told him yesterday, it saddens me to find myself so completely against him on such a subject as South Vietnam. On most issues of foreign policy I find myself in complete agreement with him. I am satisfied that our great Secretary of State is concerned about where the South Vietnam war may lead. But the time has come for the American people to give the present administration its direction, for foreign policy does not belong to this administration. The old bromide that we hear repeated so often in the Senate and elsewhere in our country that foreign policy belongs to the President of the United States is, of course, complete nonsense, for the President is only an administrator of the people's foreign policy.

The American people will have to give direction to this administration in respect to the war in South Vietnam. I say to them today that I am satisfied that although they are a small minority, there is a group of officials in our country, in and out of uniform, who apparently think that we must prepare the way for a bombing of nuclear installations in Red China.

How anyone could possibly think that such a course of action on the part of the United States could produce peace is beyond my imagination. The danger of provoking a major war in Asia on the part of the United States is so great that, in my judgment, the American people should demand, without further delay, that this question be taken to the conference table.

I say again that the senior Senator from Oregon has never favored our simply pulling out of Vietnam. The senior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that if the only course open to us is to remain on a unilateral basis, we cannot justify staying there under international law. What I have urged, in speech after speech and article after article, is that we should make use of existing international agencies for the settlement of this dispute, if possible, by way of negotiated settlement, short of war. So I have urged, time and time again, and repeat this afternoon, that we ought to try to use SEATO; but the fact is that a majority of the SEATO nations want no part of it.

A foreign minister of Pakistan said some months ago, in Washington, that Pakistan had no intention of coming to the assistance of the United States in South Vietnam. I have called the roll of the SEATO nations in speech after speech, and I call it again this afternoon, with the question on my lips: Where are you in South Vietnam? Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, and Great Britain are not there. It is quickly said that some of them are there in token; but it is a pretty small token. The Australians have probably some 60 or 70 advisory troops there. There is some delivery of materiel, mostly out of Australia—and at a good dollar profit—in a few cargo planes belonging to Australia. But there is no active participation by Australia in the war in South Vietnam.

If any countries have a large stake in South Vietnam, if our claims are true, they are Australia and her sister state, New Zealand. In the lecture that I shall introduce into the RECORD shortly, I quote the Australian press—a conservative press. The Australian press is greatly concerned about U.S. plans for escalating the war in South Vietnam. The Australian press is saying some of the very things I am saying as to the danger of a massive war in Asia leading to nuclear war. The "domino" theory cannot be sold to Australia; they will not buy it. It cannot be sold to New Zealand. It is interesting to observe that there is no great concern so far as Thailand and the Philippines are concerned. We do not find their troops dying in South Vietnam. Aside from the Vietnamese, the only ones who are dying are American boys. We cannot justify that.

Let me say something about the question of SEATO. We do not hear the lack of SEATO action discussed very much. Although the SEATO nations have pledged themselves under the protocol agreement in the SEATO treaty to consider South Vietnam an area of vital concern and interest, they have also a procedural rule of unanimity. It is not possible to get any action by SEATO on a majority vote basis. The only way to get any help from SEATO is to have an individual SEATO nation, on the basis of its own sovereignty, but not as a member of the SEATO treaty, come into South Vietnam voluntarily. I should like us to try to change that. I should like us to try to see if we could have SEATO—and I have said this for many months—undertake a peace-keeping action and try to bring about a cease-fire, setting up a SEATO control for a period, until stability and order can be restored in South Vietnam.

I am afraid it is true, as has been pointed out to me by so many persons, that we cannot get sufficient support in depth from SEATO nations to accomplish that purpose. We may get some token support from a few, but that will be all. I shall have something to say about token support momentarily.

I turn now to the possibility of reconvening the 14-nation conference. The fact that that was first proposed by President De Gaulle, of France, is no reason for not approving of it, but, rather, is a reason for giving him credit for seeking to work out a peaceful solution to the war in South Vietnam.

The White House and the State Department ought to be urging the reconvening of the 14-nation conference, to the end of seeing what can be worked out, if anything, to bring about a cease-fire in South Vietnam and an administration of that country by a joint commission, with a view to stopping the killing in South Vietnam.

It may be said that if that course of action is followed, Communist nations will be participating in any such joint commission. Of course they will. We Americans cannot wish Communist nations out of existence. They are an ugly reality on the face of the earth. But we shall not defeat communism by following the course of action that we are following in South Vietnam. To the contrary, in my judgment, we are making more Communists around the world by the unilateral action of the United States in South Vietnam than we have any reasonable hope of defeating in South Vietnam. The use of the jungle law of military force by the United States will make more Communists around the world, not reduce their number.

It may be said that if Communists are placed in any representative positions, the danger always is that they will produce conflict; that they will try to take over; and that the action eventually will end in chaos. Here again, we shall never know until we try. I believe the time has come for us to try, at least, to be law abiding and to keep our commitments under the United Nations Charter.

But it is said that the United States is in South Vietnam because the Geneva

accords of 1954 are being violated. They certainly are. They are being violated by Red China; by North Vietnam; by the Pathet Laos; probably, on some occasions, by Cambodia; but also by the United States and South Vietnam. The record is undeniable. We cannot justify refusing to go to the United Nations on the basis of the argument that we are in South Vietnam only to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954. The United States did not even sign them. We convinced our puppet, Mr. Diem, that he should not sign them. Neither the United States nor South Vietnam ever signed the Geneva accords. But my argument would be the same if we had. The fact that the Geneva accords are being violated by Red China, North Vietnam, and other nations does not justify the United States taking the law into its own hands, so to speak, and setting itself up as the policeman of the world to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954.

That is the responsibility under the international law, of the United Nations, or of a regional organization that is qualified to function under the authorization of the United Nations. No, Mr. President, we cannot justify our illegalities in South Vietnam, our unjustifiable killing of American boys, or our participation in the killing of thousands of Vietnamese on both sides in that great war on that great hypocritical pretense that we are there only because others are violating the Geneva accords of 1954. The time has come for us to seek peaceful procedures to stop violations by all parties, including ourselves.

Mr. President, the American action in southeast Asia has been the action characteristic of a provocateur. We have provoked incident after incident in South Vietnam. There is no question that the borders of North Vietnam have been violated with our knowledge. There is no question that we are supplying materiel for those violations. We cannot even get a categorical denial from this administration that our own so-called military advisers have participated in some of those transgressions.

Mr. President, as I said last year, we were a provocateur in the Tonkin Bay. We knew in advance of the bombing of the North Vietnam islands that was going to take place by the South Vietnam ships that we furnished, that we armed, by the personnel that we trained. We kept our own destroyers in the proximity of the bombing, in constant radio communication with our headquarters in Saigon. We stated that we had a right to do what we did. We had a right to be where we were. I have never denied that. We were on the high seas. And we had a right to defend our ships from attack. But, after we defended those ships, we had no right to commit an act of aggression against the mainland of North Vietnam.

That was an act of war on the part of the United States. As I said in the Senate at the time, and repeat today, what we should have done at that time, once our ships were defended, was to take the charge of the violation of international law by North Vietnam to the United Nations immediately, and lay our charges before the United Nations. We should have found out if that body has become nothing but a chatterbox, or is a great fortress, enforcing the peace of the world.

I want to find out whether the United Nations has become naught but a great debating society, or is an organized body of nations pledged to enforce the peace.

Mr. President, we have not taken our case to the United Nations. What are we afraid of? I think the American people are entitled to have an answer to that question. The only way to get an answer will be to have this administration, under this great President, lay the South Vietnam crisis before the United Nations and find out how much multilateral support we can get. As I say in the Syracuse lecture, I have asked for nothing more than what Franklin Delano Roosevelt asked for 20 years ago at Teheran when he proposed at the Teheran Conference that all of Indochina be placed under an international trusteeship. He was blocked by Winston Churchill. As I point out in the lecture, Franklin Delano Roosevelt knew that the British would not favor it because of the British colonial policy in southeast Asia. France has already learned. The Dutch have learned. The British are learning, and the Americans ought to learn that white-man colonialism in Asia is as dead as a dodo. We are not going to save it by killing American boys.

What the United States has to face up to is the reality that Asians are going to control Asia.

One further word about the fallacious Dulles theory about the dominoes, that all of Asia will go down if one of the countries goes down. What nonsense that is. Tell it to Burma. Tell it to Cambodia. Tell it to Australia. Tell it to New Zealand.

Even the Prime Minister of India in the press today came out against American military action in South Vietnam.

The best way for the United States to lose its sphere of influence in Asia is to stay in South Vietnam on a unilateral basis.

I shall support our staying in, and have always tried to make it clear that I shall support our staying in on a multilateral peacekeeping basis, but not on a warmaking basis. In the Senate, I shall enthusiastically support funds for military assistance to a peacekeeping corps, to supply our fair share of men for a peacekeeping corps, acting under the jurisdiction of any one of the three agencies that I have mentioned, SEATO, a reconvened 14-nation conference, or the United Nations.

But if the ultimate choice is given us of staying there on a unilateral basis, with no jurisdiction being exercised under existing international law procedures by any one of these three groups I have mentioned, or getting out, then I am for getting out. But not until then. I do not think we will ever have to get out, because I think we will be surprised by the enthusiastic response that a relieved world will give to the kind of international statesmanship I am calling upon my Government to exercise in respect to South Vietnam. I think it will be hailed around the world.

Of course, we shall have great difficulties with that kind of operation, but we are going to have even more difficulty with warmaking policies we are following that bring us to the brink of war.

Note, I am not talking about token support. I am talking about good faith, full support, on an international law basis, with the membership, preferably, of the United Nations, in which a peacekeeping corps, with whatever numbers and at whatever financial cost may be necessary will carry out the principle which Franklin Roosevelt proposed 20 years ago for this area. That was for an international jurisdiction—call it trusteeship or whatever one wants to call it, but international jurisdiction—based on a cease-fire order, that would bring about stability and freedom in South Vietnam.

That statement causes me to comment that all this talk about freedom has no bearing upon reality in South Vietnam, for there is no freedom in South Vietnam, and there has never been any freedom in South Vietnam since the United States took over. There has been no freedom in South Vietnam since the first American puppet, Diem, became the first dictator of South Vietnam, followed by General Minh, followed by Khanh, and now followed by complete chaos. Freedom? South Vietnam is ruled by military tyrants acting under military dictatorships carrying out American orders.

No; we are not going to help the cause of reality, or the cause of stability, or of freedom, in South Vietnam that way. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense have said that North Vietnam and Red China and others should leave South Vietnam alone. If we would go over there, we would find in countries in that area that the sentiment is for the United States to let South Vietnam alone. The truth is that the war there is a civil war. It is not a war between two nations. It is a war civil in nature. It is true that North Vietnam is receiving assistance, but it is true also that South Vietnam is getting aid from the United States, in the amount of over $1.5 million a day now; and since the war began in 1946, $6 billion of the taxpayers' money have been poured into South Vietnam, not covering the cost of keeping American forces there. Much of that, I want to say, and I say it sadly, has resulted in great waste and has produced great corruption in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, we are not going to end this civil war by any of the courses of action being recommended by the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon Building. We cannot win this war by the policies we are following. We can win military victories. We can bomb and kill by the thousands. We can destroy the cities of Red China and Vietnam. We can destroy the nuclear installations of Red China. But we will lose the war, for, do not forget, we are dealing with a people and a philosophy of a people to whom time does not matter. And after we win all these military victories, what are we going to do with South Vietnam and North Vietnam and

Laos and Red China and the rest of the nations that will be involved, assuming for the moment that we might get into a nuclear war? We would have to police them for decades. We have neither the manpower nor the resources to rebuild that part of Asia after that type of war. We will inherit as a legacy for generations of Americans yet to come the undying hatred of the yellow man. He will hate us for hundreds of years. It will be an unending war. Let us think not in terms of the present time, but let us think in terms of the next 100 years. We have the responsibility in our time to lay out courses of action that will not produce the type of holocaust that will bring about for millions of American boys and girls the hatred of many people of the world that will be incurred if we continue to pursue our course of action in South Vietnam.

TOKEN ASSISTANCE

I said I would make a brief comment on token assistance. I am very disturbed about some of the activity on the part of the State Department, through the American embassies in Latin America, urging the heads of Latin American countries and high officials in those States to at least send something to South Vietnam—an ambulance or a medical corps or some contingency of assistance—so that it can be said by American officialdom that "We have the following nations in." The American people are not going to be fooled by that kind of hypocrisy, either. The American people are not going to be fooled by token assistance. I happen to know that there is already resentment on the part of some of those people—I speak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs—with this approach. We are told it is going to be used by Communists and non-Communists as pointing up that, because we provide so much foreign aid to Latin America, we are using it as a means of pressure to obtain token support in Latin America for our policy in Asia.

It should be repudiated. The State Department should desist from any such course of action.

Let us find out where the Latin Americans stand in the United Nations. Let us find out where the Latin American countries stand with respect to the proposal for the reconvening of a 14-nation conference on the war in South Vietnam. Let us find out where the Latin Americans stand on SEATO as offering a jurisdictional basis. Let them pledge their support, if pledge their support they will, to an international organization; but not to the United States, which is conducting this unjustified unilateral military action in South Vietnam.

Such a course of action, of seeking to get token support from nations into whose coffers we are pouring millions of dollars in military and economic aid is a great mistake, and it ought to be stopped immediately.

From time to time I shall discuss the unjustifiable course of action of my country in South Vietnam. Let me say, as I have said before, if a declaration of war is recommended by the President, and the Congress of the United States passes that declaration of war, the senior Senator from Oregon will take the position that we must unite behind the declaration and do what we can to bring that war to a speedy and successful end. But until there is a declaration of war, our position in South Vietnam cannot be reconciled by the Constitution of the United States. Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, only Congress can declare war, and no President has the right to make war on such a sustained basis as he is making it in South Vietnam in the absence of a declaration of war. Let the record show that if I were asked to vote for a declaration of war tonight in connection with South Vietnam, I would vote against it, because in my judgment the facts do not warrant our declaring war. If the facts remain that way, if, as, and when a declaration of war is proposed, I shall vote against it.

But, if the facts change, so as to justify a declaration of war under our Constitution, the senior Senator from Oregon will vote for it.

However, we should not be talking about war at all. We should be talking about how best to bring about peace in southeast Asia.

I intend to continue here, and across the country, to offer the proposal that I have offered for more than a year, of submitting this war in South Vietnam, as far as the U.S. participation in it is concerned, to one of three agencies that I have outlined again in this speech. We must do more than prate about substituting the rule of law for the jungle law of military force; we must practice it; we must stop being hypocrites about it. We must live our ideal of peaceful pursuit in connection with disputes that threaten the peace of the world.

I close this subject matter, before I turn to my next one, by asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a lecture I delivered at Syracuse University on December 14, 1964, entitled "Is Our Policy in Vietnam Leading the United States Into War?"

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

IS OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM LEADING THE UNITED STATES INTO WAR?

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE before Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., December 14, 1964)

A few weeks ago, people laughed when presidential candidate Barry Goldwater talked blithely of "interdicting" the routes from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, especially by use of chemicals and radiation to defoliate the trees that conceal the jungle trails.

But today there is every evidence that the American Ambassador has returned to Saigon from Washington with something very similar to the Goldwater prescription for the civil war in South Vietnam.

A traditional signpost that points to this conclusion is the increased emphasis in the White House communique on the Taylor talks, in the statements by the Vietnamese Ambassador in Washington, and from official sources in Saigon, upon infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam through Laos into South Vietnam.

This new emphasis is in total contrast to the previous official testimony on this point presented to the Foreign Relations Committee. In fact, no new evidence has been offered to change the assessment that the great bulk of the Vietcong rebels were local residents, that close to 90 percent of their weapons were captured from Government sources, and that their civil war against the Government would continue whether or not it received aid or leadership from North Vietnam.

But the 100 percent expansion of the South Vietnamese Air Force and the drumbeating in both Washington and Saigon about alleged infiltration from North Vietnam, suggest to these experienced ears that air attacks by U.S. jets flown by United States and Vietnamese pilots will soon commence in Laos, as they may already have begun in the demilitarized zone of North Vietnam.

What this will accomplish, no one has explained. But it has long been obvious that just as Chiang Kai-shek could never return to the Chinese mainland except on the crest of a full-scale American invasion, neither can the patchwork Government of South Vietnam survive much longer except with full-scale U.S. military intervention that escalation of the war will bring about.

ORIGINS OF PRESENT POLICY

One of the most astonishing elements in the discussions of this policy is the number of Washington officials who will tell you that getting into South Vietnam was a hideous mistake, but once involved we have no choice but to continue. One wonders how much blood they are willing to spill to pursue a policy they recognize was fallacious from the beginning.

But I would like to go back to the end of World War II and examine the history of American relations with southeast Asia to see just how our policy led us to the present perilous situation.

Twenty years ago almost to the very month, the subject of postwar American policy in southeast Asia came in for study in the high levels of Government. A State Department memorandum to President Roosevelt suggested that positive announcements should be made of American policy toward the former colonial areas of southeast Asia being liberated from Japanese occupation. It suggested that specific dates for their self-government be set as objectives of American policy.

We know from Cordell Hull's memoirs that President Roosevelt heartily endorsed that policy. He believed that French dominion over Indochina should not be restored. At the Cairo and Teheran Conferences he urged that it be placed under an international trusteeship as a final step toward independence.

Cordell Hull records that only Prime Minister Churchill disagreed, and he quotes Roosevelt as saying: "The only reason (the British) seem to oppose it is that they fear the effect it would have on their possessions and those of the Dutch. They have never liked the idea of a trusteeship because it is, in some instances, aimed at future independence.

"Each case must, of course, stand on its own feet, but the case of Indochina is perfectly clear. France has milked it for 100 years. The people of Indochina are entitled to something better than that."

Today we are paying the price for our failure to carry out that policy. Within 10 years of the end of the war, the British, the Dutch, and the French largely recognized, after years of war and the expenditure of billions of dollars, that colonialism is a thing of the past. It is the United States that has failed to recognize what Mr. Roosevelt knew to be true: The era of white rule in Asia is finished, whether it takes the form of economic exploitation through direct rule or the form of manipulating governments to protect what we regard to be our interest—the postwar American form of colonialism.

Roosevelt's policy died with him. Our primary interest became one of bowing to French wishes in all international matters to guarantee her support and participation in NATO, and we began financing the French effort to recapture Indochina. We put over $1¼ billion into that futile struggle. And when the French finally gave up, we took it over ourselves.

WANTED: A WESTERN FOOTHOLD

All in all, it has cost American taxpayers $5½ billion, exclusive of the cost of our own forces, to try to keep a Western foothold in southeast Asia. Some writers are working hard to convince the American people that all we are doing is maintaining a historic American policy. Journalistic spokesmen for the Defense Department are vehement in declaiming that to lose our foothold in Vietnam is to lose all we fought for in the Pacific in World War II.

Nothing is further from the truth. Never in our history have we had any kind of foothold on the mainland of Asia. Before World War II, the most we ever had was the Philippines, which we voluntarily relinquished in 1935 and formally freed in 1945. Since 1945, we have maintained base rights in the Philippines, as in Japan; and we have kept a base in Okinawa, won by conquest. Our present "foothold" in South Korea is a legacy of World War II, not its objective.

What these Defense Department spokesmen really have in mind are not the strictly American footholds and bases in that part of the world but the whole network of French, Dutch, and British possessions that in World War II were freely used by Americans in the prosecution of the war against Japan. The possibility that these staging areas should no longer be available for use at our pleasure vis-a-vis China is for many of them so unthinkable that they believe it is worth a war to retain at least one of them.

When France finally gave up the struggle in Indochina, the United States refused to sign the Geneva Accord of 1954, which ended the war. And we prevailed upon a new government we had chosen to back in South Vietnam not to sign it either. We began to send military aid early in 1955, and we, along with South and North Vietnam, were found by the International Control Commission to be in violation of the treaty.

The sad truth is that the threats of leading American officials to make war on China and the present war crisis, are the logical end of the dismal road in Indochina that John Foster Dulles set us upon in 1954. After failing in his efforts to keep the French fighting on in Indochina, despite American aid to their war effort and the promise of direct U.S. military action, Dulles refused to put the signature of the United States on the Geneva agreement of 1954 which marked the end of French rule there. South Vietnam also declined to sign. The most the United States said about the 1954 agreement was that we would recognize it as international law and regard violations with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

Among the provisions of the 1954 accords was article 16: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

An exception was made for rotation of personnel, meaning French, already there.

Article 17 provided: "(a) With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions, and other war materials, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines, and jet weapons and armored vehicles is prohibited."

Again, an exception was made for replacement on the basis of piece for piece of the same type and with similar characteristics.

Article 18: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the establishment of new military bases is prohibited through Vietnam territory."

For 10 years we have claimed that North Vietnam was violating the accord by sending in help to the rebels against the South Vietnamese Government. But our solution was not to go to the parties who signed the agreement and who were responsible for its enforcement. Nor did we go to the United Nations, the sole international body with jurisdiction over threats to the peace.

Instead we multiplied our own violations by joining in the fighting. Each time we increase the number of American boys sent to that country to "advise" the local troops we violate the Geneva agreement of 1954. Every jet plane, every helicopter, every naval vessel we furnish South Vietnam or man with American servicemen is a violation, and so is every military base and airstrip we have constructed there.

Yet we hypocritically proclaim to ourselves and the world that we are there only to enforce the Geneva agreement.

Part of the 1954 agreement established an International Control Commission of Poland, India, and Canada to investigate complaints of violations. As early as its report covering 1956, this Commission found both North and South Vietnam had violated the accords of 1954, the latter in conjunction with the U.S. military aid activities.

The independent Commission, consisting of Poland, India, and Canada, found as early as 1956, that both North Vietnam and South Vietnam were in violation of the accords, and that the United States was in violation with them, because of the military aid that we supplied in direct violation of the articles of the accord which I have previously read.

Immediately upon the signing of the 1954 agreement, the United States began to support the new government of South Vietnam in a big way. In the letter President Eisenhower wrote President Diem, a letter still serving as the basis for our policy in 1964, aid was pledged to Diem, and in turn, "the Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

NO FREEDOM OR DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

In 1964, President Johnson refers to that letter as the basis for our aid, but the part about reforms has long since been forgotten.

In the decade following 1954, the United States for all practical purposes made a protectorate out of South Vietnam. Its new government immediately became financially dependent upon us; as rebellion against it grew, our level of aid was stepped up. By 1961, we had to send 15,000 American troops as "advisers" to the local military forces. Today, the figure is 22,000.

When the Diem government diverted itself from fighting rebels to fighting Buddhists, a coup by military proteges of the United States overthrew it. Within a few weeks, another coup replaced the Minh junta with what American advisers considered a more efficient military junta under General Khanh. In turn, the Khanh government has been succeeded by a series of coalitions, the current one being headed by Tran Van Huong.

At no time have the people of this unfortunate country had a government of their own choosing. In fact, the Khanh junta justified its coup with the excuse that some Minh officers were pro-French, and might seek some way of neutralizing the country. Just how these various creations of the U.S. Government differ from the old Bao Dai government which served as the French puppet, I have never been able to see. Yet American leaders talk piously of defending freedom in South Vietnam.

We say that one of our objectives is the enforcement of the 1954 agreement. But it has never been explained why we have any business enforcing by force of arms an agreement to which neither we nor our client country is a signatory.

Nor is it explained why enforcement can only take the form of massive violations by ourselves of articles 16, 17, and 18 of that agreement.

In the case of Laos, we did sign the Geneva accord of 1962, which sought to neutralize that country. Hence, we claim that the violations we have committed ourselves were undertaken only after North Vietnam violated the accord first. Our violations have taken the form of sending armed planes flown by American pilots over Laos.

The 1962 agreement permits military equipment to be brought into the country at the request of the Laotian Government, but it forbids "the introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations, and foreign military personnel into Laos."

Any American planes raiding Laos, whether flown by Americans or South Vietnamese, will be in violation of the 1962 Laotian accord.

Now we are faced with the collapse of the government we have been supporting. It is becoming obvious that it was not a case of our aiding an established government; but of having created and maintained in office a whole series of governments that have had little or no support among the people.

We have been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time, instead of seeking to keep the peace. It was inevitable and inexorable that we would have to engage in overt acts of war as we are now doing.

There never was a time when it was possible for us to impose a government upon the people of South Vietnam without constant fighting to keep it in power. Nor was it possible to "bring the boys home by 1965," or by any other date. Never could the war be fought and won in South Vietnam alone, because the Khanh junta—and any of its successors and predecessors—could not survive without the massive and direct American military backing that is possible only if the war is expanded.

OUR INTERESTS NOT THEIRS

The United States is, of course, a full partner in the Government of South Vietnam. I am satisfied that since 1954 we have been a provocateur of military conflict in southeast Asia and marched away from our obligations to international law.

In recent months, evidence has mounted that both the Pentagon and the State Department were preparing to escalate the war into Laos and North Vietnam. American forces in nearby bases in the Philippines and Okinawa have been poised for air attacks on Laos and North Vietnam. The 7th Fleet has moved into the South China Sea and the Gulf of Tonkin, while the entry of ground forces through Thailand into Laos has been prepared.

Last August, vessels we had furnished to South Vietnam were used to shell two islands in the Tonkin Gulf belonging to North Vietnam. Meanwhile, American naval vessels patrolled a few miles seaward in international waters.

Those vessels were pursued by northern PT boats. Anticipating an attack, our destroyers began the exchange of fire while they were still some 3 miles away. After the second such incident, a well-planned retaliatory air raid was carried out against the ports harboring the PT boats.

This raid was not self-defense on our part; it was supposed to be a "lesson" to North Vietnam. It was supposed to give her a taste of what would happen to her if she did not cease and desist from what we regard as her interference in the affairs of South Vietnam. Today, one can only conclude that the lesson was lost.

It is evident that our military policymakers believe that our losses in South Vietnam must be covered by fighting elsewhere. Not able to win the battle against the local rebels, they believe American interests must be served by fighting where the power of American weapons superiority can be brought into play.

Shortly before the election, James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "While the political situation in Saigon is said officially to be deteriorating, the administration insists that there is no danger of collapse there in the foreseeable future, and Ambassador Maxwell Taylor has stated this week that the Communist military assault on South Vietnam is further from success now than ever before. If this is true, it is difficult to understand why some prominent officials, a few weeks before a national election, should be talking so openly about expanding the war, and not only advocating but almost lobbying for such a course of action.

"It is even possible now to hear officials of this Government talking casually about how easy it would be to 'provoke an incident' in the Gulf of Tonkin that would justify an attack on North Vietnam and thus, according to this thesis, enable the United States to bring strong military pressure on the Communists there to let up on their pressure on South Vietnam."

As Mr. Reston points out, our policy always has been described as helping a people remain free from Communist domination. We have stated over and over again that the war had to be fought and won in South Vietnam because the rebels were people of South Vietnam and the great bulk of their weapons were taken from Government forces or brought by defectors from Government armies.

The fact that it is really American interests and not the interests of South Vietnam about which we are concerned is coming to the surface. Now, we hear that American prestige cannot take the blow of a retreat from South Vietnam; and if the war cannot be won there, then we must display our strength somewhere else. Our objective is no longer to help another people, but to maintain an American military presence on the mainland of Asia.

The discrepancy between our announced interests and our real interests is the source of much of our difficulty with American public opinion about southeast Asia. As long as the fiction could be maintained that we were helping a people remain "free," support for almost any U.S. involvement could be expected. But the disintegration of the political fabric of South Vietnam has exposed this discrepancy.

The signs from official Washington indicate a recognition among even the most ardent advocates of this U.S. policy in Vietnam that it has been a failure. Of the alternatives now being discussed, the one espoused so long by General Taylor and Secretary McNamara for increased U.S. aid is rarely heard.

That is because the preponderance of American money and military equipment is already so heavy that additional increments could not affect the situation. South Vietnam—at least the third or so of it still under Government control—has for many months been completely saturated with U.S. money, U.S. military equipment, and U.S. advisers, both political and military.

Still the tide runs against us. Still the political condition of the country deteriorates, and still the Vietcong raid with greater success and audacity.

So General Khanh openly calls for attacks on North Vietnam by the United States. And his frank recognition of the failure of past U.S. policy is being echoed by more and more of the American community of policymakers who devised it in the first place.

The theory they are now advancing is that the leadership for the Vietcong movement comes from North Vietnam and if we inflict heavy damage upon the industry and transportation network of that country, it will cease and desist from whatever succor it is giving the Vietcong.

All this assumes, of course, that the body and the muscle of the Vietcong resistance would be rendered helpless without the vague and unknown amount of direction it receives from the north. It further assumes that only the United States will decide to escalate the conflict and that North Vietnam and China will not respond by increasing their level of participation.

These assumptions are so unsound as to render the theory even less likely to succeed than the present policy. They are sheer guesswork, and they are the product more of embarrassment and frustration than of careful thought about the long-range interests of the United States.

IGNORING THE U.N. CHARTER

If we expand the war into Laos, North Vietnam, or China, in the name of protecting our investment in South Vietnam, it will be an outright American aggrandizement of the kind we have not embarked upon since the Mexican War. We will not only be inviting disaster but will be flouting every principle of international policy we have espoused since World War II.

Not the least of these is our signature on the U.N. Charter and our support of its activities. If our signature means anything, it requires us to observe article 2, section 4: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Other charter provisions are specific as to the duty of nations when they find themselves involved in a dispute. Article 33 states:

"Section 1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Notice that the controlling verb is "shall." This is not an option but a directive. So far, it has been ignored by the United States.

It is commonly said both in and out of government that the U.N. is a waste of time and that the Communists understand nothing but force. However, the line continues; maybe at some future date we will find it to our interest to go to the U.N. This supposedly sophisticated argument ignores several points.

First, it may not be left to us to decide whether and when the issue should go to that body. Article 35 provides that "any member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34 (threats to international peace), to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly." This means that if we wait for another country to invoke article 35, we can be sure it will not be under conditions most favorable to us.

Second, the assumption by administration spokesmen that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances we will seek U.N. action is an admission that the issue is really one of U.N. jurisdiction. What they are saying is that to adhere to the charter now would not serve American interests: the time to negotiate is when we dominate the battlefield.

This amounts to saying that any treaty obligation that does not serve our national interest is just a scrap of paper. These officials take the view that we may one day resurrect the charter from the wastebasket but not until we think it serves our interests.

If this is to be our policy, then we are helping to destroy the United Nations and all the advances in the rule of law in world affairs that it represents. This will undermine our moral position and seriously compromise our capacity for calling others to account for breaches of the peace. This is already the case in connection with Mr. Sukarno's aggressions against Malaysia.

Third, the "fight now, negotiate later" line is based on the wholly illusory assumption that Red China and North Vietnam will do what we refuse to do—negotiate when they are losing. Can we really expect that when China is in the same situation in which she was in Korea, she will negotiate instead of pouring her hordes into the fray? I know no reason to justify either this wishful thinking or the head-in-the-sand attitude that if we kill enough and bomb enough, North Vietnam and Red China will yield.

UNITED STATES ISOLATED IN ASIA

There is yet another element to this problem that has largely been ignored. That is the isolation we would create for ourselves in Asia.

There is no evidence that any other nation would join us in expansion of the war into Laos or North Vietnam. Although a spokesman for Thailand recently proposed that military forces from other Far Eastern nations join the United States in the fighting, not even Thailand has actually sent any. There are no British, New Zealand, French, Filipino or Pakistani forces in Vietnam, either, yet all are members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under whose terms we claim we are acting in South Vietnam.

Prime Minister Wilson has rejected a request by President Johnson that Britain send troops to join ours. But so did the President reject Wilson's request that the United States help fry Britain's fish in Malaysia. Apparently each country will act unilaterally in those places with a moratorium on criticism of any illegalities or threats to world peace that may result.

Of SEATO members, only Australia has sent a token force. It now amounts to perhaps 60 to 70 men, with a few air transport planes and crews promised for the future.

That is the measure of how our SEATO allies feel about fighting in Vietnam.

The SEATO organization, in the first meeting of its foreign ministers in 1955, adopted what amounts to a bylaw requiring that all action taken by the treaty organization shall be by unanimous agreement. Flat opposition by France and Pakistan has foreclosed any formal military action in Vietnam by SEATO.

Indeed, the largest newspaper in Pakistan, Jang, recently editorialized: "As long as the United States is allowed to remain in the area she will continue to involve countries of the area in war. This is because the United States is out to encircle and destroy the People's Republic of China."

Even Australia is expressing alarm about the possible escalation of the war. The Daily Mirror, of Sydney, a relatively conservative Australian paper, said on November 26:

"DON'T BOMB HANOI

"There are ominous signs that renewed efforts are about to be made in Washington to stampede the Johnson administration into agreeing to bomb North Vietnam.

"This would be the last throw in an effort to end the civil war that has racked South Vietnam for so long.

"Any such reckless action could well prove to be disastrous. At the best it is not likely to achieve its objective. At its worst it could start a Korea-type war, with Chinese intervention, which might spread nobody knows where.

"The American Ambassador to South Vietnam, General Maxwell Taylor, left Saigon yesterday to confer with President Johnson and Defense Department officials.

"Before leaving he gave an indication of his thinking when he said that Communist forces 'outside South Vietnam' had played a major role in supporting the Communist Vietcong insurgents.

"The reference was clear. Support for the rebels, in his view, comes from North Vietnam. It is logical to assume that he is thinking about attacking Hanoi, the capital, and other strategic targets across the border. For some time a steady flow of propaganda from the 'bomb Hanoi' school in Washington has been trying to prepare the American people for such action.

"Yet there is very little evidence that support for the Vietcong is coming from the north. They are strongest in the southern tip of South Vietnam, farthest from North Vietnam, and they are armed largely with American weapons captured from the Government forces.

"They are, in fact, a strongly organized Communist movement capitalizing on popular dissatisfaction with the rottenness of successive administrations in Saigon. It is a serious fallacy to think that bombing North Vietnam would end their activities.

"Two of the most influential British newspapers, the Guardian and the Times, condemn the proposal to extend the war. The Guardian says that even if the present propaganda campaign is merely designed to put the United States in a better bargaining position, it still does not seem a good idea.

"The Times says that the dangers 'scarcely need pointing out.' One of the risks, it says, is of Chinese intervention, and it adds: 'One of the fallacies of the past 5 years in South Vietnam has been that the guerrillas in the south were a creation of the north and not a genuine revolt against misgovernment.'

"The French, who have bitter cause to know more about the situation in Indochina than anybody else, also oppose bombing North Vietnam."

"After 16 years of ruinous civil war surely commonsense would dictate to Washington that a political, not a military, solution is the answer."

Although India is the one country of Asia most threatened by China, even India has no desire to see a war break out, because in conditions of war between the United States and anyone in Asia, nuclear weapons would be used sooner or later. Moreover, like Australia, India knows that in war, nations lose control of events. Nations are controlled by wars, and not the other way around.

Official opinion in India has been expressed for a 14-nation conference on Vietnam. That is the most sympathetic view of our position among any of the leading nations of Asia.

How much further do we want to dig ourselves into this pit, started by the Eisenhower administration and deepened by the Kennedy administration?

FUTURE OF UNITED STATES IN ASIA UP TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

That question is going to have to be answered by President Johnson alone. It is too bad that all these chickens have all come home to roost on his doorstep; but there they are.

The resolution passed last August by Congress gave the President a blank check to use force in Asia. As a legal statement it means little; but it was sought and given as a political backstop. On two other occasions, similar resolutions authorizing a President to use armed force in given areas led right straight to war. One was with Mexico in 1846 and a second was with Spain in 1898. Those resolutions, like the current one, were supposed to prevent war by warning an adversary of our intentions. But both had to be followed by declarations of war.

President Johnson has said little in public on this matter except for what he said in a New Hampshire campaign speech last September 28, 1964. In responding to the Goldwater prescription, he said:

"So just for the moment I have not thought that we were ready for American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. What I have been trying to do, with the situation that I found, was to get the boys in Vietnam to do their own fighting with our advice and with our equipment. That is the course we are following. So we are not going north and drop bombs at this stage of the game, and we are not going south and run out and leave it for the Communists to take over. We have lost 190 American lives, and to each one of those 190 families this is a major war. We lost that many in Texas on the 4th of July in wrecks. But I often wake up in the night and think about how many I could lose if I made a misstep. When we retaliated in the Tonkin Gulf, we dropped bombs on their nests where they had their PT boats housed, and we dropped them within 35 miles of the Chinese border. I don't know what you would think if they started dropping them 35 miles from your border, but I think that that is something you have to take into consideration.

"So we are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them. We think that losing 190 lives in the period that we have been out there is bad, but it is not like 190,000 that we might lose the first month if we escalated that war. So we are trying somehow to evolve a way, as we have in some other places, where the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists finally, after getting worn down, conclude that they will leave their neighbors alone, and if they do we will come home tomorrow."

The question now is whether President Johnson can bring himself to do the only thing that can be done in Asia to escape an expanded war: to bring other interested parties into a multilateral political agreement for southeast Asia.

This could take the form of a United Nations jurisdiction along the lines proposed so wisely by President Roosevelt; or it could take the form of seeking a SEATO action that would police South Vietnam while a political solution is developed; or it could take the form of a new 14-nation conference among the same nations that arranged the 1954 Geneva accord.

The further we go in expanding the war—the more agreements we violate and the more people we kill in the name of peace—the more military opposition we harden against us in North Vietnam and China—the more we alienate ourselves from the now-Communist nations in that part of the world—the more impossible any peaceful solution becomes.

In the last 10 years we have learned that we are not masters of events in Vietnam, despite our billions of dollars and our thousands of troops on the scene. It has not been shown that any stepped-up investment of blood or money will make us masters.

It still is not too late for President Johnson to lead the American people out of this morass. Whether he leads us out or further in, will be the first great test of his administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said earlier in this speech, since Congress adjourned last fall, from time to time, I have discussed the war in South Vietnam. In order to keep the record straight—I understand there are those who have been heard to say that I have been surprisingly silent on the subject matter during the adjournment—I ask unanimous consent that the following press releases on the subject matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

The press releases of November 23, 1964, November 27, 1964, December 22, 1964, December 23, 1964, December 24, 1964, December 30, 1964, and January 5, 1965.

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

NOVEMBER 23, 1964.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in a press statement today that "widespread circulation is being given in today's press to a State Department and Pentagon Building trial balloon on South Vietnam.

"The dope story is that Ambassador Taylor is on his way back to the United States from South Vietnam to recommend an expansion of the South Vietnam war into North Vietnam and Laos by United States bombing a limited number of selected targets and bases in North Vietnam and Laos.

"I hope there is no basis in fact for these stories of proposed warmaking. On the other hand, if they prove to be accurate, then in my judgment, Ambassador Taylor should be summarily fired and all others in the State Department and Pentagon Building who may be associated with him in any such recommendation of international outlawry on the part of the United States.

"It was on General Taylor's recommendation of 1961 that 21,000 U.S. military personnel, much of the 7th Fleet, and extensive air forces are now floundering in Vietnam.

"The new adventures he is alleged to be proposing would only shove this country even deeper into an Asian quicksand.

"The United States is not legally at war with North Vietnam or any other country in Asia although it is true that we are engaged in unilateral military action in South Vietnam in violation of our international treaty obligations under the United Nations Charter. In the absence of a declaration of war, the State Department and the Pentagon Building cannot justify under international law the continuation of our acts of aggression against the borders of North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

"Contrary to repeated newspaper misrepresentations of my position of the past year in opposition to United States military action in South Vietnam, I have not advocated only that the United States stop making war in South Vietnam; but rather I have advocated that the United States insist that the United Nations or SEATO or a reconvening of the 14-nation Geneva Conference assume jurisdiction over the threat to world peace in southeast Asia.

"I have advocated that the United States contribute its share of assistance to the establishment of such a United Nations program which would amount, in effect, to the setting up of a United Nations trusteeship over war-stricken South Vietnam until peace can be restored. This, in essence, is the same program as President Franklin Roosevelt recommended for all of Indochina 20 years ago.

"If the State Department and the Pentagon Building continue with advocating expansion of the South Vietnam civil war into a war against North Vietnam and Laos and possibly Red China by American military forces, the American people will rightly hold this administration to accounting. Every day produces increased evidence that the American people are becoming fed up with the continuation of unjustified slaughter of American boys in southeast Asia.

"The unilateral military action of the United States in Asia should be stopped, and our Government should insist that the procedures of international law applied through

the United Nations Charter should be used in meeting the threat to world peace in Asia which is growing more dangerous by the day."

NOVEMBER 27, 1964.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, issued the following statement today on the southeast Asia crisis:

"Ambassador Maxwell Taylor is back in the United States appearing on television, radio and in press conferences where he is spreading his propaganda and alibis in support of increased United States military action in southeast Asia.

"Taylor should be kept in the United States permanently. His Deputy Ambassador, Alexis Johnson, should be recalled along with him. These two Ambassadors have not only been complete failures as far as bringing about greater internal stability in South Vietnam but they have been in league with war expansionists in the South Vietnamese military establishment, headed by America's No. 1 puppet, General Khanh.

"Taylor's last appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee convinced me that he is a key leader among United States military and State Department warmongers who are seeking to extend the war in Asia in the absence of a declaration of war.

"Any proposal to use American men or equipment to commit acts of bombing, selective or general, in North Vietnam, Laos or elsewhere in Asia in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress, constitutes acts of aggression on the part of the United States. Such military action by the United States would make our country the most serious threat to the peace of the world.

"The slaughter of American boys in South Vietnam and the continued killing of both South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese, as the result of illegal and unjustifiable aggressive unilateral military action by the United States in southeast Asia, constitutes the writing of a bloody and shameful page in United States history. Our Government, to date, has made no attempt to take the southeast Asia war to the conference tables of the United Nations or to the negotiations of a reconvened Geneva Conference.

"Instead our Government is permitting the Pentagon Building and the State Department to conduct an undeclared war in Asia to the consternation of millions of people throughout the world, including people in the United States.

"A civil war prevails in South Vietnam. It cannot be settled by unilateral United States intervention. The Pentagon Building and the State Department are playing into the hands of our despicable Communist enemies, and they are frightening our friends among the free nations of the world who want no part of United States outlawry in Asia.

"The time has come for the American people to make clear to the Johnson administration that the slaughter of American boys in southeast Asia must stop immediately.

"The time has come for member nations of the United Nations to impose all the sanctions of international law available through the procedures of the United Nations Charter to stop the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Red China and Russia from a further endangering of the peace of the world by expanding the civil war in South Vietnam to a major war in Asia."

DECEMBER 22, 1964.—"Our bankrupt policy in Vietnam has reached the point where we cannot even put together a government," Senator MORSE said today.

"General Khanh and his fellow military progeny of the American aid program have no capacity to govern, nor even to carry out the military end of the civil war. Apparently they do not intend to let anyone else govern, either.

"This chaos in South Vietnam is the fruit of 10 years of American mistakes. It is the result of installing one clique of corrupt tinhorn generals after another to carry out American interests, with no thought whatsoever for the interests or well-being of the 14 million people of South Vietnam.

"These generals and their civilian counterparts have been living off American aid for 10 years. They have made corruption a way of life. They have done nothing to unite their country or to reform their society so as to remove the appeal of the Vietcong, and they never will so long as American boys are there to die for the status quo. These men are accomplished only in maladministration.

"To place the lives of American soldiers at the mercy of these flunkies is to throw away those lives. The administration must stop concealing from the American people the futility of what we are being asked to do in Vietnam, and the futility of the American deaths there.

"It is obvious that there is no will among its people to fight the rebels. There is no incentive for 14 million people in South Vietnam to put down some 35,000 rebels. The only incentive is with those who have waxed fat off American aid, but for them the status quo is the most profitable situation. We must stop protecting these corruptionists with American lives.

"There must be a complete change in our policy and a complete change in the personnel responsible for it. The administration must face the fact that the Taylor-McNamara policy is a failure. It must stop the further slaughter of American boys and start finding the political solutions that should have been devised 10 years ago. Those whose advise brought the country to this debacle must be replaced with men willing to do what should have been done long ago, and that is to place Vietnam under international auspices."

Senator WAYNE MORSE, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today made the following statement about South Vietnam:

"President Johnson must lay the Vietnam problem before the United Nations. The loss of one more American life in defense of the hopeless chaos in South Vietnam would be inexcusable.

"The military and civilian factions in Saigon are indulging in their struggle for power with the understanding that American military power will always protect them from their excesses and from whatever follies they may commit. The masses of the South Vietnamese people, however, are demonstrating no interest in defending their country for the benefit of these factions and profiteers.

"Sending American boys to their death for these greedy and incompetent cliques should no longer be sanctioned by the American people.

"President Johnson cannot justify further pursuit of the costly and dangerous Taylor-McNamara policy in that country."

DECEMBER 24, 1964.—Senator MORSE said today that Secretary Rusk's press conference remarks about South Vietnam "were further evidence that Rusk's department has failed to work out a sound American policy in South Vietnam.

"His feeble platitudes did not hide the fact that American soldiers are being sacrificed for a small group of men in South Vietnam who live off American aid. Americans are not dying for anyone's freedom in Vietnam; they are dying only to save a few 'faces' in Saigon and Washington.

"It is the Pentagon that has fashioned the present disastrous policy in Vietnam. It is a policy that promises perpetual war at best, and a bigger and expanded war at worst.

"Mr. Rusk must know that only Vietnamese will ever unify Vietnam. Americans will only divide it so long as any faction there depends upon U.S. aid for its existence. There will never be any American-sponsored 'unity' in South Vietnam. What we need from Mr. Rusk is not more tranquilizing but an American policy in Asia that will be based on realities."

DECEMBER 30, 1964.—Speaking again today of our problems in South Vietnam, Senator WAYNE MORSE said:

"Contrary to oft-published reports, it is not my position that the United States should merely 'get out' of South Vietnam.

"We should get out in the sense that we should stop making war there for U.S. interests, and stop making an American puppet out of South Vietnam.

"That unfortunate country should be put under international auspices through the United Nations, a new 14-nation conference, or even through SEATO. In any of these procedures, there will be an important role to be played by the United States.

"It is the continued use of South Vietnam as a battleground for American interests and prestige that must stop because it can only end in disaster for the United States."

JANUARY 5, 1965.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, issued the following statement today on President Johnson's state of the Union message:

"The rhetoric of the foreign policy part of the President's speech does not camouflage successfully the illegality under our treaty obligations of American unilateral military action in South Vietnam.

"We are not defending freedom in South Vietnam, because there has never been a free government in South Vietnam. That unfortunate country has always been ruled by a dictatorship acting as American puppets.

"The American people will not be deceived much longer by the administration's propaganda about alleged freedom in South Vietnam. Only an aroused American public opinion can now stop the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me a few comments from American newspapers bearing on the subject, which I should like to make a part of my speech.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Providence Journal of December 24, 1964, entitled "U.S. Withdrawal From South Vietnam."

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

U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM SOUTH VIETNAM

The crisis in Saigon has grown to the point where American policy must be backed by firm decisions; no longer can we drift along in the hope that time will cure the Vietnamese situation. Withdrawal will be a serious blow to our prestige in Asia, but harsh facts dictate the need for tough-minded policy decisions now.

This country cannot and must not attempt to go it alone in southeast Asia or in any other region or country where our presence and our help are not wanted by local governments. We are in South Vietnam to help the Vietnamese win the war, not to replace them or to win the war for them.

Implicit in the congressional resolution authorizing American aid, including the use of armed forces, to maintain the peace and security of southeast Asia, is the understanding that nations seeking our help will establish, maintain, and observe reasonable standards of partnership.

Today in Saigon, power rests on the gun barrels of dissident young generals. Any civilian government they allow to exist will be a facade, and the thrust of attacks on

Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor makes it plain that the generals propose to rewrite the terms of partnership to their own benefit.

America cannot afford to let the generals milk us of arms and cash, turn the country into a military dictatorship, and run the war for their private prestige and personal profit. If the terms of partnership are changed unilaterally, there will be no partnership. We were asked to help—but in a common cause.

Withdrawal from Vietnam need not mean withdrawal from southeast Asia or the frustration of the congressional resolution on maintenance of peace in that area. We can still help those governments willing to fight for themselves and cooperate honorably in joint restraint of internal and external attack.

We can offer Malaysia a more active participation (with Great Britain) in the defense of that nation against Indonesian assault. We can affirm our support of Thailand, although the Thai, almost wholly surrounded by Communist or Communist-leaning countries, may elect to survive by attempting some sort of coexistence.

But most of all, we can do no less than restate our historic ties with the Philippines and Australia, our two best friends in the Pacific, each with a stable government dedicated to the principles of the free world and whose people are demonstrably ready to fight to preserve their freedoms.

Withdrawal from Vietnam, in short, need not mean the disappearance of our presence or our strength from southeast Asia. A reinforced 7th Fleet alone gives us continuing, meaningful power that even Red China will hesitate to provoke and certainly is not prepared to attack.

If we leave Saigon, we shall leave in honor, not because we broke promises to South Vietnam but because the Vietnamese refused to keep the terms of agreement under which we went there. An agreement to help is just that, not a promise of an unending free ride for a clique of power-hungry generals.

Withdrawal will not be easy, but it's time that we faced up to the prospect of leaving instead of simply appealing for a unity that grows more unlikely every day. If we do leave, we must take, however, this one solid fact with us: In the future, we must help only those nations genuinely dedicated to self-help. All else is dangerous delusion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there next follow in the RECORD a very brilliant analysis, by Richard Starnes, entitled "Shameful Mess," published in the Washington Daily News of January 4, 1965.

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

SHAMEFUL MESS

(By Richard Starnes)

The pretense of legality cloaking American intervention in southeast Asia grows more threadbare with every passing hour.

U.S. aircraft are preparing to launch strikes against parts of the miscalled Ho Chi Minh Trail that cross Laos, in clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which we signed.

The 1962 pact, which undertook to neutralize Laos, prohibits "introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations, and foreign military personnel into Laos."

Our excuse for this calculated violation of a solemn covenant is that North Vietnam violated it first. Even if this is true, it reveals a corrosive cynicism on the part of the one nation on earth that has always preached the rule of law in international affairs.

Leaving for the moment the moral and legal character of our resolve to enlarge the war, we find that the more practical aspects of the decisions are no more durable. The theory (which even our most ardent war hawks cannot really believe) is that bombing the Ho Chi Minh Trail will somehow persuade North Vietnam and Communist China to withdraw support from the Vietcong insurgency that is winning South Vietnam.

There are three tragically dangerous fallacies involved here—fallacies that could cost a great many young American lives.

Fallacy 1: That any amount of bombing (short of laying a massive radioactive carpet across the waist of the peninsula) would be effective. Korea proved that no amount of conventional bombing could diminish the enemy's ability to supply his troops. There is, moreover, not one shred of credible evidence that the bulk of munitions used by the Vietcong originate in the north. At the outset, the Vietcong used crude homemade weapons, but the bulk of their arms now are captured or otherwise acquired from the woefully inept defenders of South Vietnam.

Fallacy 2: On no evidence at all, the proponents of escalation insist that this demonstration of Western armed power would create an atmosphere in which negotiations for peace could be undertaken from a position of strength. This reasoning simply won't float, for it assumes that North Vietnam and Red China would be willing to do what we ourselves are so unwilling to do—that is, negotiate from a position of weakness.

Underlying all else is fallacy three: That the insurgency in South Vietnam is primarily an external war of aggression. Again, there is no real evidence of this. The war is nurtured and encouraged by North Vietnam, to be sure, but there is no assurance that Hanoi could stop the war even if it so willed.

In Korea we hypnotized ourselves into believing that Communist China would not enter the war. We are now in the process of repeating this catastrophic piece of self-deception. On past performance, Red China is calculated to respond in kind if the United States falls into the trap of stepping up the war in southeast Asia. It is a mistake to assume that this would simply result in another Korea. It would result in something infinitely worse, for we are now dealing with a Communist China that has the bomb.

Thus the smallest increment in the war contains the frightful seeds of nuclear holocaust.

There are, sadly, times when such terrible risks must be taken. The Cuban missile crisis was one such time, for it threatened the very existence of the American nation.

No such threat exists in South Vietnam. The fact that the Vietcong are Communists does not make the war any less a civil war. Talk that we are fighting to keep a foothold on the Asian mainland makes no more sense than the Soviet gibberish that it was installing defensive missiles in Cuba. It is equally indefensible.

American interests in the Western Pacific can be handsomely garrisoned from Okinawa, the Philippines and South Korea. There is no more military rationale for risking war over South Vietnam than there is moral or legal justification.

President Johnson needs to remind himself of Clemenceau's dictum that war is too important a concern to be left in the hands of generals, and he needs to find the courage and statecraft to extricate us from the shameful mess we are in in southeast Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a column entitled "Bipartisan Mistakes in Vietnam," written by Drew Pearson and published in the Washington Post, Friday, December 4, 1964.

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

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—BIPARTISAN MISTAKES IN VIETNAM

(By Drew Pearson)

When you read over the file on Vietnam and French Indochina, you get no tingle of American pride.

For after 18 years of Western civilian and military aid—8 under the French and 10 under the United States and after $7 billion of American money plus the services of thousands of Western advisers, South Vietnam is worse off than at the end of World War II.

Furthermore, if a vote were held in South Vietnam today, the majority of its people would probably vote to have the United States, with all its aid, all its advisers, and all its troops, go home.

These are the facts, unpleasant as they may be.

The mistakes are bipartisan. Both the Republican and the Democratic administrations made them. Both sides made grandiose promises, both waved the flag of unfulfilled achievement.

John Foster Dulles on October 6, 1953, stated that a stronger French position in Indochina was his "brighest achievement for the year."

But 1 year later, France had tossed in the sponge. It was out of Indochina altogether. Seven years later, April 20, 1961, John F. Kennedy told the American people: "We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of the new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency that we will need to combat it in Cuba or South Vietnam."

And 10 years later, January 1964, President Johnson was making the same promises: "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and materiel needed to assist you in achieving victory."

RECORD OF THE COST

One month later, Secretary of Defense McNamara made the most sensible statement of the entire 18-year period of flag waving. "I don't believe," he said, after returning from Vietnam, "that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in Vietnam. It is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves."

Meanwhile the American people have been getting only fragmentary information regarding the burden, the bungling in Vietnam. The record shows, for instance, that in 1953 the United States paid $300 million for training Vietnamese troops under the French. And General de Gaulle, believe it or not, protested.

It shows that between 1950 and 1952, the United States footed one-third of the French war bill in Indochina, sending 228 warplanes, 235 naval vessels, 775 combat vehicles, and 1,300 trucks. In 1953, furthermore, the United States spent $100 million building airstrips for the French. One year later, the French got out.

Added together we spent about as much on the French in Indochina as we spent to rebuild metropolitan France under the Marshall plan.

There was one cautioning voice at the time, that of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, later to become Senate majority leader. "We should end all but humanitarian aid to South Vietnam," he said in 1955. He later claimed, after a Senate investigation, that President Eisenhower had censored and kept secret a report on the evaluation of U.S. aid.

Aid continued at around $200 to $300 million a year under Mr. Eisenhower, then was stepped up under Mr. Kennedy. As a

Senator, J.F.K. had been one of John Foster Dulles' faithful supporters.

On October 26, 1961, he exchanged letters with President Diem regarding military assistance, following up the exchange on November 9, with 200 Air Force instructors, plus heavy amounts of Air Force equipment.

EVENTS IN 1962

By February 8, 1962, a total of 5,000 U.S. military men was in South Vietnam, actively engaged in battle. On June 25, 1962, the International Control Commission charged South Vietnam with violating the 1954 Geneva agreement by accepting U.S. military men and making a factual military alliance with the United States.

Meanwhile Presidents Kennedy and Diem had exchanged further correspondence charging the Communists of North Vietnam with unceasing violation of the Geneva treaty.

Since the assassination of President Diem there has been no political stability whatsoever. Premiers and military dictators have come and gone, some picked by the United States, none able to remain in power more than 5 minutes without the United States.

All of this is why silent sentiment has increased among the men who have to do the fighting to turn over the entire Vietnam problem to the United Nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post of December 22, 1964, entitled "Empty Sack?" It refers to an analysis of the situation in South Vietnam by the editorial writer of the Washington Post.

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

EMPTY SACK?

Unless a stable, continuing government can be established in South Vietnam, the U.S. Government, whatever its preferences and wishes, may be compelled to withdraw its aid and support. The sixth uprising in 14 months almost eliminates the assumption that there is a South Vietnam Government competent to extend a request for aid and capable of utilizing whatever aid is extended.

The rebelling generals have made it quite clear that some of the young leadership of the armed forces is interested first in promotion and pay, thereafter in personal and family prerogatives, then in the distribution of American aid and only then, if there are any intellectual or emotional resources left over, in fighting the Vietcong.

The United States has frequently expressed and has continuously demonstrated its willingness to help defend the freedom and independence of small countries who do not have the economic or military resources to defend themselves against Chinese Communist aggression. That willingness persists, but it cannot be effective in a country which is not willing or able to use its resources in its own behalf. The indispensable ingredient of an endurable situation in South Vietnam is a stable civilian government backed by a military force appropriately subordinate to civilian authority. No amount of American aid can make up for the lack of this ingredient. Unless it is present, no foreign power can save Vietnam. Efforts to do so will constitute an attempt to prop up an empty sack.

It does not much matter what we would like to do in South Vietnam. What we would like to do is governed by what we can do and what we cannot do. And it is becoming increasingly clear that, without an effective government, backed by a loyal military and some kind of a national consensus in support of independence, we cannot do anything for South Vietnam.

When we decide that the hope of putting together these elements of success can no longer be entertained, the United States must have the courage to confess the unattainability of its ends and courageously abandon them. The economic aid and military power of the United States are going to be needed by countries that have the restraint, national discipline, and military purpose to use them effectively. They must not be wasted in a futile attempt to save those who do not wish to be saved.

If the warring factions in South Vietnam extinguish the last spark of hope and confidence, we will need to make it clear that they and not we have made the decision to give up the fight. This country will depart with a heavy heart; for the subjection of the unfortunate people of South Vietnam seems inevitable. Our national honor and interest alike compelled us to help ourselves; but neither honor nor interest requires us to continue that help a moment beyond the instant when it is clear that all help will be unavailing. We are very close to that decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Time for Decision," published in the Oregonian, of my State, for Tuesday, December 22, 1964.

I hope that my inserting the editorial from the Oregonian will not cause the editorial writer of that newspaper too great a shock. I believe I have demonstrated over the years that whenever I find that in my opinion the Oregonian is right about something, which is seldom, I always give due credit for such writing.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point this editorial, which is critical of our policy in South Vietnam.

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

TIME FOR DECISION

The latest military coup in South Vietnam, the sixth change in governmental power in 14 months, comes near the end of the wet season and in a period of increasing Communist military attacks. Obviously, the role of the 22,000 U.S. military men assigned to help the South Vietnamese defend their country from the Vietcong is made more difficult.

None of these military and civilian upheavals at the top levels of government, including the ouster and murder of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his ruthless brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, has touched the main problem. That problem is the inability of the government to compete with the Vietcong agitators in winning the support of the Vietnamese farmers and villagers outside Saigon.

The "young generals" who arrested 9 remaining members of the civilian High National Council and about 20 other generals and politicians left the new premier, Tran Van Huong, Chief of State Phan Khac Suu and Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, chief of the armed forces, in their offices. But it is apparent these will take orders, for the time being, at least, from the "Young Turks." A new civilian government is promised. But this, too, is window dressing.

Some politicians under Buddhist attack were among those arrested. But so were some Buddhist leaders. The Buddhists called off weekend demonstrations while appraising the new situation. But nothing in the change in military authority promises satisfaction to the Buddhist politicians. Indeed, nothing is likely to satisfy them except all-out Buddhist authority, possibly accompanied by a blood bath of Catholics.

The proclaimed goal of the "young generals" is to mediate religious and political differences, to achieve national unity and to "annihilate the Communists." The junta has power. Its leader is Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, commander of the 1st Army Corps, and it includes Air Force Commander Brig. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Marine Corps Commander Brig. Gen. Le Nguyen Khang and 4th Army Corps Commander Brig. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu. But these are only unfamiliar names to the Vietnamese people who help or join the Vietcong, either because they want to or are afraid not to. They have no popular following among people so drained by years of war that they want peace above all and care nothing about the ideological beliefs of their rulers.

It is absurd for the U.S. diplomats to hint that aid will be cut off from the South Vietnamese Government because some generals have usurped the power earlier usurped by other generals. The Johnson administration cannot any longer postpone a decision. If it has no plan which has a hope of defeating the Vietcong, and only intends to hang on, it must continue to aid whatever batch of generals or politicians is on top at the moment. The alternatives are to strengthen American forces and do more of the fighting for the South Vietnamese, or to get out. It is President Johnson's move.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of December 27, 1964, entitled "What Kind of Regime?" It is a very keen analysis of the corrupt regime that prevails in South Vietnam.

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

WHAT KIND OF REGIME?

A news dispatch from the Far East the other day raised the question of whether the United States is justified in insisting on a civilian government in South Vietnam in view of the fact that Asians generally are not politically mature enough to fulfill all the demands of democracy.

It was pointed out that parliamentary democracy works in India, Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Ceylon, all of which, excepting Japan, had long experience with Western teaching. Japan developed independently. But of the others, mainland China, North Korea and North Vietnam are Communist controlled, and there are military regimes in South Korea, Thailand, Burma, and Pakistan. Formosa, Indonesia, Laos, and Cambodia have outward democratic forms, but are authoritarian.

It is certainly true that self-rule is an advanced concept, outside the frame of reference of many Asians. Democracy is expensive, and it connotes an informed and politically alert population. But the fact that it is difficult of attainment is no reason why it should not be urged universally by the United States. The United States may often have to settle for less, but it should not be in the business of advocating less.

The United States is right in demanding a civilian regime in Saigon as a condition of support. The reason is that the civilian government, which was cut to pieces a week ago by a group of young military officers, was reasonably representative of the population and was struggling to solidify itself. The United States must be interested in the welfare of the people of a country, rather than their rulers. We have too often made the mistake of supporting dictatorships, military and otherwise.

The excuse is made that Saigon is engaged in a guerrilla war, and needs military direction. But military interests were adequately represented in the duly constituted government of Premier Tran Van Huong. The overall policy direction of the civil war, as well as the negotiations for the eventual peace, should be in the hands of civilians.

There is also a practical reason why the United States should not support the military clique that seems to be dominant in Saigon at the moment. Its leadership is likely to be transitory, and there is no evidence that the military can do better than the civilians. The dictatorial Diem regime was overthrown 2 years ago by the military. The soldiers failed to establish a viable government. There have been six upheavals in the last 14 months. One of the regimes that went under was headed by Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, who was highly regarded by the United States: He is still chief of the armed forces, but he failed to attract popular support as Premier.

So those who advocate a military regime for Saigon ask for what has already proved a failure, and more than once. And they ask the United States to desert principles for expediency. We cannot and should not dictate the form of another country's government, but we can and should encourage governments that are responsive to the will of the people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the New York Journal-American of December 29, 1964, entitled "We've Had It."

It covers not only the views of the editor on the South Vietnam subject, but also his views on our shameful policies in giving further support to Nasser in Egypt, as well as the views of the editor in regard to the assessment crisis in the United Nations.

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

WE'VE HAD IT

Because we've been a nation of even temper, controlled strength and persistent peaceful purpose, we've endured for years a vicious kicking around. Our patience and generosity have misled certain high-handed and low-minded adversaries into the blunder of regarding us a namby-pamby, wishy-washy, faltering paper tiger.

There are indications in Washington at long, long last we're near the turning point.

It's time to get tough. Being tough doesn't mean being rough. It means that enough is enough. We're fed up. We've had it.

Frustrated by our insistence on a civilian government if our cooperation is to continue, General Khanh who yearns to be South Vietnam's military overlord with his army in full charge, suggests the Yankee pack up and go home. Leaving Vietnam may not be a bad idea. But not to go home, which would be to abandon southeast Asia.

We are not there to take care of South Vietnam but to stop communism.

We can move over a bit to friendly stable Thailand and its fine American-trained Air Force, fine airfields and deep-rooted concern over possible Communist aggression. Thailand is a nation of proud independence. Thailand would be a convenient replacement for our South Vietnam futility. We could even continue providing Saigon with some arms, fuel and economic aid and let Khanh and his stripe squirm in their barrel of worms.

We have squandered millions on aid to Egypt and Algeria.

These ingrates lead the malicious chorus of vituperation over our part in rescuing hundreds of beleaguered people from the murderous savagery of the Congolese rebels.

Our Embassy library in Cairo is burned. President Nasser rejects our protest against the wanton killing of two civilians in an unarmed commercial American plane. He brags of sending arms to the Congo rebels, and when we object in the U.N. he accuses us of "interfering" with Egypt's foreign and domestic policies.

OK—let us cease interfering completely.

A few years ago we saved this crummy dictator's neck by interfering—on his side—when our good and old friends, Great Britain and France, decided to take over the Suez Canal.

We badly ruffled our allies' feelings, but did we get any credit or thanks from or make a friend of Nasser? No, indeed.

As a matter of fact were it not for the stubbornness of John Foster Dulles, we would have sunk heaven knows how many of the American taxpayers' dollars into the Aswan Dam. Dulles in effect said "not for or by a dam site."

So let's leave Nasser alone, as he demands. We can, and should cut off economic aid to him.

Let Nasser turn to the Congolese rebels for his food supply.

And the same goes for Algeria and other nations whose dictators play the same game.

Russia owes the United Nations $52.6 millions toward the cost of the Congo and Middle East peacekeeping operations.

She has owed it more than 2 years.

Moscow has refused to pay. A compromise, face-saving for Russia, has been proposed, involving a special fund to which Russia could contribute. We are willing to go along with the arrangement, which Russia continues to spurn.

Article 19 of the U.N. Charter says a member more than 2 years delinquent in payments is to be deprived of its Assembly vote. We didn't write the book. But we subscribed to it. Russia subscribed to it.

It's time to cut out the dillydallying and go by the book. No rubles, no representation. In plain English, put up or shut up.

And if the U.N. Assembly does not stand by this, then, of course, should we continue to pay our share?

The Hearst newspapers long have advocated a harder line in our foreign policy. It's time to take an unyielding stand toward our adversaries and our make-believe friends. Its the American way to be enduring, to suffer even continuing frustrations in our hope of eventual restoration of reason over madness. But the limit has been reached.

Its time now to be tough. Its time for a new broom to sweep clean. Let that be our resolution for the new year.

THE FLOOD DISASTERS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the great calamity which has struck the west coast.

Tomorrow, the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation in both Houses will introduce in each House the first of what may probably be a series of bills seeking to use the services of the Federal Government and the appropriations of the Federal Government to alleviate, to the extent that it is possible under the law, the great human suffering and heavy losses that the people of the west coast have suffered in the recent past.

The hour is late, and I shall be discussing this subject matter at other times in the Senate as we take up necessary legislation. But there are a few points I wish to make hurriedly.

First, let me express my thanks and my commendation to the Governor of the State of Oregon—Mark O. Hatfield—for the diligence and dedicated public service he has rendered to the people of my State during these days of travail in Oregon.

Under existing law, as Senators know, the first responsibility when a disaster strikes a State rests upon the shoulders of the Governor, to determine the extent of the disaster and to determine whether it is of such proportions that it meets the criteria necessary to declare an area a disaster area, and then to issue a proclamation to that effect and notify the Federal Government.

Immediately upon the breaking of this terrible and horrible tragedy upon the people of not only my State but also parts of the States of Washington, California, and Idaho, the Governor of Oregon reached me by telephone and described the situation and stated that he would remain in frequent contact with me in my position as head of the Oregon delegation, and would keep me advised and the other Members of the delegation—through me—advised, as to the tragedy and its extent.

He did that. I, of course, in turn, on behalf of myself and members of the Oregon delegation, pledged to the Governor that we would do everything we could to be of maximum assistance to him and to the people of my State.

The Governor declared the State a disaster area under the requirement of the law, and transmitted the proclamation to Washington. We assisted in having it processed in less than 2 hours, because the Federal officials had already been aware of the situation in Oregon and had sent Federal officials into the State and knew whereof the Governor spoke.

The declaration was approved at the administrative level and then rushed by plane to Johnson City for the consideration of the President of the United States. It was only a matter of formality, for the President had already fully informed himself in regard to the crisis and had signed the Federal order immediately. Since that signing, the area has been a disaster area, including also parts of Washington, California, and Idaho.

This afternoon, I have not recited the extent of the losses, the damage and the suffering, except to say that this tragedy has been unequaled in the history of my State. Oregon has had nothing like it in all its history. That is because of a combination of natural circumstances—often described as resulting in "acts of God" which produced this terrible flood—that we had a long, hard freeze, which is not common in our State. Many Senators know that the Willamette Valley, where the greatest loss occurred—although it spread, too, into many other parts of the State—is an area that seldom gets snow in the winter. The ground is seldom frozen. The pastures are used the year around. We have heavy rains, but the freeze that occurred—and it was a hard freeze—made

the ground so hard that the water could not be absorbed into the ground and it just flowed off. It was followed by a very heavy snow in the mountains.

Then, more bad luck was added by what we call a Chinook rain or thaw immediately following. A Chinook rain or thaw—an old Indian term—is a very sudden rise in temperature bringing warm rain which melts the snow at a rapid rate and develops flood.

The waters of part of the Willamette Valley at times were 12 feet above flood crest. Later, I shall discuss the great benefits that the people of our State enjoyed in these days of tragedy as the result of existing public works developments in the form of dams built by the Army Engineers, and dams and reclamation projects built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

My hometown of Eugene was very fortunate. Some loss occurred there, of course. But compared with other parts of my State, the loss in Eugene was de minimus. That was because the dams which had been built in that area of the Willamette River were sufficient to hold back the water so that the Willamette River did not overflow its banks to the degree it overflowed them farther down.

The capital city of my State, Salem, and the surrounding area, suffered great losses. The last report I had was that 27 major bridges had been washed out. For days, every major highway in the State was closed. Road damage rose to unbelievable proportions. A good many of our lumber mills—the main source of employment in my State—are located on or near river banks and a good many of those mills were washed out. Access roads to commercial timber stands were also destroyed.

I shall insert in the RECORD and discuss in the days to come the evidence which is being supplied me daily, as to what this flood has done to the economic life of my State from the standpoint of employment alone, due to the damage that the lumber industry has suffered.

Thus, I could go on and point out the great damage to houses—houses washed away, houses ruined, livestock losses which were tremendous; but the country knows and the Senate knows whereof I speak.

The Oregon delegation, along with the Washington, California, and Idaho delegations, are all deeply concerned over the great losses which were sustained from this terrible tragedy.

Tonight, we are all greatly concerned because the reports that we have been receiving during the day indicate another flood stage is developing. There is great concern that there may be an additional major tragedy, although the last report I had from Salem gave some hope that the waters might start receding in a matter of hours.

I know that the committees of the Congress are going to be anxious and willing to be of assistance; yet, as the senior Senator from my State and speaking in behalf of my junior colleague and also in behalf of my colleagues on the House side, both Democrats and Republicans, I can say tonight that speed and time are of the essence in this matter. The matter of emergency assistance which is being obtained under the emergency program is going forward at a rapid rate. I have not the slightest criticism about the highest of praise for the response of the Federal Government.

One could not have received more sympathetic and helpful cooperation from the President of the United States than the Oregon delegation has received in regard to this Pacific coast disaster. But the Congress has an obligation—and I know it will assume it—of proceeding with dispatch in passing whatever implementing legislation is necessary to make available Federal assistance to the people of my State and the other States involved. In a good many instances we shall have to make low-interest rate loans available to help rehabilitate the economy, to get men back to work, and to try to restore the economic damage that the State has suffered, and we will have to appropriate these funds promptly.

As I indicated heretofore, the December flood in the State of Oregon was one of the most devastating floods in its recorded history. The damage inflicted upon private and public property totaled hundreds of millions of dollars, and many lives were lost in the floodwaters. There were more than 20 lives lost in my State. The total loss of life in the whole area may reach 40.

Mr. President, Federal and State officials responded promptly with help in the flood-ravaged areas, and they are to be commended for the remarkably fine job they did under difficult and trying circumstances.

I repeat that I do not see how anyone could have done more in carrying out the duties of his office than the Governor of our State did. He and I agreed that I could be of the greatest assistance if I stayed on the Washington, D.C., end of the telephone line. I sent to Oregon my administrative assistant, Mr. Berg, and made available to the Government my executive assistant in Oregon, Mr. Charles Brooks.

I also made available to the Governor a very close associate of mine in public life in Oregon, Mr. Ed Spencer, the postmaster of the post office at Salem and the former State chairman of the Democratic Party. Governor Hatfield, Travis Cross, an assistant to the Governor, Warne Nunn, also an assistant, and the Governor's other associates extended every possible cooperation to my assistants as they worked together in connection with the governmental problems that were involved in the tragedy.

Much remains to be done before we can say that we have done everything humanly possible to help those who were the hardest hit by the flood. My colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I and the entire Oregon delegation in the House of Representatives are working intensively to ascertain the extent of additional funds required by Federal agencies to continue their programs to reduce the impact of the flood on Oregon's citizens and the public facilities of the State.

Today we issued a press release explaining the nature of our work in that respect. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the release be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Members of the Oregon delegation in the Congress are surveying the entire range of Federal assistance programs available to the flood-stricken areas of Oregon to determine the amount of additional funds Government agencies will require to meet the staggering needs.

In a joint statement today, Senators WAYNE MORSE and MAURINE NEUBERGER, Representatives EDITH GREEN, AL ULLMAN and ROBERT DUNCAN reported that conferences are being scheduled with the Bureau of the Budget and the President's Office of Emergency Planning.

Detailed and expanded contacts are being made with all Federal agencies that could be of any assistance in extending aid to flood areas, including the Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, Army Corps of Engineers, Small Business Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and others whose programs could be used to reduce the impact of the floods and storms on the lives and businesses of Oregon citizens.

Delegation members are also working with the Federal agencies to determine what additional congressional authorization might be needed to speed and make more effective such agency programs in the flood-swept areas of the State. The members pledged that everything is being done and will be done to get all the Federal assistance possible for Oregon's flood areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the severity of the damage in Oregon warrants immediate study, not only by Federal agencies, but also by the Congress. Therefore, I cannot urge too strongly that an appropriate committee of the Senate send committee and staff members to the west coast to study the needs and make recommendations to the Congress concerning funds and additional legislative authorizations that will be required for reducing to some extent, the impact of this disaster in Oregon and a number of other Western States.

Mr. President, the entire Oregon congressional delegation is working on legislation designed to help our State in connection with this great disaster. When this legislation is introduced, it is our earnest hope that it will have prompt action in committee and in the Senate. The needs are great, and we are sure the Congress will respond.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 6, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years. He was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mary Gardiner Jones, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1959, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Sheldon S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, vice Mortimer M. Caplin, resigned.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service), vice Sheldon S. Cohen.

Frederick Lewis Deming, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, vice Robert V. Roosa, resigned.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The following-named persons to be members of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Benjamin Aaron, of California.
Joseph A. Beirne, of Maryland.
Daniel Bell, of New York.
Howard R. Bowen, of Iowa.
Patrick E. Haggerty, of Texas.
Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland.
Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, of New York.
Edwin H. Land, of Massachusetts.
Walter P. Reuther, of Michigan.
Robert H. Ryan, of Pennsylvania.
John I. Snyder, Jr., of New York.
Robert M. Solow, of Massachusetts.
Philip Sporn, of New York.
Whitney M. Young, Jr., of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile.

William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now Foreign Service officers of class two and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Antonio Certosimo, of Arizona.
Philip H. Chadbourn, Jr., of California.
William B. Connett, Jr., of New Jersey.
Livingston D. Watrous, of Massachusetts.

Now Foreign Service officers of class three and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Gilbert, of Florida.
John L. Hagan, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class three, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John P. Condon, of Oklahoma.
Herbert G. Ihrig, Jr., of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lee S. Bigelow, of Texas.
Henry Clay Black II, of Illinois.
Edmund T. DeJarnette, Jr., of Virginia.
Denis Lamb, of New York.
George H. Lane, of Illinois.
Michael J. Mercurio, of Ohio.
Ned E. Morris, of Tennessee.
Geoffrey Ogden, of California.
Alan D. Romberg, of New York.
Charles B. Salmon, Jr., of New York.
David S. Wilson, of California.

For appointment as Foreign service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edward James Alexander, of Colorado.
George T. Basil, of New York.
David E. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Patricia L. Guyer, of California.
Richard J. Harrington, of California.
John J. Hurley, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Frank P. Kelly, of New Jersey.
John H. Kelly, of Virginia.
Thomas J. O'Flaherty, of New York.
Roger E. Sack, of New York.
Miss Eleanor Wallace Savage, of California.
Robert D. Simon, of New York.
Miss Elizabeth R. Thurston, of Indiana.
William D. Wade, of Massachusetts.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Fentress Gardner, of Virginia.
Anthony J. Gentile, of Ohio.
Daniel M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.
S. Richard Rand, of Florida.
Edward L. Robinson, of Illinois.
Robert A. Rockweiler, of Wisconsin.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Jerry J. Allinson, of New York.
Walter C. d'Andrade, of Massachusetts.
Vernon J. Goertz, Jr., of Virginia.
Michael A. Kristula, of California.
Edward H. Schulick, of New Jersey.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William H. Brubeck, of Virginia.
Philip Cherry, of Pennsylvania.
Edwin P. Earnest, of Maryland.
John C. Erskine, of Maryland.
Fred C. Fischer, of Virginia.
John F. Gilhooly, of Connecticut.
John G. Gloster, of Maryland.
John Heilman, of Pennsylvania.
William C. Ide, of Virginia.
Kenneth L. Mayall, of Washington.
Adger E. Player, of Colorado.
Charles L. Stermer, of Illinois.
Donald H. Winters, of Ohio.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Mary Willis McKenzie, of Virginia.
Miss Eleanor R. Paulson, of Washington.
Victor D. Russillo, of Rhode Island.
Miss Ruth E. Wagner, of the District of Columbia.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, [redacted] (major general Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, effective February 1, 1965, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

Gen. John P. McConnell, [redacted] (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 2 years beginning February 1, 1965, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10 of the United States Code.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Captain to major

Aaron, Doyce L., [redacted].
Aaronson, Allan E., [redacted].
Abel, Charles R., [redacted].
Abernathy, Robert L., [redacted].
Abraham, James G., [redacted].
Ackfeld, Virgil F., [redacted].
Adams, Glenn D., [redacted].
Adams, Robert E., [redacted].
Adams, Vincent O., Jr., [redacted].
Addor, Henry S., [redacted].
Adelson, Stanley M., [redacted].
Agosta, Howard A., [redacted].
Agosta, Joseph J., [redacted].
Ailes, Richard H., [redacted].
Ainslie, Wilbur R., [redacted].
Akins, George D., Jr., [redacted].
Albrecht, Walter H., [redacted].
Aldrin, Edwin E., Jr., [redacted].
Alexander, Sigmund, [redacted].
Alexander, William T., [redacted].
Alfano, Mario A., [redacted].
Allard, Joseph A., [redacted].
Allen, Gordon J., [redacted].
Allen, John E., [redacted].
Allen, Marion S., [redacted].
Allen, William E., [redacted].
Allison, Clifford, Jr., [redacted].
Allison, Jack G., [redacted].
Allison, John M., [redacted].
Allison, John V., [redacted].
Allison, William B., [redacted].
Allred, John P., [redacted].
Allred, Laurence L., [redacted].
Alongi, Frederick F., [redacted].
Amado, Frank B., Jr., [redacted].
Ames, Henry P., Jr., [redacted].
Andersen, Robert N., [redacted].
Andersen, Roger E., [redacted].
Anderson, Charles D., [redacted].
Anderson, Edwin P., Jr., [redacted].
Anderson, Jesse J., [redacted].
Anderson, Loren A., [redacted].
Anderson, Paul R., [redacted].
Anderson, Robert L., [redacted].
Andres, Donald L., [redacted].
Andrews, William, [redacted].
Andrichak, John J., [redacted].
Anthony, Thomas P., [redacted].
Appleby, Phillip E., [redacted].
Apter, Ethel E., [redacted].
Archuleta, Harry M., [redacted].
Areen, Frank M., [redacted].
Arey, David, [redacted].
Armbruster, Owen R., [redacted].

Armstrong, Dwight F., xxxxxx.
Arrowood, William J., xxxxxx.
Artz, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Ash, John R., xxxxxxx.
Askew, Arthur N., xxxxxx.
Astrella, Ralph J., xxxxxx.
Atkins, James G., xxxxxx.
Atkisson, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Atwood, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Aubry, George, Jr., xxxxxx.
Augsburger, Willi E., xxxxxx.
Augustine, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Austin, John W., xxxxxx.
Avinger, Isaac E., xxxxxx.
Avlakeotes, Atha, xxxxxx.
Ayala, John S., xxxxxx.
Babbitt, Louie A., xxxxxx.
Babcock, Earl L., xxxxxx.
Bacon, Walter J., II, xxxxxx.
Baer, Allan R., xxxxxx.
Bagby, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Bailey, Burt S., xxxxxx.
Baird, Weldon R., xxxxxx.
Baird, Willet J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Baker, Albert R., xxxxxx.
Baker, Coleman L., xxxxxx.
Baker, Henry F., xxxxxx.
Baker, John W., xxxxxx.
Baker, Joseph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Baker, Kenneth G., xxxxxx.
Baker, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Baldwin, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Ballard, John G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Baltz, Dickey L., xxxxxx.
Baltzell, Leonard E., xxxxxx.
Banfield, Thomas V., xxxxxx.
Banks, William O., xxxxxx.
Baptiste, Joseph C., xxxxxx.
Barber, Bruce H., xxxxxx.
Bardnell, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Barker, Kendall S., xxxxxx.
Barker, Stewart G., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Daniel S., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Barnes, John F., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Oswald E., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Rodman W., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Warren S., xxxxxx.
Barnes, William C., xxxxxx.
Barr, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Barrett, Joseph M., xxxxxx.
Barrett, Ralph W., xxxxxx.
Barrett, William R., xxxxxx.
Barry, William D., xxxxxx.
Bartholoma, John H., xxxxxx.
Bartolich, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Barwin, Richard O., xxxxxx.
Bass, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Baulch, Henry L., xxxxxx.
Baumgardner, Budd E., xxxxxx.
Bayly, Arthur M., xxxxxx.
Bazley, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Beardslee, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Beasley, Ewell M., xxxxxx.
Beatie, Billingsley, xxxxxx.
Beatty, Bernard L., xxxxxx.
Bebout, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Beckwith, Bicknel K., xxxxxx.
Beebe, Wallace E., xxxxxx.
Beery, Rhoderick J., xxxxxx.
Beitsch, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Belew, Ruby C., xxxxxx.
Belinski, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Bender, Jack N., xxxxxx.
Bendorf, Harry H., xxxxxx.
Benefield, Bruce S., xxxxxx.
Benham, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Benjovsky, Victor C., xxxxxx.
Benn, Bohden, xxxxxx.
Bennett, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Bennett, Frank E., xxxxxx.
Bennett, John H., xxxxxx.
Bennett, William B., xxxxxx.
Bennington, J. T., xxxxxx.
Bennink, William H., xxxxxx.
Benson, John J., xxxxxx.
Bento, William L., xxxxxx.
Bepko, Stephen J., xxxxxx.
Beranek, Orville J., xxxxxx.
Berdoy, Ronald A., xxxxxx.
Berg, Wallace S., xxxxxx.
Berga, John O., xxxxxx.
Bergeron, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Berher, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Berndt, Harley E., xxxxxx.
Bernich, Kirby A., xxxxxx.
Berrie, William M., xxxxxx.
Berry, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Berry, Schuyle P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bialas, Howard S., xxxxxx.
Bielefeldt, Vilas L., xxxxxx.
Bienert, Albert R., xxxxxx.
Bierman, Casper S., xxxxxx.
Biggers, Edgar W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Biggs, Walter J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Billingslea, Clem D., xxxxxx.
Binderim, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Binkin, Martin, xxxxxx.
Birch, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Bird, John F., xxxxxx.
Bischofs, Hans, xxxxxx.
Bishop, Arthur F., xxxxxx.
Bishop, Norman C., xxxxxx.
Bissette, John H., xxxxxx.
Bittinger, Dale A., xxxxxx.
Bjorklund, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Black, Harold H., xxxxxx.
Blackbird, David P., xxxxxx.
Blackburn, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Blackmon, Leon A., xxxxxx.
Blaisdell, Morton C., xxxxxx.
Blakemore, Malcolm, xxxxxx.
Blan, Kennith W., xxxxxx.
Blanchard, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Blanchard, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Blankenship, Bill F., xxxxxx.
Blankinship, Albert B., xxxxxx.
Blincow, Dean R., xxxxxx.
Blinkinsop, Paul H., xxxxxx.
Block, Gerald A., xxxxxx.
Block, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Blodgett, Donald D., xxxxxx.
Bloom, William M., xxxxxx.
Bloomfield, George A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Blume, George D., xxxxxx.
Boatright, William J., xxxxxx.
Bobbitt, William M., xxxxxx.
Bogle, Chester V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bohe, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Bohinc, Samuel H., xxxxxx.
Bolado, Victor H., xxxxxx.
Boldi, George, xxxxxx.
Boles, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Bollinger, Russell W., xxxxxx.
Bollman, William J., xxxxxx.
Bonczek, Roman J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bond, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Bonnell, John H., xxxxxx.
Bonner, William F., xxxxxx.
Bonsac, Francis L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bonsac, John W., xxxxxx.
Bookout, Bertram E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Booth, Harry J., xxxxxx.
Bores, James J., xxxxxx.
Borgeson, Marvin A., xxxxxx.
Borkowski, Edmond J., xxxxxx.
Borowski, Eugene C., xxxxxx.
Boswell, Samuel E., xxxxxx.
Bosworth, Alvin L., xxxxxx.
Bott, James F., xxxxxx.
Bounds, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Bowden, Jackson H., xxxxxx.
Bowe, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Bowen, Clifford R., xxxxxx.
Bowen, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Bowlin, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Bowman, Howard L., xxxxxx.
Bowman, Lloyd D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Box, George B., xxxxxx.
Boyd, John R., xxxxxx.
Boyd, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Boyer, Wallace R., xxxxxx.
Boyle, James M., xxxxxx.
Brackett, Wentworth, xxxxxx.
Bradford, John A., xxxxxx.
Bradley, Andrew J., xxxxxx.
Brady, John D., xxxxxx.
Braly, Harold C., xxxxxx.
Brame, Horace L., xxxxxx.
Branch, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Brandom, Thomas M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brandt, John S., xxxxxx.
Brandy, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Brantley, Arnim L., xxxxxx.
Breazeale, Paul C., xxxxxx.
Breden, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Breeding, Kenneth W., xxxxxx.
Breithaupt, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Brennan, Eugene A., xxxxxx.
Brennan, James C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brennen, Harold J., xxxxxx.
Bretzke, Lou E., xxxxxx.
Brewer, Andrew C., xxxxxx.
Brewer, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Bridges, Garland D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bridgford, Lloyd R., xxxxxx.
Briggs, James E., xxxxxx.
Briggs, Morris F., xxxxxx.
Briley, James R., xxxxxx.
Brinson, James K., xxxxxx.
Brockmeyer, William D., xxxxxx.
Brode, Ross B., xxxxxx.
Brooks, Barnet E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Broome, Lees xxxxxx.
Broussard, James H., xxxxxx.
Brown, Allan L., xxxxxx.
Brown, Chester L., xxxxxx.
Brown, Donald D., xxxxxx.
Brown, Jack N., xxxxxx.
Brown, James L., xxxxxx.
Brown, James R., xxxxxx.
Brown, James S., xxxxxx.
Brown, Jasper C., xxxxxx.
Brown, John D., xxxxxx.
Brown, Julius W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, Larry F., xxxxxx.
Brown, Norma E., xxxxxx.
Brown, Ogden, Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Brown, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, William R., xxxxxx.
Brown, William S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brownfield, Harold H., xxxxxx.
Browning, Howard J., xxxxxx.
Browning, John W., xxxxxx.
Brumbeloe, James T., xxxxxx.
Bruton, Albert T., xxxxxx.
Bryan, William A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bryant, Edward H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bryant, William P., xxxxxx.
Bryniarski, Al F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bucher, Tilman K., xxxxxx.
Buckio, Frank L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Budd, Roger, Jr., xxxxxx.
Budner, John R., xxxxxx.
Buehler, James W., xxxxxx.
Buettgenbach, Max A., xxxxxx.
Buffington, Le C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Buhler, Theodore W., xxxxxx.
Bull, Herbert R., xxxxxx.
Bunker, Herbert, Jr., xxxxxx.
Burch, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Burch, John R., xxxxxx.
Burgess, George M., xxxxxxx.
Burgy, William P., xxxxxx.
Burkardt, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Burke, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Burkett, Howard R., xxxxxx.
Burkhart, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Burkley, Edward L., xxxxxx.
Burks, Tillman C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Burnett, James R., xxxxxx.
Burns, John W., xxxxxx.
Burns, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Burnsed, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Burrell, Francis A., xxxxxx.
Burri, Raymond A., xxxxxx.
Burtt, Stuart E., xxxxxx.
Burwell, William D., xxxxxx.
Buschman, Glen W., xxxxxx.
Bush, David A., xxxxxx.
Bush, Harry L., xxxxxx.
Bush, James O., xxxxxx.
Bush, William H., xxxxxx.
Bushey, Warren E., xxxxxx.
Buss, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Bussell, Henry C., xxxxxx.
Butler, Paul A., xxxxxx.
Butts, Duncan R., xxxxxx.
Butz, William J., xxxxxx.
Byer, Harry J., xxxxxx.
Bynum, Paul H., xxxxxx.

Byrne, John J., xxxxxx.
Cabaniss, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Cadwell, Harry B., xxxxxx.
Cady, Robert P., xxxx.
Cagle, James D., xxxxxx.
Cahoon, Jack, Jr., xxxxxx.
Caldwell, Alonza L., xxxxxx.
Callahan, Drury, xxxxxx.
Callander, Bertha K., xxxxxx.
Callen, Lonnie E., xxxxxxx.
Cameron, Raymond C., xxxxxx.
Cameron, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Cameron, Thomas B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Don L., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Will C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Campbell, William H., xxxxxx.
Cannon, Lawrence F., xxxxxx.
Canon, Gustave A., xxxxxx.
Cantrell, George K., xxxxxx.
Cantrell, John B., xxxxxx.
Capers, William T., III, xxxxxx.
Caple, John W., xxxxxx.
Capstraw, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Caraher, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Carcich, Marvin J., xxxxxx.
Cardwell, Max D., xxxxxx.
Cardwell, Thoma J. M., xxxxxx.
Carell, William A., xxxxxx.
Carey, John B., xxxxxx.
Carlson, Howard F., xxxxxx.
Carman, Kenneth R., xxxxxx.
Carnahan, Kenneth R., xxxxxx.
Carnathan, Herbert G., xxxxxx.
Carr, William E., xxxxxx.
Carter, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Carus, Glenn A., xxxxxx.
Caruso, Charles P., xxxxxx.
Casaus, Jesse, xxxxxx.
Casey, James M., xxxxxx.
Cass, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Cassinotti, Jo M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Castellina Valentine, xxxxxx.
Casterlin, Har B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Castleman, Stanley A., xxxxxx.
Catlin, Frank S., xxxxxx.
Catlin, John E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Caudle, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Caudle, Ted W., xxxxxx.
Caulfield, Patrick H., xxxxxx.
Cerny, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Chabbott, George H., xxxxxx.
Chag, Steve S., xxxxxx.
Chambers, Cant P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Chamness, Benjamin H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Chaney, Hubert E., xxxxxx.
Chaney, Lester E., xxxxxx.
Chapman, D. L., xxxxxx.
Chapman, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Chapman, John H., xxxxxx.
Chapman, Ray E., xxxxxx.
Charette, Franklin M., xxxxxx.
Chatfield, Ric C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Chatfield, William E., xxxxxx.
Chatham, Roy J., xxxxxx.
Chellman, Chester E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Chesney, Michael T., xxxxxx.
Chester, Louie B., xxxxxx.
Chestnut, Johnny C., xxxxxx.
Chevrier, John A., xxxxxx.
Chick, Robert L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Childers, William L., xxxxxx.
Christner, Wallace G., xxxxxx.
Christofferson, D. D., xxxxxx.
Church, Harold N., xxxxxx.
Church, Joe L., xxxxxx.
Churchill, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Cima, Anthony P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cisco, Guy C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Clance, James R., xxxxxx.
Clanton, Charles C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Clapsaddle, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Clark, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Clark, Edward P., xxxxxx.
Clark, Ray E., xxxxxx.
Cleary, Edward G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cleland, Paul S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Clelland, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Clem, William J., xxxxxx.
Clement, Harold R., xxxxxx.
Clement, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Click, Allen R., xxxxxx.
Cline, Theodore, Jr., xxxxxx.
Clontz, Charles B., xxxxxx.
Clouse, Leland F., xxxxxxx.
Coady, John S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Coats, J. C., xxxxxx.
Cobb, William J., xxxxxx.
Coblenz, Jack G., xxxxxx.
Cochran, Samuel W., xxxxxx.
Cochrane, Albert C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Codding, Ray E., xxxxxx.
Coen, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Coffee, Kenneth H., xxxxxx.
Cogburn, John B., xxxxxx.
Coggin, Billy B., xxxxxx.
Cole, Arthur S., xxxxxx.
Cole, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Cole, Donald K., xxxxxx.
Cole, Raymond E., xxxxxx.
Cole, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Coley, Ray H., xxxxxx.
Collins, Earl J., xxxxxx.
Collins, Harry R., xxxxxx.
Collins, Kriebel N., xxxxxx.
Colson, James E., xxxxxx.
Combs, Chalmer J., xxxxxx.
Comerford, John R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Compton, Laurence B., xxxxxx.
Cone, Lafayette W., xxxxxx.
Cone, Ralph A., xxxxxx.
Conine, William B., xxxxxx.
Conley, Kenneth H., xxxxxx.
Conlin, Thomas P., xxxxxx.
Connolly, John M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Connor, Gerald B., xxxxxx.
Connor, Vernon L., xxxxxx.
Connors, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Conrad, David M., xxxxxx.
Conti, Julius R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Convey, John P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cook, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Cook, Daniel E., xxxxxx.
Cook, David L., xxxxxx.
Cook, James A., xxxxxx.
Cooke, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Cooney, Lloyd I., xxxxxx.
Cooper, James P., xxxxxx.
Cooper, Leland J., xxxxxx.
Copas, Charles B., xxxxxx.
Cope, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Corbitt, Gilland W., xxxxxx.
Corcoran, Daniel G., xxxxxx.
Corea, Dominick J., xxxxxx.
Corey, Michael L., xxxxxx.
Corkery, Eugene F., xxxxxx.
Cornetti, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Correll, Paul P., xxxxxx.
Corrigan, Patrick J., xxxxxx.
Corrigan, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Cotton, James P., xxxxxx.
Counce, James M., xxxxxx.
Courtney, Clifford E., xxxxxx.
Couture, Ernest P., xxxxxx.
Coville, Alan, xxxxxx.
Cowan, Arista H., III, xxxxxx.
Cowan, Gordon E., xxxxxx.
Cowart, George B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cowne, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Cox, Billy F., xxxxxx.
Cox, Myron K., xxxxxxx.
Coyner, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Craig, Edward P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Craigie, John H., xxxxxx.
Cramer, Dayton C., xxxxxx.
Crandall, Clifford S., xxxxxx.
Crandall, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Crane, George R., xxxxxx.
Crank, Dale F., xxxxxx.
Crawford, Arch M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Crawford, Lawrence V., xxxxxx.
Crawford, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Creekman, David B., xxxxxx.
Creswell, Boyce L., xxxxxx.
Crews, Alvan M., xxxxxx.
Croan, John W., xxxxxx.
Crocker, John C., xxxxxx.
Cromar, Jack J., xxxxxx.
Crooke, Jack O., xxxxxx.
Cross, Carl S., xxxxxx.
Cross, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Crouch, Solon R., xxxxxx.
Crow, Frederick A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Crowell, Schuyler T., xxxx.
Cruise, Joe N., xxxxxx.
Crum, Suzanne, xxxxxx.
Crume, William R., xxxxxx.
Crump, Enoch, xxxxxx.
Cullen, George E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Culp, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Cunneely, Eugene P., xxxxxx.
Cunningham, Joe C., xxxxxx.
Cunningham, John W., xxxxxx.
Cunningham, Orpha R., xxxx.
Custer, Gerald B., xxxxxx.
Cuthbertson, William H., xxxxxx.
Cuthill, Fred J., xxxxxx.
Cyr, Louis P., xxxxxx.
Czarnomski, Edward F., xxxxxx.
Dague, Jesse R., xxxxxx.
Dahl, Gerald R., xxxxxx.
Dahlberg, Carl A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Daigle, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Daily, Ralston B., xxxxxx.
Dale, William C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Daley, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Danforth, Gordon E., xxxxxx.
Danielson, Walter R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Danner, Bruce L., xxxxxx.
Darby, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Darby, John C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Darby, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Darlington, Arthur E., xxxxxx.
Darrow, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Datson, Burton T., xxxxxx.
Daube, Daniel C., xxxxxx.
Davenport, David E., xxxxxx.
Davenport, Sterling E., xxxx.
David, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Davidson, Carl M., xxxxxx.
Davidson, Robert N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davies, Benjamin W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davis, Cecil, xxxxxx.
Davis, Charles T., xxxxxx.
Davis, Charlie B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davis, John E., xxxxxx.
Davis, Paul M., xxxxxx.
Davis, Philip C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davis, Thurman C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Day, Devon, xxxxxx.
Day, George E., xxxxxx.
Deans, David H., xxxxxx.
Dearmond, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Debelles, Ignazio R., xxxxxx.
Deem, Paul S., xxxxxx.
Dees, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Dejong, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Delancey, Harry W., xxxxxx.
Delcambre, Pierre L., xxxxxx.
Dellaripa, James M., xxxxxx.
Deloney, Thurmon L., xxxxxx.
Delvecchio, Henry J., xxxxxx.
Dempsey, William F., xxxxxx.
Denardo, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Dennard, Mack W., xxxxxx.
Denton, Tommy C. L., xxxxxx.
Desilets, John C. M., xxxxxx.
Dessauer, Christopher F., xxxxxx.
Deuschle, Francis J., xxxx.
Dewar, William N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dibaggio, Anthony J., xxxxxx.
Dickens, Samuel T., xxxxxx.
Dickey, Guy E., xxxxxx.
Dickson, Gerald E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Diehl, Arthur F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Diener, William E., xxxxxx.
Dietrich, Burnell R., xxxxxx.
Diggs, William D., xxxxxx.
Dimalante, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Dimmery, Hubert M., xxxxxx.
Dingman, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Dingus, Hubert R., xxxxxx.
Dingwell, Cyril H., xxxxxx.
Dinkins, William M., xxxxxxx.
Dippold, Dennis R., xxxxxx.
Dirienz, John A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dishon, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Divall, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Dix, Louis E., xxxxxx.
Dixon, Paul V., xxxxxx.
Dobbs, Maurice T., xxxxxx.
Dobek, Henry W., xxxxxx.

Dodge, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Dodge, Ward K., xxxxxx.
Dollard, Oakley J., xxxxxx.
Donaldson, Henry S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Donnelly, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Donohue, William J., xxxxxx.
Doolittle, Harry B., xxxxxx.
Dorroh, William E., xxxxxx.
Doss, Thornton T., xxxxxx.
Dougherty, Charles B., xxxxxx.
Dougherty, William E., xxxxxx.
Doughty, Herbert H., xxxxxx.
Downer, Leo H., xxxxxx.
Dozier, Wayne M., xxxxxx.
Drake, Ernest E., xxxxxx.
Driessnack, Hans H., xxxxxx.
Druen, Walter D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Duc, Albert C., xxxxxx.
Ducharme, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Duer, Walter G., xxxxxx.
Dugan, Earl M., xxxxxx.
Dugger, Frank H., xxxxxx.
Duke, Charles B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dukett, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Dula, Billy F., xxxxxx.
Dulaney, Dan E., xxxxxx.
Dulin, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Dunagan, Bobby J., xxxxxx.
Duncan, John H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Duncan, Kenneth W., xxxxxx.
Dunn, Creighton R., xxxxxx.
Duquette, Norman E., xxxxxx.
Durham, Leonard E., xxxxxx.
Duval, James D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Duval, Lawrence H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dybvad, William R., xxxxxx.
Dye, Gerald J., xxxxxx.
Eberanz, Howard V., xxxxxx.
Eckles, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Eckrich, George W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Edgar, Gordon C., xxxxxx.
Egierd, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Eichbaum, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Eicher, Jacob M., xxxxxx.
Eidenire, John L., xxxxxx.
Ellanson, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Elliott, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Elliott, Stewart E., xxxxxx.
Ellis, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Ellis, John M., xxxx.
Elton, Calvin W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Emmert, Merle W., xxxxxx.
Emmons, Melvin B., xxxxxx.
Endsley, Leland C., xxxxxx.
Engelbrecht, Louis E., xxxxxx.
England, John K., Jr., xxxx.
Engle, Alan B., xxxxxx.
Engle, James C., xxxxxx.
English, Lysle R., xxxxxx.
English, Webster C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Enright, Joseph K., xxxxxx.
Enslen, Allen T., xxxxxx.
Entsminger, William L., xxxxxx.
Epperson, Lee M., xxxxxx.
Eppley, Lawren L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Erdman, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Erikson, Lester A., xxxxxx.
Erwin, Henry E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Esping, James E., xxxxxx.
Espy, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Etheridge, Travis R., xxxxxx.
Eubank, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Evans, Albert J., xxxxxx.
Evans, Clyde G., xxxxxx.
Evans, Douglas C., Sr., xxxxxx.
Evans, Harold M., xxxxxx.
Evans, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Evans, Quintin H., xxxxxx.
Evans, William L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Eveland, William A., xxxxxx.
Everett, Ronald H., xxxxxx.
Every, John E., xxxxxx.
Fabian, Gregory W., xxxx.
Fagan, James F., xxxxxx.
Fagan, William E., xxxxxx.
Fairburn, Edward H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Falvey, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Farfel, Clifford A., xxxx.
Farley, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Farmer, Darrell, xxxxxx.
Farquhar, Arnold S., xxxx.
Farquhar, Hoyt Q., xxxxxx.
Farrell, Norman J., xxxxxx.
Farris, Harold D., xxxxxx.
Fass, Franklin R., xxxxxx.
Fatiuk, Michael, Jr., xxxxxx.
Faulds, Rodney D., xxxxxx.
Faulkner, Leroy xxxxxx.
Faurot, William L., xxxxxx.
Fauteux, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Fay, James R., xxxxxx.
Fay, John V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Federle, Gordon I., xxxxxx.
Feero, Urban A., Jr. xxxxxx.
Fehlings, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Feiden, Richard S., xxxxxx.
Felker, Walter J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fenell, Klas K., xxxxxx.
Fenn, James R., xxxxxx.
Ferguson, William C., xxxxxx.
Ferlmann, Herbert C., xxxxxx.
Fernandez, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Ferrara, Vincent L., xxxx.
Ferree, David F., xxxxxx.
Ferriell, Kendrick E., xxxxxx.
Fiebelkorn, John A., xxxxxx.
Fiedor, Rudolph E., xxxxxx.
Field, Burton M., xxxxxx.
Field, William H., xxxxxx.
Fierro, Lawrence R., xxxxxx.
Fillingim, Rob L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fincher, Julian A., xxxxxx.
Finley, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Finney, Raymond M., xxxxxx.
Firebaugh, James R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fischl, Frank R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fisher, Victor G., xxxxxx.
Fisk, Delbert L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fitch, William L., xxxxxx.
Flaherty, Warren F., xxxxxx.
Flanagan, Stephen M., xxxxxx.
Flanders, Fred J., xxxxxx.
Fleischman, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Fletcher, Marshal H., xxxxxx.
Florio, Philip, Jr., xxxxxx.
Fluitt, Marvin L., xxxxxx.
Foldy, Mark S., xxxxxx.
Ford, Clarence W., xxxxxx.
Ford, Harry E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ford, Jack xxxxxx.
Ford, John, xxxxxx.
Forrey, William R., xxxxxx.
Forsythe, Fred W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fortuna, Angelo L., xxxxxx.
Fosdick, James C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Foster, Hugh B., xxxxxx.
Foster, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Foster, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Fox, Arthur E., xxxxxx.
Fox, Galen C., xxxxxx.
Fox, George A., xxxxxx.
Fox, Roger P., xxxxxx.
Frailey, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Frame, Hubert V., xxxxxx.
Frank, Jack C., xxxxxx.
Franklin, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Franklin, Willard E., xxxx.
Franzen, Marvin H., xxxxxx.
Frasca, William H., xxxxxx.
Fraser, Edward C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Frazier, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Frazier, Frank D., xxxxxx.
Frazier, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Frederick, Walter H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fredericks, Leslie L., xxxxxx.
Fremont, John C., xxxxxx.
Friday, Grady L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Friedman, Arnold, xxxxxx.
Frigeri, Peter G., xxxxxx.
Frink, John P., xxxxxx.
Frisch, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Froehlich, Emil, Jr., xxxxxx.
Fruge, Romain C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fryauf, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Fulcher, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Fullerton, John R., xxxxxx.
Fulton, Thomas L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fyock, Charles B., xxxx.
Gallaway, Stanley D., xxxxxx.
Gallenberger, Dar A., xxxxxx.
Gallion, John W., xxxxxx.
Gallogly, Inman G., xxxxxx.
Gamache, Albert C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gamble, Thomas O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gammon, Clay, xxxxxx.
Gant, George T., xxxxxx.
Gantt, Richard B., III, xxxxxx.
Garcia, Miguel A., xxxxxxx.
Gardner, Arthur J., xxxxxx.
Gardner, Gayle B., xxxxxx.
Gardner, James L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gardner, Laurence F., xxxxxx.
Gardner, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Garner, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Garofalos, Nick, xxxxxx.
Garrett, Bill J., xxxxxx.
Garrett, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Garrison, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Garrison, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Garvey, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Garvey, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Gatz, Edward C., xxxxxx.
Gaudion, John J., xxxxxx.
Gavin, Frederick J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gavin, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Gaynor, Lee R., xxxxxx.
Gehrke, Edward F., xxxxxx.
Geier, Frederick P., xxxxxx.
Geiger, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Geisinger, Walter F., xxxxxx.
Gemmill, William B., xxxxxx.
Gentzel, Charles R., xxxxxx.
George, Harry E., Jr., xxxxxx.
George, James L., xxxxxx.
George, Konrad, xxxxxx.
Georgen, Larry R., xxxxxx.
Gerdau, Richard V., xxxxxx.
Germundson, Carl N., xxxxxx.
Gex, Louis J., xxxxxx.
Gibson, Doyle G., xxxxxx.
Gibson, William H., xxxxxx.
Giesen, Herman M., xxxxxx.
Giesler, Bryan E., xxxxxx.
Gilbert, Daniel F., xxxxxx.
Gilbert, Thomas M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gilbreath, George C., xxxxxx.
Gillmour, Louis B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gimble, Billie, xxxx.
Gindrat, Norman R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Giordano, Bruno A., xxxxxx.
Giovannini, Max, xxxxxx.
Gipson, Carl R., xxxxxx.
Gipson, John B., xxxxxx.
Gleason, Leonard E., xxxxxx.
Gleason, William J., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Donald T., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Ervin L., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Joshua, xxxxxx.
Glenn, Leo, Jr., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Sam D., xxxxxx.
Glenn, Sidney A., xxxxxx.
Glover, Allison G., xxxxxx.
Goelz, Raymond F., xxxxxx.
Gore, James E., xxxxxx.
Gores, Vernon D., xxxxxx.
Gori, Floyd E., xxxxxx.
Gorman, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Gottsleben, Alvin A., xxxxxx.
Gould, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Gould, Richard V., xxxxxx.
Gould, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Gozur, Alexander, xxxxxx.
Graber, Fred L., xxxxxx.
Grady, James H., xxxxxx.
Graeb, Kenneth, xxxxxx.
Graham, Bruce E., xxxxxx.
Graham, Eugene M., xxxxxx.
Graham, James E., xxxxxx.
Graham, Neal F., xxxxxx.
Graham, Russell A., xxxxxx.
Graves, Harry W., xxxxxx.
Graves, William H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gray, David L., xxxxxx.
Gray, Edmund W., xxxxxx.
Gray, Paul L., xxxxxx.
Green, Billy J., xxxxxxx.
Green, Lewis U., Jr., xxxxxx.
Greene, Vernon F., xxxxxx.
Greener, William I., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gregory, Jack W., xxxxxx.
Gregory, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Gregory, Robert F., xxxx.

Gribble, William A., xxxxxx.
Griese, Herman R., xxxxxx.
Griesmer, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Hays F., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Joseph M., xxxxxx.
Griffith, Maurice L., xxxxxx.
Griffith, William C., xxxxxx.
Grimsley, George C., xxxxxx.
Grinham, Ernest E., xxxxxx.
Grissom, Virgil I., xxxxxx.
Gronewald, Harry L., xxxxxx.
Gross, Albert B., xxxxxx.
Gross, Stanley C., xxxxxx.
Grosse, Guy W., xxxxxx.
Grosz, Milton J., xxxxxx.
Grover, Arnold L., xxxxxx.
Groves, Richard T., Sr., xxxxxx.
Grubaugh, Kenneth W., xxxxxx.
Grube, George R., xxxxxx.
Gryska, Frank C., xxxxxx.
Guider, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Guidice, Daniel E., xxxxxx.
Guidroz, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Guild, Samuel M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gunnell, Alan K., xxxxxx.
Gutweiler, William D., xxxxxx.
Guymon, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Gwinn, Thomas W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gyulavics, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Haas, Harold H., xxxxxx.
Hackenberger, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Hackett, Richard S., xxxxxx.
Hagan, William J., xxxxxx.
Hagen, Howard A., xxxxxx.
Haggard, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Haggren, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Hagood, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Hagopian, Jack, xxxxxx.
Hain, Harlon A., xxxxxx.
Haines, Frank W., xxxxxx.
Hair, Thomas L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Haislip, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Halbert, Billy G., xxxxxx.
Hall, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Hall, Clarence M., xxxxxx.
Hall, Harold H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hall, Hollis O., xxxxxx.
Hall, Howard D., xxxxxx.
Hall, John W., xxxxxx.
Hall, Randolph L., xxxxxx.
Hall, Raymond W., xxxxxx.
Hall, William E., xxxxxx.
Hallett, Edward D., xxxxxx.
Hallgren, John F., xxxxxx.
Hallin, Carl G., xxxxxx.
Halstead, Frank C., xxxxxx.
Hambleton, John A., xxxxxx.
Hamborsky, Rudolph J., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Harold T., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Laverne A., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Richard K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Hamley, Earle S., xxxxxx.
Hammann, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Hammond, Henry L., xxxxxx.
Hammons, Jim E., xxxxxx.
Hampton, Frederick J., xxxxxx.
Hanaway, John F., xxxxxx.
Hancock, Humphrey J., xxxxxx.
Haner, Byron E., xxxxxx.
Haney, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Hanners, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Hanning, Royal M., xxxxxx.
Hansen, Edward L., xxxxxx.
Hansen, Lester T., xxxxxx.
Hanson, George B., xxxxxx.
Hanson, Paul G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hanson, Wilbur T., xxxxxx.
Hanto, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Haralson, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Harbaugh, Albert K., xxxxxx.
Harding, Francis W., III, xxxxxx.
Harding, Lynn B., xxxxxx.
Harding, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Hargrove, James T., xxxxxx.
Harmes, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Harmon, Orrin C., Sr., xxxxxx.
Harmon, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Harness, Arminta J., xxxxxx.
Harper, Henry A., xxxxxx.
Harrell, Louis J., xxxxxx.
Harrington, Roger D., xxxxxx.
Harris, Chester D., xxxxxx.
Harris, Dana H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Harris, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Harris, James M., xxxxxx.
Harris, Ralph M., xxxxxx.
Harris, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Frank B., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Michael H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hart, Gilbert A., xxxxxx.
Hart, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Hartley, Howard K., xxxxxx.
Hartley, Millard C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hartline, James H., xxxxxx.
Hatcliff, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Hatfield, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Hatzenbuehler E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Haug, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Hay, David J., xxxxxx.
Hay, Jack R., xxxxxx.
Hayford, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Hays, James A., xxxxxx.
Hays, Theodore C., xxxxxx.
Head, James W., xxxxxx.
Headlee, Harold E., xxxxxx.
Hearon, Ernest F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hearon, Wallis T., xxxxxx.
Heasman, James W., xxxxxx.
Hebert, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Heck, Floyd M., xxxxxx.
Hedge, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Hedges, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Hegberg, Willard W., xxxxxx.
Hegland, Eugene E., xxxxxx.
Hegland, Martin J., xxxxxx.
Heider, Eugene J., xxxxxx.
Heinzig, Floyd E., xxxxxx.
Held, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Helton, Daymond E., xxxxxx.
Hemm, Wayne H., xxxxxx.
Hemmer, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Hemphill, Will T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Henderson, James D., xxxxxx.
Henderson, William R., xxxxxx.
Hendren, Arthur E., xxxxxx.
Hendricks, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Hendricks, Gerald K., xxxxxx.
Henkell, Victor C., xxxxxx.
Hennessy, John E., xxxxxx.
Henney, Frederick A., xxxxxx.
Henning, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Hennrikus, George F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Henry, Frederick P., xxxxxx.
Henson, Lenore, xxxxxx.
Herman, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Herrick, Louis E., xxxxxx.
Herrin, Lexie E., xxxxxx.
Herron, Eldon L., xxxxxx.
Herron, Elmer E., xxxxxx.
Hessman, Fred W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hester, Joyce B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hevern, Howard S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Heyser, Richard S., xxxxxx.
Hickle, Buster A., xxxxxx.
Hickman, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Hicks, Ben F., xxxxxx.
Hicks, James L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hicks, Stephen B., xxxxxx.
Hiebert, Frederick C., xxxxxx.
Hiers, John D., xxxxxx.
Hildebrand, Don R. H., xxxxxx.
Hill, Arthur S., xxxxxx.
Hill, Burritt E., xxxxxx.
Hill, John J., xxxxxx.
Hill, Kenneth D., xxxxxx.
Hill, Watt G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hillard, Stephen D., xxxxxx.
Hilliard, Joseph C., xxxxxx.
Hilliard, Roy E., xxxxxx.
Hillock, Joseph P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hines, John S., xxxxxx.
Hines, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Hinman, Joseph C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hinz, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Hite, Kennith F., xxxx.
Hobbie, Eugene G., xxxxxx.
Hochreich, Leigh A., xxxxxx.
Hodek, Henry W., xxxxxx.
Hodges, Vernon W., xxxx.
Hodges, Willis M., xxxxxx.
Hodgkins, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Hoffman, Francis J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hoffman, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Hoffman, Wylie W., xxxxxx.
Hogan, Eugene S., xxxxxx.
Hogan, Jack F., xxxxxx.
Hoggard, Clarence H., xxxxxx.
Hoke, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Holcombe, William P., xxxxxx.
Holland, Anthony E., xxxxxx.
Holland, John M., xxxxxx.
Hollandsworth, Vi R., xxxxxx.
Hollenbaugh, David I., xxxxxx.
Hollinden, Albert B., xxxxxx.
Hollingshead, Fra J., xxxxxx.
Holloman, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Holston, Walter E., xxxxxx.
Holt, Harold J., xxxxxx.
Holt, Jack H., xxxxxx.
Holtgrewe, George F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hook, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Hooks, Arnold S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hooper, Vincent C., xxxxxx.
Hooten, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Hoover, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Hope, Raymond L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hornbake, William S., xxxxxx.
Horne, Elmer A., xxxx.
Horton, Howard C., xxxxxx.
Horton, James J., xxxxxx.
Horton, Lemuel D., xxxxxx.
Horton, William R., xxxxxx.
Horvath, Joseph D., xxxxxx.
Horvath, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Hosack, Ted A., xxxxxx.
Hoskins, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Hostetter, Henry G., xxxxxx.
Hotard, Josep L., III, xxxxxx.
Houghton, Rodney E., xxxxxx.
Houlahan, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Houser, Carlton E., xxxxxx.
Houston, Ben H., xxxxxx.
Houy, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Howard, David F., xxxxxx.
Howard, David R., xxxxxx.
Howard, William H., xxxxxx.
Howell, Harold, xxxxxx.
Howells, Orville J., xxxxxx.
Hoyt, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Hudack, David M., xxxxxx.
Hudson, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Huebinger, Vincent, xxxxxx.
Huff, David W., xxxxxx.
Huff, Wilbur C., xxxxxx.
Huffman, Edward C., xxxxxx.
Huffman, James P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hughes, Allen M., xxxxxx.
Hughes, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Hughes, James B., xxxxxx.
Hugo, Vane, Jr., xxxxxx.
Hull, John R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hull, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Hummel, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Hummel, Gerald W., xxxxxx.
Hummel, Hubert H., xxxxxx.
Humphrey, Eugene C., xxxxxx.
Humphrey, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Humphries, John A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hunt, Eldon W., xxxxxx.
Hunt, James C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hunter, Harold A., xxxxxx.
Hurd, Calvin W., xxxxxx.
Huston, Evan E., xxxxxx.
Huston, John M., xxxxxx.
Hutchinson, William K., xxxxxx.
Hutchison, Curtis R., xxxxxx.
Hutchison, Eric W., xxxxxx.
Hutton, Glenn K., xxxxxx.
Hyde, William H., xxxxxx.
Immler, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Ingeman, James W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ingmire, Gardner C., xxxxxx.
Ingraham, Ronald L., xxxxxx.
Ingram, Benjamin F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Iosue, Andrew P., xxxxxx.
Irvine, William E., xxxxxx.
Irvine, William G., xxxxxx.
Irwin, James B., xxxxxx.
Jackson, Linwood S., xxxxxx.
Jackson, Oliver N., xxxxxx.
Jackson, Philip R., xxxxxx.

Jackson, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Jacobs, Delmar G., xxxxxx.
Jacobs, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Jacobs, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Jacobs, Saul A., xxxxxx.
Jacobson, Martin P., xxxxxx.
Jacobson, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Jaffers, Harry, xxxxxx.
Jakoboski, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
James, David R., xxxxxx.
James, Terrence C., xxxxxx.
Janczewski, George H., xxxxxx.
Jarrell, Vernon H., xxxxxx.
Jeans, Harley E., xxxxxx.
Jeffrey, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, Joyful J., xxxxxx.
Jenks, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Jennings, Bruce D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jensen, George W., xxxxxx.
Jensen, Marvin E., xxxxxx.
Jessen, Dean L., xxxxxx.
Jewell, Samuel G., xxxxxx.
Joachim, Frank M., xxxxxx.
Joel, Nathan L., xxxxxx.
Joganich, Rudolph, xxxxxx.
Johns, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Albert W., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Edwin W., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Elven A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, George W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, George E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Glendon T., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Grant W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Harlan W., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Herbert H., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Holden C., xxxxxx.
Johnson, James O., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Jay J., xxxxxx.
Johnson, John H., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Keith B., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Larry R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Leroy K., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Loyd M., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Maurice E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Norris A., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Roy T., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Samuel R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Stanley M., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Veskel E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, William T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, William J., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Worth R., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Robert A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Sidney F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Verle L., xxxxxx.
Jolley, Hughlon W., xxxxxx.
Jondahl, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Jones, Alvan C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jones, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Jones, Donovan L., xxxxxx.
Jones, George H., xxxxxx.
Jones, Hilton A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jones, Hubert K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jones, James L., xxxxxx.
Jones, Oscar E., xxxxxx.
Jones, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Jones, Wilmer E., xxxxxx.
Joppa, Jacob A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Joppa, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Jordan, James D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jordan, Joe B., xxxxxx.
Jordan, Marvin E., xxxxxx.
Joyce, John P., xxxxxx.
Jubber, George F., xxxxxx.
Jungers, Raymond A., xxxxxx.
Kadous, Calvin J., xxxxxx.
Kaehlert, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Kalapach, Fabian F., xxxxxx.
Kalb, John F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kalberer, William A., xxxxxx.
Kaldahl, Bernard A., xxxx.
Kale, Gerald A., xxxxxx.
Kalinowski, Francis J., xxxxxx.
Kalisch, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Kane, James L., xxxxxx.
Kane, Stuart E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kantar, Nick, xxxxxx.
Karalis, Evangeli H., xxxxxx.
Karas, Norman, xxxxxx.
Karki, Govind S., xxxxxx.
Karl, George M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Karstetter, Wayne H., xxxxxx.
Kasler, James H., xxxxxx.
Kauttu, Paul A., xxxxxx.
Kaven, Wilbur V., xxxxxx.
Kawamoto, Francis H., xxxxxx.
Kay, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Kayea, Raymond F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Keables, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Keel, Murray E., xxxxxx.
Keenan, John J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Keenan, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Keeney, William O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kelgard, Philip E., xxxxxx.
Kelleher, Timothy F., xxxxxx.
Keller, Frank O., xxxxxx.
Keller, Thomas D., xxxxxx.
Keller, Walter R., xxxxxx.
Kelley, George E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kelley, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Kelly, Lloyd J., xxxxxx.
Kelly, Russell F., xxxxxx.
Kempe, Harry E., xxxxxx.
Kendrick, Jack I., xxxxxx.
Keney, Russell S., xxxxxx.
Kenney, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Kerl, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Kern, Albert E., II, xxxxxx.
Kertesz, George J., xxxxxx.
Kerwin, John J., xxxxxx.
Ketchum, James C., xxxxxx.
Kiah, Clifford B., xxxxxx.
Kidd, Cara W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kidder, David B., xxxxxx.
Kienholz, Donald D., xxxxxx.
Killelea, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Kilpatrick, Ri H., Jr., xxxxxx.
King, Charles H., Jr., xxxxxx.
King, John A., xxxxxx.
King, Leroy J., xxxxxx.
King, Robert P., xxxxxx.
King, Ronald R., xxxxxx.
Kinghorn, William H., xxxxxx.
Kingsbury, Dal C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kingston, Raymond F., xxxxxx.
Kinkade, Lester D. F., xxxxxx.
Kinney, John J. R., xxxxxx.
Kinnier, Ferdinand M., xxxxxx.
Kirby, Kermit A., xxxxxx.
Kirk, Alfred H., xxxxxx.
Kirkham, Don T., xxxxxx.
Kirkland, Floyd W., xxxxxx.
Kirlin, William F., xxxxxx.
Kirstein, Leroy M., xxxxxx.
Kissling, Lamar R., xxxxxx.
Kittrell, Donald N., xxxxxx.
Klatt, Gustav B., xxxxxx.
Kleck, Peter G., xxxxxx.
Klena, Martin D., xxxxxx.
Klodzinski, Edwin L., xxxxxx.
Kloeppel, Frederick A., xxxxxx.
Kminek, John M., xxxxxx.
Knapp, Herman L., xxxxxx.
Knapp, Leslie E., xxxxxx.
Knight, Albion, xxxxxx.
Knight, Dean A., xxxxxx.
Knopf, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Knothe, William C., xxxxxx.
Knowles, John S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Knox, Edward M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Koenig, Ramon L., xxxxxx.
Koeninger, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Kokoszka, Florian T., xxxxxx.
Konaszewski, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Koons, Burt S., xxxxxx.
Korbett, Arthur, xxxxxx.
Kormos, William J., xxxxxx.
Kosmerl, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Kosnick, John E., xxxxxx.
Kottas, William M., xxxxxx.
Kramer, Louis R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kranske, Eugene J., xxxxxx.
Kraus, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Kresl, John M., xxxxxx.
Krikorian, Garo, xxxxxx.
Kronbetter, Alvin H., xxxxxx.
Kruggel, Ewald G., xxxxxx.
Krumpe, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Kubesch, Sidney J., xxxxxx.
Kuchera, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Kuhlmann, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Kundrat, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Kuntz, David T., xxxxxx.
Lach, Joseph C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lachner, Gerald O., xxxxxx.
Lacy, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
LaFrancis, Cyril R., xxxxxx.
Lair, Norman L., xxxxxx.
Laird, Fred L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lamb, Norman C., xxxxxx.
Lambert, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Lambrecht, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Lands, Billie F., xxxxxx.
Lang, George W., xxxxxx.
Langer, Warren, xxxxxx.
Langhorne, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Langhorne, John P., xxxxxx.
Langlois, Russell G., xxxxxx.
Laplante, Clifford C., xxxxxx.
Larger, Bernard A., xxxxxx.
Larkin, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Larock, Michael K., xxxxxx.
Larsen, Larry J., xxxxxx.
Larson, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Larue, James E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lassetter, Jimmy S., xxxxxx.
Lathrop, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Laughrun, Noble B., xxxxxx.
Lavish, Alexander, xxxxxx.
Lavoie, George P., xxxxxx.
Lawler, Rita A., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Norton J., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Wendell B., xxxxxx.
Lawson, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Lawton, William H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Layer, Eugene E., xxxxxx.
Layman, Loren J., xxxxxx.
Leach, George T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Leaf, Howard W., xxxxxx.
Leahy, Cornelius M., xxxxxx.
Leavell, Adelbert D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lebsack, Alvin J., xxxxxx.
Lee, Dwight A., xxxxxx.
Lee, John M., xxxxxx.
Lee, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Leeper, Neil M., xxxxxx.
Leggate, George H., xxxxxx.
Lehr, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Leibrock, James T., xxxxxx.
Leman, Anthony, xxxxxx.
Leming, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Lemke, Herbert M., xxxxxx.
Lemoine, William P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lemon, Lewis C., xxxxxx.
Lenahan, Harry F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lerner, Robert, xxxxxx.
Lessard, William D., xxxxxx.
Lessig, Raymond H., xxxxxx.
Levy, Eugene D., xxxxxx.
Lewis, David, Jr., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Gladstone S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Leroy C., xxxxxx.
Lewis, William E., xxxxxx.
Lewis, William H., xxxxxx.
Lightner, Gerald W., xxxxxx.
Lilygren, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Lindo, Jesse P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lindsay, John T., xxxxxx.
Lingel, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Lingenfelter, Glen, xxxxxx.
Lingle, Harvey C., xxxxxx.
Linnon, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Little, Forest L., xxxxxx.
Lloyd, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Locke, Jesse C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lockyer, Jesse L., xxxxxx.
Loemker, Fred H., xxxxxx.
Loest, John E., xxxxxx.
Logie, Loren C., xxxxxx.
Logsdon, Harold E., xxxxxx.
Loken, Virgil D., xxxxxx.
Long, Elon, xxxxxx.
Long, Harry C., xxxxxx.
Long, Herbert N., xxxxxx.
Long, James D., xxxxxx.
Long, Patrick G., xxxxxx.
Long, Robert C., xxxxxx.

Loosmore, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Lopes, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Loree, Ellis R., xxxxxx.
Lorenz, Bernard C., xxxxxx.
Lorenzen, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Lorey, Willis E., xxxxxx.
Loscalzo, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Lottich, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Lounsbery, William R., xxxxxx.
Love, Curtis C., xxxxxx.
Love, James S., xxxxxx.
Low, James F., xxxxxx.
Lowe, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Lowe, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Lucas, Clyde J., xxxxxx.
Luckingham, Rudolph M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ludwig, John H., xxxxxx.
Lund, Neils H., xxxxxx.
Lunsford, Hollis, xxxxxx.
Lynch, Andrew C., xxxxxx.
Lysaght, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Mabus, Earl F., xxxxxx.
MacAlpine, James G., Jr., xxxxxx.
MacCallum, John M., Jr., xxxxxx.
MacDonald, Robert, xxxxxx.
MacDonald, Robert W., xxxxxx.
MacGlothlin, Tho M., xxxx.
Mack, William M., xxxxxx.
Mackey, Wilfred G., xxxxxx.
Maclaren, Will G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Madril, Ernest, xxxxxx.
Main, Eugene L., xxxxxxx.
Maines, Leland E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Major, Alford M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Majoros, Theodore E., xxxxxx.
Mallard, Herbert L., xxxxxx.
Malone, Edwin F., xxxxxx.
Malone, William C., xxxxxx.
Malot, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Malsbury, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Manning, William F., xxxxxx.
Markel, Richard K., xxxxxx.
Marks, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Marks, John B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Marks, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Marlow, Louis G., xxxxxx.
Marrs, Maurice A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Marshall, Frank R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Marshall, James H., xxxxxx.
Martin, Emlen L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Martin, Lyal A., xxxxxx.
Martin, Paul B., xxxxxx.
Martin, Ralph D., xxxxxx.
Martin, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Martin, William H., xxxxxx.
Martineau, Horace W., xxxxxx.
Martini, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Marzluf, Earl R., xxxxxx.
Mason, Dwight E., xxxxxx.
Mason, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Massey, Guy R., xxxxxx.
Massey, Rawlinson M., xxxxxx.
Mateer, Alan, xxxxxx.
Mathews, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Mathews, James W., xxxxxx.
Matson, Keith W., xxxxxx.
Matula, Walter E., xxxxxx.
Maultsby, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Maxwell, Allen D., xxxxxx.
Maxwell, James R., xxxxxx.
May, Clarence T., xxxxxx.
May, Hugh E., xxxxxx.
May, William A., Jr., xxxxx.
Mayfield, William O., xxxxxx.
Mazak, Edward P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mazza, James D., xxxxxx.
McAlpine, James L., xxxxxx.
McArdle, Frank H., xxxxxx.
McBride, Donald B., xxxxxx.
McCaffrey, Margar I., xxxxxx.
McCain, Otis E., xxxxxx.
McCallum, William, III, xxxxxx.
McCarthy, George F., xxxxxx.
McCartie, Floyd E., xxxxxx.
McCauley, Clifton H., xxxxxx.
McClain, Keith E., xxxxxx.
McCollester, Robert E., xxxxxx.
McConnell, John P., xxxxxx.
McConnell, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
McConnell, William F., xxxxxx.
McCord, Beverly B., xxxxxx.
McCormick, James E., xxxxxx.
McCormick, Mark H., Jr., xxxxxx.
McCormick, Robert J., xxxxxx.
McCracken, Naomi, M., xxxxxx.
McCreary, Richard D., xxxxxx.
McDaniel, Gerald, xxxxxx.
McDonald, David R., xxxxxx.
McDonald, James R., xxxxxx.
McDonald, Lewis E., xxxxxx.
McDonald, Richard Q., xxxxxx.
McDonald, Robert F., xxxxxx.
McDougal, Douglas C., xxxxxx.
McElhaney, John H., xxxxxx.
McElroy, Jane, xxxxxx.
McFarland, Walter J., xxxxxx.
McFolin, Olin E., xxxxxx.
McGee, Patrick L., xxxxxx.
McGregor, Mark A., xxxxxx.
McGuire, Dale A., xxxxxx.
McGuire, Danny W., xxxxxx.
McHargue, Robert S., xxxxxx.
McIlvain, Kenneth J., Jr., xxxxxx.
McIntosh, Robert H., xxxxxx.
McIntyre, Robert K., xxxxxx.
McKague, James F., xxxxxx.
McKanna, William R., xxxxxx.
McKee, Roy L., xxxxxx.
McKeethen, Lloyd B., xxxxxx.
McKenzie, Carl W., xxxxxx.
McKenzie, Eugene A., xxxxxx.
McKenzie, Wallace J., xxxxxx.
McKinley, Richard J., xxxxxx.
McKinney, Robert E., xxxxxx.
McKusick, Charles E., xxxxxx.
McLaughlin, Jean W., xxxxxx.
McLoud, Harold J., Jr., xxxxxx.
McLucas, Bob, xxxxxx.
McManamon, Arnold G., xxxxxx.
McMillan, James A., xxxxxx.
McMillan, Lonnie C., xxxxxx.
McMullen, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
McMullian All E., Jr., xxxxxx.
McNamara, Donald J., xxxxxx.
McNamee, Albert R., xxxxxx.
McNeil, Sidney L., xxxxxx.
McQuillen, John R., xxxxxx.
McRae, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Medcalf, John R., xxxxxx.
Meharg, William B., xxxxxx.
Meinhold, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Mellin, James A., xxxxxx.
Mendenhall, Joseph H., xxxxxx.
Merrill, Frank J., xxxxxx.
Merrow, Elmer W., xxxxxx.
Mesropian, Leon M., xxxxxx.
Messinger, Mary W., xxxxxx.
Messmore, Jack W., xxxxxx.
Methfessel, Herman J., xxxxxx.
Metscher, William, xxxxxx.
Meyer, Delvin H., xxxxxx.
Meyer, Warren W., xxxxxx.
Mickelson, Gordon B., xxxxxx.
Mickelson, John M., xxxxxx.
Miknuk, Harry J., xxxxxx.
Miller, Burr V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Miller, George R., xxxxxx.
Miller, Harold R., xxxxxx.
Miller, Howard E., xxxxxx.
Miller, John, xxxxxx.
Miller, John H., xxxxxx.
Miller, John M., xxxxxx.
Miller, Milton E., xxxxxx.
Miller, Nelson L., xxxxxx.
Miller, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Miller, Ray E., xxxxxx.
Miller, Richard O., xxxxxx.
Miller, Walter H., xxxxxx.
Milliman, Dain W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Milling, Robert W., xxxx.
Mills, Royce L., xxxxxx.
Milstead, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Mingus, John H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Minor, Roy N., xxxxxx.
Miraglia, Michael B., xxxxxx.
Misgen, Darrell J., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Harry A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Hershal, xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Mixon, Exley C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mohr, William E., II, xxxxxx.
Moise, Benjamin J., xxxxxx.
Molzer, Victor J., xxxxxx.
Monaghan, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Money, James E., xxxxxx.
Montague, George H., xxxxxx.
Montague, Ronald B., xxxxxx.
Montgomery, Wi T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Montgomery, William H., xxxxxx.
Moody, Eugene E., xxxxxx.
Moore, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Moore, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Moore, Emory R., xxxxxx.
Moore, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Moore, James R., xxxxxx.
Moore, Warren C., xxxxxx.
Moore, William E., xxxxxx.
Moore, William L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Bernard S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Glenn F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morgan, James F., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Thomas P., xxxxxx.
Morgan, Wallace M., xxxxxx.
Moritz, Franklin P., xxxxxx.
Morrell, Bruce E., xxxxxx.
Morris, Eldon W., xxxxxx.
Morris, Emerson E., xxxxxx.
Morris, Jack, xxxxxx.
Morrow, Joseph W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morrow, William F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morton, George J., xxxxxx.
Morton, James L., xxxxxx.
Moshier, Howard W., xxxxxx.
Mott, Elbert L., xxxxxx.
Mottsmith, Tipton P., xxxxxx.
Mounts, Thomas T., xxxxxx.
Muhlbach, George W., xxxxxx.
Mularz, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Mullaney, David M., xxxxxx.
Mullenix, Ronald R., xxxxxx.
Mullinix, Mark F., xxxxxx.
Mullins, Jimmy W., xxxxxx.
Munsey, Virgil W., xxxxxx.
Murdock, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Murdy, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Murnin, John J., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Cecil R., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Frank, Jr., xxxxxx.
Murphy, James B., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Miles G., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Patrick J., xxxxxx.
Murray, Daniel C., xxxxxx.
Murray, John V., xxxxxx.
Musgjerd, Clair H., xxxxxx.
Myers, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Myers, Fred B., xxxxxx.
Myers, Paul R., xxxx.
Myers, Ralph H., xxxxxx.
Nadeau, Louis J., xxxxxx.
Narciso, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Nash, James S., xxxxxx.
Navarro, Herbert, xxxxxx.
Nealon, Francis R., xxxxxx.
Neimeyer, Allen C., xxxxxx.
Nelson, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Nelson, William B., xxxxxx.
Nelson, William E., xxxxxx.
Nelson, William L., xxxxxx.
Nesbitt, Walter H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nesmith, E. Archie, Jr., xxxxxx.
Newhall, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Newton, Brewer N., xxxxxx.
Nicholl, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Nichols, William L., xxxxxx.
Nichols, William L., xxxxxx.
Niggle, Harry T., xxxxxx.
Noe, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Noll, Harry E., xxxxxx.
Nolli, John, xxxxxx.
Norrbohm, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Norris, Karl D., xxxxxx.
Northey, Clare E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Northrup, Edgar A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Norton, Alfred D., xxxxxx.
Norton, James B., xxxxxx.
Norton, Neal E., xxxxxx.
Norton, Nile B., xxxxxx.
Norton, Phillip A., xxxxxx.
Nowogrowski, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Nugent, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Nunn, Rodolph L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nunnery, William E., xxxxxx.
Nurge, Henry C., Jr., xxxxxx.

Nutt, Waymond C., xxxxxx.
Nyquist, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Nystrom, Robert K., xxxxxx.
O'Brien, Charles C., xxxxxx.
Ochota, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, Charles J., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, Donald R., xxxxxx.
O'Connor, William L., xxxxxx.
Odom, James R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ogden, Wallace H., xxxxxx.
O'Grady, Barry, xxxxxx.
Ohlheiser, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Okuly, Robert L., xxxxxx.
O'Leary, James L., xxxxxx.
Oliver, John K., xxxxxx.
Olmsted, Joan, xxxxxx.
Olsen, William P., xxxxxx.
Olson, James L., xxxxxx.
Olson, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Olson, Rollie G., xxxxxx.
O'Malley, Gene J., xxxxxx.
O'Malley, John F., xxxxxx.
Omo, Wayne H., xxxxxx.
Orabona, John J., xxxxxx.
Origer, Leo J., xxxxxx.
Orr, Loren E., xxxxxx.
Ortolivo, Basil A., xxxxxx.
Orwoll, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Osborn, John R., xxxxxx.
Osborne, George S., xxxxxx.
Ostman, Harold A., xxxxxx.
Ottaway, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Outlaw, Albertus B., xxxxxx.
Overton, Norris W., xxxxxx.
Owens, Joy L., xxxxxx.
Pack, Moody J., xxxxxx.
Pagano, Frank G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pahl, Philip M., xxxxxx.
Palmer, Donald P., xxxxxx.
Palmquist, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Panas, George W., xxxxxx.
Panuska, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Parber, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Pardee, William J., xxxxxx.
Parenti, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Paris, Harold K., xxxxxx.
Parker, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Parks, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Parks, Roland W., xxxxxx.
Parlett, Henry W., xxxxxx.
Paroby, Michael J., xxxxxx.
Parsons, Russell K., xxxxxx.
Partridge, Norman E., xxxxxx.
Pascoe, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Pasley, John V., xxxxxx.
Passauer, James L., xxxxxx.
Pate, Joe H., xxxxxx.
Pate, William B., xxxxxx.
Paterson, Cameron D., xxxxxx.
Patrick, Alexander, xxxxxx.
Patrone, Ferdinand L., xxxxxx.
Patten, Andrew L., xxxxxx.
Patterson, Gerald L., xxxxxx.
Patton, Dewey, Jr., xxxxxx.
Patton, Norman P., xxxxxx.
Patton, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Paul, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Paul, Leroy S., xxxxxx.
Paul, Norman L., xxxxxx.
Paulnock, Eugene N., xxxxxx.
Paxton, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Paydo, John, Jr., xxxxxx.
Payne, Sam, xxxxxx.
Peake, Erwin C., xxxxxx.
Peck, Joe P., xxxxxx.
Peck, Warren G., xxxxxx.
Peckham, Howard L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Peden, Alpha E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pemberton, Gene T., xxxxxx.
Penney, Francis W., xxxxxx.
Percival, Wilson, xxxxxx.
Perez, Mario, xxxxxx.
Perham, Guy D., xxxxxx.
Perry, Howard I., xxxxxx.
Perry, William F., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Keith E., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Nile G., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Roger K., xxxxxx.
Petska, Jerry J., xxxxxx.
Petta, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Pettway, Frank H., xxxxxx.
Pfeifer, Harold E., xxxxxx.
Pfeiffer, Leon K., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Martin T., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Paul C., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Victor F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Wilbur O., xxxx.
Phipps, Claude P., xxxxxx.
Phipps, John L., xxxxxx.
Piazza, John A., xxxxxx.
Pickett, George K., xxxxxx.
Pierce, Fred P., xxxxxx.
Pierce, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Pierson, Howard J., xxxxxx.
Pietschner, Paul W., xxxxxx.
Pijanowski, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Pilcher, Delbert L., xxxxxx.
Pilecki, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Pinckney, Thomas C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pineau, Norman T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pinkerton, David W., xxxxxx.
Pinney, George F., xxxxxx.
Piper, Marian L., xxxxxx.
Pitchford, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Pitt, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Pittman, Ralph S., xxxxxx.
Plack, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Pletcher, John S., xxxxxx.
Plonowski, Francis S., xxxxxx.
Plunk, William G., xxxxxx.
Polasek, Bill E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pollack, Raymond, xxxxxx.
Poor, Arthur R., xxxxxx.
Porritt, Orval R., xxxxxx.
Porter, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Porter, Elliott W., xxxxxx.
Porter, Eugene R., xxxxxx.
Porter, Scott S., xxxxxx.
Porter, Thurman, Jr., xxxxxx.
Post, Foster A., xxxxxx.
Potochnik, Roy, xxxxxx.
Potter, Thomas D., xxxxxx.
Potter, William D., xxxxxx.
Powell, James V., xxxxxx.
Powell, John C., xxxxxx.
Powell, John R., xxxxxx.
Powers, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Powers, William E., xxxxxx.
Pratt, Carl E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Price, Clifford D., xxxxxx.
Price, Emmerson D., xxxxxx.
Price, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Price, Thomas D., xxxxxx.
Price, William D., xxxxxx.
Price, William S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Prince, Alan M., xxxxxx.
Prince, Darrell P., xxxxxx.
Pritchard, Eve E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pritchard, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Proctor, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Provance, William J., xxxxxx.
Purdy, Channing L., xxxxxx.
Purdy, Ira J., xxxxxx.
Putt, Mitchell A., xxxxxx.
Quandt, Theodore W., xxxxxx.
Quann, John L., xxxxxx.
Quigley, Thomas K., xxxxxx.
Quinn, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Quinn, William M., xxxx.
Quinn, William P., xxxxxx.
Raeburn, Alexander N., xxxxxx.
Raful, Robert, xxxxxx.
Rainey, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Ralston, Billy L., xxxxxx.
Ramey, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Ramos, Rafael E., xxxxxx.
Randall, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Randolph, James G., xxxxxx.
Ratcliffe, James C., xxxxxx.
Rau, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Raunikar, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Raymond, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Reagan, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Reagan, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Reddoch, John H., xxxxxx.
Reddy, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Reed, Irving B., xxxxxx.
Reeder, Damon B., xxxxxx.
Reedy, Jack C., xxxxxx.
Rees, Ervin F., xxxxxx.
Reeve, Gerald S., xxxxxx.
Reeves, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Reeves, James D., xxxxxx.
Rehberg, Dwight F., xxxxxx.
Rehwaldt, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Reid, George R., xxxxxx.
Reid, Jack W., xxxx.
Reid, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Reilly, Lavern G., xxxxxx.
Reis, Andrew J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reitan, Harold T., xxxxxx.
Remaklus, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Reneau, Leland D., xxxxxx.
Renelt, Walter A., xxxxxx.
Renken, Randall R., xxxxxx.
Renner, Sylves G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Renner, Sylvester G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Renz, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Reschke, William G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reynold, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Herbert H., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Plea G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Rhemann, John F., xxxxxx.
Rice, Russell H., xxxxxx.
Richards, John W., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Edgar L., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Floyd W., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Kenneth M., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Russe G., xxxx.
Richardson, Wi L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Richman, Samuel R., xxxxxx.
Rick, George H., xxxxxx.
Rickey, Roger M., xxxxxx.
Rider, John, xxxxxx.
Riepling Robert O., xxxxxx.
Rilling, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Rinearson, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Rines, David D., xxxxxx.
Ripp, Mason L., xxxxxx.
Risdon, Willis P., xxxxxx.
Ritchie, John, xxxxxx.
Rivers, John S., xxxxxx.
Rivers, William J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rizzo, Harry F., xxxxxx.
Roach, James M., xxxxxx.
Roan, Norman C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Robar, Leland J., xxxxxx.
Robb, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Roberts, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Robertson, George B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Robertson, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Robertson, William E., xxxxxx.
Robinette, Roy C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Charles G., xxxxxx.
Robinson, John S., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Leonard G., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Samuel M., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Walter A., xxxxxx.
Robison, Donald, xxxxxx.
Robison, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Rode, David, xxxxxx.
Rodriguez, Francis W., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Billy F., xxxxxx.
Rogers, John A., xxxxxx.
Rogers, John R., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Lynn, xxxxxx.
Rogers, William A., xxxxxx.
Rogge, Gene F., xxxxxx.
Rohlfs, Max E., xxxxxx.
Rohlinger, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Roloff, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Romine, Lester M., xxxxxx.
Roper, Clarence R., xxxxxx.
Rosalia, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Rose, Ernest G., xxxxxx.
Rose, James E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rosker, Benjamin H., xxxxxx.
Ross, Glenn D., xxxxxx.
Ross, Irving F., xxxxxx.
Ross, Leroy E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rosser, William E., II, xxxxxx.
Rossler, Arthur A., xxxxxx.
Rothwell, Lyman W., xxxxxx.
Routhier, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Rowell, Claude R., xxxxxx.
Rowland, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Rowley, Armand G., xxxxxx.
Roy, Robert W., xxxxxx.

Rozar, James P., xxxxxx.
Rozner, Maurice, xxxxxx.
Rozsa, Allen C., xxxxxx.
Rudd, Walter L., xxxxxx.
Rule, John H., xxxxxx.
Rumph, Herbert L., xxxxxx.
Runyan, Albert E., xxxxxx.
Ruppert, Warren G., xxxxxx.
Rush, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Rushing, Henry C., xxxxxx.
Russell, Daniel W., xxxxxx.
Russell, Francis M., xxxxxx.
Russell, Harry C., Sr., xxxxxx.
Russell, John P., xxxxxx.
Russell, Thurman C., xxxxxx.
Rutherford, Leslie G., xxxxxx.
Rutter, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Ruvolo, Sam J., xxxxxx.
Ryan, B. W., xxxxxx.
Ryan, Wallace C., xxxxxx.
Ryan, William A., xxxxxx.
Ryan, William J., xxxxxx.
Rynning, James L., xxxxxx.
Saffell, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Safford, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Sakanich, Donald, xxxxxx.
Salem, George L., xxxxxx.
Salemi, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Salvi, Albert M., xxxxxx.
Samotis, John A., xxxxxx.
Sampson, James B., xxxxxx.
Sandberg, Theodore H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sandel, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Sanders, Claude R., xxxxxx.
Sanders, Elisha P., xxxxxx.
Sanders, James B., xxxxxx.
Sandini, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Sandlin, David W., xxxxxx.
Sands, Carl A., xxxxxx.
Saunders, Menno R., xxxxxx.
Savage, Bernard M., xxxxxx.
Savage, George R., xxxxxx.
Savage, Joseph E., xxxxxx.
Savidge, David, xxxxxx.
Savoy, Harry J., xxxxx.
Savoye, Richard O., xxxxxx.
Sawyer, Mary A., xxxxxx.
Schafer, Gerald G., xxxxxx.
Scharff, James H., xxxxxx.
Schatzman, George W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Scheerer, Ernest A., xxxxxx.
Schenaker, Jack H., xxxxxx.
Schiffer, John T., xxxxxx.
Schiltz, Juanita D., xxxxxx.
Schimberg, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Schimsk, Herbert F., xxxxxx.
Schindler, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Schlatter, David M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Schlatter, James D., xxxxxx.
Schlotterback, Da L., xxxxxx.
Schmid, Ernest A., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Glenn E., xxxxxx.
Schmitt, Russell E., xxxxxx.
Schmuck, Frank J., xxxxxx.
Schock, Grover J. D., xxxxxx.
Schooley, Jean M., xxxxxx.
Schra, Carl J., xxxxxx.
Schultz, Jean L., xxxxxx.
Schultz, Paul G., xxxxxx.
Schultz, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Schulz, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Schumacher, Elmer J., xxxxxx.
Schutawie, Ted J., xxxxxx.
Schwab, Paul F., xxxxxx.
Schwanke, Otto F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Schweisfurth, Walter, xxxxxx.
Schwob, Clair A., xxxxxx.
Scott, Alden A., xxxxxx.
Scott, Bobby L., xxxxxx.
Scott, Ralph, xxxxxx.
Scott, Ralph D., xxxxxx.
Scott, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Scovell, Rolf S., xxxxxx.
Scruggs, Seth W., xxxxxx.
Seal, William R., xxxxxx.
Seaman, Ernest G., xxxxxx.
Seawards, Earlan L., xxxxxx.
Sedivec, Edward G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sedlak, John E., xxxxxx.
Seegren, Norman W., xxxxxx.
Seehafer, Don, xxxxxx.
Seibel, Conrad H., xxxxxx.
Seiders, Reed E., xxxxxx.
Seiler, Charles E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Self, Jimmy K., xxxxxx.
Self, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Selfridge, Harold R., xxxxxx.
Sellers, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Seltzer, Lloyd M., xxxxxx.
Selvaggi, Rossi L., xxxxxx.
Senger, Pius F., xxxxxx.
Sentir, Harris, xxxxxx.
Severson, Eldon B., xxxxxx.
Shackelford, Coll G., xxxxxx.
Shackelford, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Shaff, Maurice A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shaffer, Glenn B., xxxxxx.
Shannon, Hugh R., xxxxxx.
Shannon, James J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shannon, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Sharp, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Shattuck, Eugene J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shattuck, James W., xxxxxx.
Shaw, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Sheekley, John R., xxxxxx.
Sheen, Jack W., xxxxxx.
Sheldon, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Sheldon, Roscoe T., xxxxxx.
Shepard, Jack E., xxxxxx.
Shepard, Marcella M., xxxxxx.
Shepherd, Philip R., xxxxxx.
Sheridan, Philip, xxxxxx.
Sherman, Thomas W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sherry, Donald T., xxxxxx.
Sherwood, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Shipley, George R., xxxxxx.
Shivers, Edward D. III, xxxxxx.
Shockley, Charles, xxxxxx.
Shockley, Harold J., xxxxxx.
Shoemaker, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Shoop, Marion H., xxxxxx.
Short, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Shoults, Hugh W., xxxxxx.
Showen, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Shrider, Robert E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shultz, Harold D., xxxxxx.
Shuping, James A., xxxxxx.
Sifers, Samuel I., Jr., xxxxxx.
Silagy, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Simanonok, Joseph E., xxxxxx.
Simmons, Clyde M., xxxxxx.
Simmons, Jimmie L., xxxxxx.
Simon, Kalman D., xxxxxx.
Simon, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Simon, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Simons, John C., xxxxxx.
Simpson, George M., xxxx.
Simpson, Travis L., xxxxxx.
Sims, Eaton K., xxxxxx.
Singer, Stewart M., xxxxxx.
Sisson, Frank E., II, xxxxxx.
Sittig, Beverly E., xxxxxx.
Skidmore, John G., xxxxxx.
Skiles, Thomas N., xxxxxx.
Skillman, Tom M., xxxxxx.
Skousen, Alma W., xxxxxx.
Slaughter, Norman E., Jr., xxxxx.
Sleep, Otis A., xxxxxx.
Slepicka, Francis W., xxxxxx.
Slezak, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Sloan, Glenn R., xxxxxx.
Smalley, Wyman J., xxxxxx.
Smith, Allen, xxxxxx.
Smith, Arthur F., xxxxxx.
Smith, Cecil R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Charles O., xxxxxx.
Smith, Claris A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith Click D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Conrad H., xxxxxx.
Smith, Cooper R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Smith, Eugene A., xxxxxx.
Smith, Floyd E., xxxxxx.
Smith, Guy L., xxxxxx.
Smith, Harold A., xxxxxx.
Smith, James A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, John A., xxxxxx.
Smith, John S., xxxxxx.
Smith, Louis J., xxxxxx.
Smith, Norman L., xxxxxx.
Smith, Paul A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Ray H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Raymond C., xxxxxx.
Smith, Richard N., xxxxxx.
Smith, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Smith, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Smith, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Smith, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Smith, Ronald W., xxxxxx.
Smith, Scott G., xxxxxx.
Smith, Vernon W., xxxxxx.
Smith, Von L., xxxxxx.
Smith, Wayne E., xxxxxx.
Smith, William F., xxxxxx.
Smith, William L., xxxxxx.
Smith, William M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smithson, Claude J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smurro, William E., xxxxxx.
Snider, Henry G., xxxxxx.
Soapes, Thomas D., xxxxxx.
Sobelman, Phillip, xxxxxx.
Solis, Roland X., xxxxxx.
Sommer, William R., xxxxxx.
Soper, William R., xxxxxx.
Sorenson, Nile A., xxxxxx.
Sorrelle, John W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Southworth, St George, Jr., xxxxxx.
Sparks, David K., xxxxxx.
Sparks, James C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sparks, Lawrence R., xxxxxx.
Spaulding, Melbur C., xxxxxx.
Spears, Kent C., Jr., xxxx.
Spelis, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Spelts, David E., xxxxxx.
Speroni, Joseph M., xxxxxx.
Spieldenner, Frank E., xxxxxx.
Sprague, Carleton K., xxxxxx.
Springer, Leonida K., xxxxxx.
Sproul, John L., xxxxxx.
Squires, John C., xxxxxx.
Staab, John M., xxxxxx.
Stables, Thomas B., xxxxxx.
Staggs, Glenn E., xxxxxx.
Stahlhut, Dale S., xxxxxx.
Stanley, Jess F., xxxxxx.
Stanley, Lawrence W., xxxxxx.
Stanton, James D., xxxxxx.
Stanton, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Stapher, Elmer F., xxxx.
Starbuck, Floyd C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Starkel, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Starkey, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Starrett, John P., xxxxxx.
Stauffer, Glenn F., xxxxxx.
Stavast, John E., xxxxxx.
Stein, James W., xxxxxx.
Steelman, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Steger, Jack M., xxxxxx.
Steger, James G., xxxxxx.
Steig, Ted, xxxxxx.
Steiner, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Steingasser, Joseph N., xxxxxx.
Stembridge, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Stephens, Dallas K., xxxxxx.
Stephens, John H., xxxxxx.
Stephens, Perry L., xxxxxx.
Stephenson, James R., xxxxxx.
Stevens, Henry L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stevens, John T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stevens, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Stevens, Walter C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stevenson, Sharman R., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Donald W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Ervin C., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Ervin O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Gerald W., xxxxxx.
Stickney, Frank A., xxxxxx.
Stiegel, Raymond B., xxxxxx.
Stiles, David L., xxxxxx.
Stiles, Ralph W., xxxxxx.
Stillman, Albert E., xxxxxx.
Stillwagon, Edwin A., xxxxxx.
Stimson, James S., xxxxxx.
Stith, Alan H., xxxxxx.
St. John, Ernest A., xxxxxx.
Stobaugh, Warren K., xxxxxx.
Stockdell, Victor B., xxxxxx.
Stockman, David T., xxxxxx.
Stokum, Russell L., xxxxxx.
Storm, Mary L., xxxxxx.
Story, Warren H., xxxxxx.
Stoss, Fred B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stout, Norman N., xxxxxx.

Stringer, William L., xxxxxx.
Stull, Ned R., xxxxxx.
Stumpf, Charles J., xxxx.
Sullivan, William H., xxxxxx.
Sulser, Mayo B., xxxxxx.
Summerour, Joseph E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Summers, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Sumner, Darvel L., xxxxxx.
Sundberg, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Sutch, Victor D., xxxxxx.
Sverha, Michael J., xxxxxx.
Swan, Robert B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Swearingen, Paul, xxxxxx.
Sweeney, Daniel J., xxxxxx.
Sweeney, Mack D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sweesy, James W., xxxxxx.
Swol, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Tackett, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Taft, Gordon G., xxxxxx.
Talbert, William H., xxxxxx.
Tarrant, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Tarrant, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Tarver, William R., xxxx.
Tatsch, Clarence C., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Clyde T., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Everette, xxxxxx.
Taylor, Harold L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Ira T., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Jack M., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Jack W., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Richard N., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Stillman V., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Victor D., xxxxxx.
Tedder, Therion D., xxxxxx.
Teegarden, Clifford J., xxxxxx.
Terry, Homer T., xxxxxx.
Therkelsen, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Thogersen, Alton J., xxxxxx.
Tholen, Lloyd A., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Arnold W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Earle G., III, xxxxxx.
Thomas, Frederick H., xxxxxx.
Thomas James R., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Ralph W., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Will R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thomas, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thomason, Jackson L., xxxxxx.
Thomason, John F., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Edwin E., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Glen E., xxxxxx.
Thompson, James B., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Johnny M., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Walter W., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Herman O., xxxxxx.
Thorne, Anthony S., xxxxxx.
Threlkeld, William R., xxxxxx.
Thresher, Russell W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tibbetts, Fred M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Timm, William M., xxxxxx.
Timmons, Robert A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tingle, Leslie G., xxxxxx.
Tinius, John O., xxxxxx.
Titus, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Tocci, Vincent R., xxxxxx.
Toedt, Dell C., xxxxxx.
Tone, Myron L., xxxxxx.
Toomey, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Towne, Earle F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Towner, Melvin, xxxx.
Tracy, Fred L., xxxxxx.
Trapani, Renato V., xxxxxx.
Travis, John T., xxxxxx.
Tribble, George S., xxxxxx.
Trimble, Garland E., xxxxxx.
Trimble, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Trobaugh, John C., xxxxxx.
Trost, Frederick J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Trost, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Troublefield, J. E. J., xxxxxx.
Trowbridge, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Truehart, James L., xxxxxx.
Truesdell, Willard M., xxxxxx.
Truitt, William F., xxxxxx.
Tucker, Roy C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tullos, Lamar G., xxxxxx.
Tunis, William C., xxxxxx.
Turner, Eldon K., xxxxxx.
Turner, William P., xxxxxx.
Twining, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Tynan, George P., xxxxxx.
Tyndall, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Tyre, Ronald, xxxxxx.
Uehara, Kiyoshi J., xxxxxx.
Uken, Helmuth L., xxxxxx.
Ulrich, Myron D., xxxxxx.
Umstead, Stanley M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Unger, Richard, xxxxxx.
Uphouse, Earl W., xxxxxx.
Vaitekunas, Anthony M., xxxxxx.
Valdez, Bobby G., xxxxxx.
Valentino, Rudolph A., xxxxxx.
Vandenberg Ho S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vandendries, John E., xxxxxx.
Vandenheuvel, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Vandusen, John N., xxxxxx.
Vangilder, William S., xxxxxx.
Vangorder, Francis C., xxxxxx.
Vanlew, William R., xxxxxx.
Vannatta, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Vanwagner, Ross, Jr., xxxxxx.
Vaughn, Billy M., xxxxxx.
Vechik, Donald, xxxxxx.
Venable, William P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Verner, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Veurink, William J., xxxx.
Vick, Robert I., xxxxxx.
Vickers, Grover W., xxxxxx.
Vickrey, Carol D., xxxxxx.
Vogt, Tom W., xxxxxx.
Vogt, Wayne D., xxxxxx.
Vonphul, Stephen, xxxxxx.
Vosburgh, Leland E., xxxxxx.
Wachter, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Waechter, Luther H., xxxxxx.
Waespy, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Waggoner, Cecil E., xxxxxx.
Waitt, Lawrence L., xxxxxx.
Wallace, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Wallace, Neil W., xxxxxx.
Wallace, Preston A., xxxxxx.
Wallis, Wesley R., xxxxxx.
Walls, James L., xxxxxx.
Walsh, Kenneth L., xxxxxx.
Walter, Alonzo, J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Walters, George S., xxxxxx.
Walters, James J., xxxxxx.
Walters, Marvin L., xxxxxx.
Walters, Wilme C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Walton, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Ward, Albert H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ward, Clifford L., xxxxxx.
Ward, John D., xxxxxx.
Ward, Kermit D., xxxxxx.
Ward, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Warix, Clay W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Warner, Eugene R., xxxxxx.
Warner, Max O., xxxxxx.
Warren, Calvin C., xxxxxx.
Warren, Walter H., xxxxxx.
Warren, William J., xxxxxx.
Warrington, James, xxxxxx.
Washington, Edward P., xxxxxx.
Wassil, Michael G., xxxxxx.
Wassom, Chester R., xxxxxx.
Wasson, Glenn E., xxxxxx.
Waterbury, David E., xxxxxx.
Waters, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Waters, William G., xxxxxx.
Watkins, Elmer R., xxxxxx.
Watkins, James L., xxxxxx.
Watson, Charles F., Jr., xxxx.
Watson, Ervin R., xxxxxx.
Watson, Harold B., xxxxxx.
Watson, Jerry F., xxxxxx.
Watson, Raymond S., xxxxxx.
Watts, Jack K., xxxxxx.
Waugh, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Weaver, Harvey C., xxxxxx.
Weaver, Russell E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Webb, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Webb, Herbert G., xxxxxx.
Webb, James A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Webb, James L., xxxxxx.
Webb, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Webb, Sidney A., xxxxxx.
Webster, Everett H., xxxxxx.
Webster, James V., xxxxxx.
Wedding, George W., xxxxxx.
Wedekind, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Weehler, Eldon R., xxxxxx.
Wehe, John H., xxxxxx.
Weil, Joseph R., xxxxxx.
Weiss, George L., xxxxxx.
Weiss, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Weitzel, Hulbert F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Welch, Dudley G., xxxxxx.
Welch, John W., xxxxxx.
Welch, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Weller, Burton L., xxxxxx.
Wells, Douglas D., xxxxxx.
Wells, George W., xxxxxx.
Wells, Lee C., xxxxxx.
Wells, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Wells, Walter W., xxxxxx.
Welsch, Jack H., xxxxxx.
Welsh, Mark A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Weltz, Charles O., xxxxxx.
Wendt, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Weniger, Andrew L., xxxxxx.
Werner, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Wertz, Andrew W., xxxxxx.
Wesse, Wilbert D., xxxxxx.
West, Glenn H., xxxxxx.
West, Keith W., xxxxxx.
Wetherell, Ernest J., xxxxxx.
Wethington, Jerry D., xxxxxx.
Whalen, Donald B., xxxxxx.
Whatley, George R., xxxxxx.
Whatley, Wayne N., xxxxxx.
Whealen, Daniel M., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, George E., xxxxxx.
Whelan, Paul A., xxxxxx.
Whelan, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Whetzel, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Whicher, William C., xxxxxx.
Whisnant, Jackson R., xxxxxx.
Whitaker, J. L., xxxxxx.
White, B. D., xxxxxx.
White, Benjamin L., xxxxxx.
White, James E., xxxxxx.
White, Kenneth J., xxxxxx.
White, Roy L., xxxxxx.
White, Simon S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Whitehead, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Whitener, Carr C., xxxxxx.
Whitten, Solomon D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Whittingham, Dona W., xxxxxx.
Whittington, Oddi E., xxxxxx.
Whitworth, Lorne D., xxxxxx.
Wicker, Eugene C., xxxxxx.
Wicks, Marvin A., xxxxxx.
Wickwire, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Wiekhorst, Mark C., xxxxxx.
Wilcox, David W., xxxxxx.
Wiles, Howard O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wilkins, George I., xxxxxx.
Wilkins, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Wilkinson, Paul K., xxxxxx.
Willahan, Leon L., xxxxxx.
Willard Garry A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Willett, Homer N., xxxxxx.
Willey, Kenneth W., xxxxxx.
Williams, Carol M., xxxxxx.
Williams, Clarence R., xxxxxx.
Williams, Gene F., xxxxxx.
Williams, Jack B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, James R., xxxxxx.
Williams, Jessie B., xxxxxx.
Williams, John T., xxxxxx.
Williams, Joseph B., xxxxxx.
Williams, Mittie R., xxxxxx.
Williams, Reuben E., xxxxxx.
Williams, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Williams, Robert, xxxxxx.
Williams, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Williams, Robert P., xxxxxx.
William, Shepherd C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, Walter A., xxxxxx.
Williamson, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Williford, James F., xxxxxx.
Willis, Stephen N., xxxxxx.
Willis, Vincent C., xxxxxx.
Willoughby, Michael E., xxxxxx.
Wills, Harley N., xxxxxx.
Willsie, Donovan L., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Clayton A., III, xxxxxx.
Wilson, Ernest F., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Troy M., xxxxxx.
Wilson, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.

Wilson, William B., xxxxxx.
Wilson, William M., xxxxxx.
Winberg, Harry L., xxxxxx.
Windland, Sara J., xxxxxx.
Wingard, Sigurd J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wingate, Clark L., xxxxxx.
Winkler, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Winters, Warren J., xxxxxx.
Wirta, Victor H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wise, Harvey E., xxxxxx.
Wise, Joseph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wissman, William O., xxxxxx.
Witt, Harry M., xxxxxx.
Wittry, John P., xxxxxx.
Wolf, Robert K., xxxxxx.
Wolfe, John L., xxxxxx.
Wolfe, Leon K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wolff, Earle R., xxxxxx.
Woliver, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Wood, Harry L., xxxxxx.
Wood, Kenneth C., xxxxxx.
Wood, Richard D., Sr., xxxxxx.
Wood, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Wood, William F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Woodall, John B., xxxxxx.
Woodell, John N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Woodhouse, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Woods, David A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Woods, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Woods, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Woods, Sumner R., xxxxxx.
Worley, Luther D., xxxxxx.
Worth, Francis H., xxxxxx.
Woske, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Wratten, Joseph B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wright, Howard E., xxxxxx.
Wright, John C., xxxxxx.
Wright, Vernon L., xxxxxx.
Wright, William N., xxxxxx.
Wurschmidt, Leo C., xxxxxx.
Wurthmann, Henry S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wylie, Sherrel W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wymer, James R., xxxxxx.
Wyrick, Glenn R., xxxxxx.
Yanecek, Earl E., xxxxxx.
Yeager, Marvin A., xxxxxx.
Yennie, Eugene V., xxxxxx.
Yoast, Charles, xxxxxx.
Yockey, Raymond, xxxxxx.
Yocum, John W., xxxxxx.
Young, Albert L., xxxxxx.
Young, George J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Yuhas, Louis D., xxxxxx.
Zaroban, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Zedaker, Willis D., xxxxxx.
Zehnder, Herbert R., xxxxxx.
Zemple, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Zettel, Frank C., xxxxxx.
Zielinski, Lester W., xxxxxx.
Zimmerman, Harry C., xxxxxxx.
Zinsmeister, P. C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Zook, Donald B., xxxxxx.
Zunic, Nicholas F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Zunker, Gordon K., xxxxxx.
Zurawski, Donald D., xxxxxx.
Zwiacher, John W., xxxxxx.

MEDICAL CORPS

Captain to major

Allen, S. Thomas, xxxxxx.
Anderson, Daniel H., xxxxxx.
Benson, Jack O., xxxxxx.
Benz, James A., xxxxxx.
Butler, Thorne J., xxxxxx.
Callaghan, Patrick E., xxxxxx.
Camp, Thomas F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Carlson, Kenneth P., xxxxxx.
Cary, George R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Christensen, Don L., xxxxxx.
Cleland, William O., xxxxxx.
Conrad, Fred G., xxxxxx.
Cooper, Alan B., xxxxxx.
Culton, Yancey G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Daley, John G., xxxxxx.
Daly, James W., xxxxxx.
Dann, Theodore A., xxxxxx.
Dart, Leroy H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davidson, W. Harley, xxxxxx.
Eagleton, John E., xxxxxx.
Ednie, Thomas F., xxxxxx.
Ezell, Roy C., xxxxxx.

Fitzgerald, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Flanagan, Paul, xxxxxx.
Froede, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Fry, Harold H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Funk, John W., xxxxxx.
Graveline, Duane E., xxxxxx.
Gretz, Herbert F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hanson, Paull R., xxxxxx.
Heine, Earle R., xxxxxx.
Higgins, Lloyd M., xxxxxx.
Hockenberry, James H., xxxxxx.
Hoffman, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Howell, William D., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, John T., xxxxxx.
Lagergren, William R., xxxxxx.
Leary, Frank J., xxxxxx.
Leigh, John E., xxxxxx.
Longenhagen, John B., xxxxxx.
Lovett, Vernor F., xxxxxx.
Manning, William K., I., xxxxxx.
Matejka, Robert E., xxxxxx.
McLain, Clarence R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Meng, Gunter R., xxxxxx.
Miller, Monte B., xxxxxx.
Miller, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Mills, Edward H., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, William J., xxxxxx.
Moore, Patrick J., xxxxxx.
Muller, Herber A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Neurnberger, Louis G., xxxxxx.
O'Brien, David D., xxxxxx.
Ockner, Stephen A., xxxxxx.
Parker, Gerald W., xxxxxx.
Patterson, Lewis T., xxxxxx.
Penry, James K., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Carl G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pories, Walter J., xxxxxx.
Priebe, Cedric J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Howard D., xxxxxx.
Rickenbach, Ho F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Riley, Claude C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rollins Lawrence T., xxxxxx.
Roman, James A., xxxxxx.
Rueve, William W., xxxxxx.
Russell, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Ryder, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Santacroce, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Scibetta, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Scott, John R., xxxxxx.
Sharp, Page, Jr., xxxxxx.
Shoener, John A., xxxxxx.
Simes, David L., xxxxxx.
Snodgrass, W. T., xxxxxx.
Snoga, Jimmy R., xxxxxx.
Story, William C., xxxxxx.
Straub, John J., xxxxxx.
Sullivan, John B., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Frank W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Titus, Charles O., xxxxxx.
Turns, James E., xxxxxx.
Weston, Eugene L., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Woodmansee, Terrence R., xxxxxx.
Woolley, Galen S., xxxxxx.
Yamauchi, Hiroshi, xxxxxx.
Zick, Herbert R., xxxxxx.

DENTAL CORPS

Captain to major

Baum, Leroy M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brolling, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Bulman, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Carr, Bernard M., xxxxxx.
Ciampa, John B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Colaizzi, Frank A., xxxxxx.
Cole, Theodore C., xxxxxx.
Curtis, William J., xxxxxx.
DeJmek, Homer W., xxxxxx.
Dooley, Benjamin E., xxxxxx.
Drake, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Fitch, Melvin G., xxxxxx.
Frady, Ralph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gilliam, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Green, Hampton, Jr., xxxxxx.
Gutweniger, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Harless, Charles F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Billy M., xxxxxx.
Henry, Richard A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hope, Harley F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hungerford, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Jacoby, James K., xxxxxx.

Jans, Jack F., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Junghans, John A., xxxxxx.
Kleinman, Preston R., xxxxxx.
Lazanas, Theodore P., xxxxxx.
Marshall, Jerome B., Jr., xxxxxx.
McCarthy, Paul H., xxxxxx.
Meffert, Roland M., xxxxxx.
Meister, Frank, Jr., xxxxxx.
Meyerhoeffer, War A., xxxxxx.
Morrow, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Parish, Gene D., xxxxxx.
Patterson, Joe M., xxxxxx.
Pelc, Henry T., xxxxxx.
Rank, Dale F., xxxxxx.
Reiner, Peter R., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Edward W., xxxxxx.
Rogers, James H., xxxxxx.
Sarka, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, William H., xxxxxx.
Smith, James R., xxxxxx.
Takacs, William J., xxxxxx.
Wall, Joseph W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Weiss, Lane E., xxxxxx.
Wilkinson, Edward G., xxxxxx.

VETERINARY CORPS

Captain to major

Clarke, Neville P., xxxxxx.
Godden, William R., xxxxxx.
Jones, William L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Whitehair, Leo A., xxxxxx.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Captain to major

Ables, William A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Allen, George F., xxxxxx.
Baber, Winston D., xxxxxx.
Bates, Jack H., xxxxxx.
Bauman, Bernard F., xxxxxx.
Beale, Charles C., xxxxxx.
Bell, Herbert E., xxxxxx.
Bitter, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Blair, Marshal N., xxxxxx.
Braden, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Britt, Clyde L., xxxxxx.
Busch, Emery B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Butcher, Bruce A., xxxxxx.
Cardarelli, Alexander J., xxxxxx.
Chambers, Binning P., xxxxxx.
Cortner, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Dibona, Joseph, xxxxxx.
Diedrich, Fred J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Diehl, Harold, Jr., xxxxxx.
Etter, Hal G., xxxxxx.
Farmer, Jack N., xxxxxx.
Freud, Sheldon L., xxxxxx.
Gabel, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Galbraith, John R., xxxxxx.
Gibble, Thomas B., xxxxxx.
Gray, Pat B., xxxxxx.
Green, John R., xxxxxx.
Grimes, Ivan B., xxxxxx.
Guerin, Michael D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hartman, John L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hirsch, Jerome A., xxxxxx.
Huttenhauer, Glen A., xxxxxx.
Isbell, Frank H., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, Thomas H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, James E., xxxxxx.
Jones, Bruce xxxxxx.
Keeffe, Loren J., xxxxxx.
Kopp, Warren W., xxxxxx.
Lapresto, Jasper, Jr., xxxxxx.
Long, Ralph S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Loper, Lester R., xxxxxx.
McAllen, Daniel L., Jr., xxxxxx.
McIntyre, Walter V., xxxxxx.
Moyer, James E., xxxxxx.
Murphy, James D., xxxxxx.
Nolan, Francis X., xxxxxx.
Nugent, Edward S., xxxxxx.
Overfelt, Clifford D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Parker, Gene H., xxxxxx.
Peters, Kenneth W., xxxxxx.
Pitts, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Pons, James T., xxxxxx.
Reischmann, William C., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Tom W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ross, William C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Simmons, Bennie F., xxxxxx.

Skafidas, Gregory J., xxxx.
Smith, Francis J., xxxxxx.
Summers, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Teems, Ray M., xxxxxx.
Thimm, Frederick F., xxxxxx.
Thornell, Emmett A., xxxxxx.
Todd, Garry W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Trager, Leonard W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tribble, William D., xxxxxx.
Truelove, James W., xxxxxx.
Watson, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Watterson, Lewis A., xxxxxx.
Williams, Williams L., xxxxxx.

NURSE CORPS

Captain to major

Banfield, Teresa, xxxxxx.
Bates, Maudie L., xxxxxx.
Beard, Sarah E., xxxxxx.
Betzold, Margery E., xxxxxx.
Burkhardt, Ann L., xxxxxx.
Carlson, Mary S., xxxxxx.
Chaplin, Genevieve, xxxxxx.
Chavez, Carmen V., xxxxxx.
Clarke, Mary M., xxxxxx.
Cole, Mary L., xxxxxx.
Collavo, Laverne M., xxxxxx.
DeJesuscruz, Maria, xxxxxx.
Farrell, Eileen, xxxxxx.
Fleming, Edith E., xxxxxx.
Fueller, Jean M., xxxxxx.
Golden, Norma J., xxxxxx.
Grim, Patricia A., xxxxxx.
Grubbs, Garnett P., xxxxxx.
Higdon, Wanda J., xxxxxx.
Hope, Louis V., xxxxxx.
Householder, Marjorie L., xxxxxx.
Howard, Lillian T., xxxxxx.
Hurley, Betty J., xxxxxx.
Ingram, Helene A., xxxxxx.
James, Phyllis M., xxxxxx.
Kellam, Agnes L., xxxxxx.
Longbottom, Vera M., xxxxxx.
Maguire, Mary P., xxxxxx.
Marshall, Louise A., xxxxxx.
Martinjak, Marti J., xxxxxx.
Maslanka, Helen A., xxxxxx.
McFall, Eleanor L., xxxxxx.
Momrow, Esther M., xxxxxx.
Myles, Ruth M., xxxxxx.
Powell, Elma J., xxxxxx.
Rolwing, Miriam D., xxxxxx.
Sanderson, Charlotte E., xxxxxx.
Scanlon, Mary M., xxxxxx.
Simpson, Iva L., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Bonnie L., xxxxxx.
Stone, Ethel, xxxxxx.
Stout, Ellen M., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Frances E., xxxxxx.
Thornburgh, Erlene, xxxxxx.
Tyler, Eva C., xxxxxx.
Veitch, Janet, xxxxxx.
Wallace, Mary E., xxxxxx.
Weaver, Phyllis J., xxxxxx.
Welborn, Ella E., xxxxxx.
Wells, Sarah P., xxxxxx.
Whitlock, Ona F., xxxxxx.
Wikoff, Lois J., xxxxxx.
Wood, Edith, xxxxxx.
Zirkle, Robbie J., xxxxxx.

MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Captain to major

Coursey,, Junie M., xxxxxx.
Schmid, Mary H., xxxxxx.
Vanscoy, Joan L., xxxxxx.

CHAPLAIN

Captain to major

Backman, Lee W., xxxxxx.
Chapman, Billy G., xxxxxx.
Coggins, Joseph H., xxxxxx.
Collins, John R., xxxxxx.
Connelly, George R., xxxxxx.
Cooper, Calvin C., xxxxxx.
Copeland, Isaa M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dier, Blanche J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ellison, Ervin D., III, xxxxxx.
Gardiner, Homer E., xxxxxx.
Hofstad, Dean C., xxxxxx.
Klaric, George M., xxxxxx.
Krieger, Wilfred L., xxxxxx.
Ledbetter, Curtis E., xxxxxx.
Lyznicki, Edmund F., xxxxxx.
Margitich, Michael, xxxxxx.
Moran, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Powell, Samuel G., xxxxxx.
Riggs, Carl B., xxxxxx.
Squires, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Wilkens, Charles H., xxxxxx.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Ache, Leroy P., xxxx.
Acheson, Densel K., xxxxxx.
Adams, George B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Adams, Joseph D., III, xxxxxx.
Adams, Wendell M., xxxxxx.
Ahl, Arthur W., xxxxxx.
Aiken, Gerald G., xxxxxx.
Albrecht, Charles F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Alcini, Gerald L., xxxxxx.
Aldridge, Robert P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Alexander, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Allen, Glenn D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Allport, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Alston, Harold R., xxxxxx.
Altman, Herbert, xxxxxx.
Andersen, Jack T., xxxxxx.
Andersen, Niels B., xxxxxx.
Andersen, William C., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Anderson, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Andres, John C., xxxxxx.
Annis, James R., xxxxxx.
April, Paul K., xxxxxx.
Armstrong, John J., xxxxxx.
Arnold, John D., xxxxxx.
Arnold, William E., xxxxxx.
Asakura, Takazum, Jr., xxxxxx.
Ashe, Braxton W., xxxxxx.
Asher, Laurence F., xxxxxx.
Atchison, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Attix, Harold B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Atwood, Daryl G., xxxxxx.
Auth, Edward G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ayers, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Baber, Gary P., xxxxxx.
Babin, Logan H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Babler, Myron J., xxxxxx.
Backman, Vernon E., xxxxxx.
Bailor, Ronald O., xxxxxx.
Baily, Joseph J., III, xxxxxx.
Baj, Chester T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Baker, Guy F., xxxxxx.
Baker, Marion K., xxxxxx.
Baker, Roy T., xxxxxx.
Baker, Samuel J., xxxxxx.
Baker, Willard L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Banks, Frederick M., xxxxxx.
Barazzone, Samuel W., xxxxxx.
Barber, Hugh W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Barker, William V. H., xxxxxx.
Barkhurst, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Barr, Michael J., xxxxxx.
Barr, Michael L., xxxxxx.
Barranco, Stephen S., xxxxxx.
Barsanti, Ronald F., xxxxxx.
Barthelemy, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Bartley, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Barton, Roland S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Barwell, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Bates, Roy O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bates, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Bates, William E., xxxxxx.
Baucom, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Baughman, Gary L., xxxxxx.
Bauhahn, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Baxter, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Bayer, Roger T., xxxxxx.
Bayless, William E., xxxxxx.
Bazet, Randolph A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Beasley, Earle C., xxxxxx.
Beaudry, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Beck, Bradley T., xxxxxx.
Beers, L. N., xxxxxx.
Beldy, Andrew J., xxxxxx.
Bell, Jerald R., xxxxxx.
Bellas, Robert, xxxxxx.
Belter, Melvin J., xxxxxx.
Bender, James F., xxxxxx.
Bender, Walter W., xxxxxx.
Bennett, Charles O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bennett, Dennis R., xxxxxx.
Benton, Stanley H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Benzel, Gerald D., xxxxxx.
Bergmann, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Bergstrom, Harry F., xxxxxx.
Berkovich, James, III, xxxxxx.
Berringer, Lynn T., xxxxxx.
Berry, John S., xxxxxx.
Bessett, George R., xxxxxx.
Betz, Ernest J., xxxxxx.
Bezanson, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Bicknell, Ernest P., III, xxxxxx.
Biegalski, Conrad S., xxxxxx.
Biel, Fredrick W., xxxxxx.
Bifolchi, George J., xxxxxx.
Bigelow, David L., xxxxxx.
Bigelow, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Billington, Gordon F., xxxxxx.
Bird, Horace C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Birkhead, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Bishop, Halford R., xxxxxx.
Bjorklund, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Blackner, Craig S., xxxxxx.
Blair, Thomas W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Blaisdell, Michael P., xxxxxx.
Blue, David R., xxxxxx.
Bobko, Peter B., xxxxxx.
Bockelman, David C., xxxxxx.
Bodenheimer, Clyde E., xxxxxx.
Boette, August E., xxxxxx.
Bogart, Bruce C., xxxxxx.
Bogart, Paul C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bogemann, Lawrence L., xxxx.
Bohan, James A., xxxxxx.
Bolster, Carl H, xxxxxx.
Bolt, James F., xxxxxx.
Bond, Jack C., xxxxxx.
Bond, John E., xxxxxx.
Booker, William E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Boortz, Eugene H., xxxxxx.
Borden, Benton L., xxxxxx.
Borts, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Bosser, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Bostick, Neil D., xxxxxx.
Bouchoux, Gerald E., xxxxxx.
Boursaw, Jon E., xxxxxx.
Bow, Rudolph N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bowen, Robert H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bowers, Hilton C., xxxxxx.
Bowles, Howard F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Bowling, Gene D., xxxxxx.
Bowman, Gary H., xxxxxx.
Boyd, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Boyke, William E., xxxxxx.
Bradstreet, Frank P., xxxxxx.
Brame, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Branch, Kirby P., xxxxxx.
Brandt, David A., xxxxxx.
Bredenkamp, Barton C., xxxxxx.
Breen, Walter M., xxxxxx.
Brenizer, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Bridge, Jason K., xxxxxx.
Briggs, Dean M., xxxxxx.
Brinkley, Vernon C., xxxxxx.
Brinkman, James M., III, xxxxxx.
Brinson, James E., xxxxxx.
Brock, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Brothers, John N., xxxxxx.
Brown, Alwyn K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Brown, Christopher H., xxxxxx.
Brown, Dennis E., xxxxxx.
Brown, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Brown, Jerry E., xxxxxx.
Brown, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Brown, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Brown, Sidney K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Browning, William A., xxxxxx.
Bruce, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Brucher, John M., xxxxxx.
Bryant, Clarence J., xxxxxx.

Bryant, William L., xxxxxx.
Buchanan, Glenn M., xxxxxx.
Bucksbee, John D., xxxxxx.
Bullard, Barry W., xxxxxx.
Bullard, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Bundy, Wayne P., xxxxxx.
Burch, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Burchett, Dewey E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Burchfield, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Burdin, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Burgess, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Burns, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Burns, Ronald A., xxxxxx.
Butchko, Michael J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Butler, Charles M., xxxxxx.
Butler, Leonard A., xxxxxx.
Butler, Ronald L., xxxxxx.
Butler, William K., xxxxxx.
Buzard, Clifford S., xxxxxx.
Byrd, Ronald D., xxxxxx.
Byrne, Richard O., xxxxxx.
Byrne, Stewart R., xxxxxx.
Calder, David M., xxxxxx.
Caldwell, Laps R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Callaway, Patrick W., xxxxxx.
Camerlo, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Burton W., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Harvey C., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Jimmie R., xxxxxx.
Campbell, Joe L., xxxxxx.
Cannon, William P., xxxxxx.
Capps, Ted C., xxxxxx.
Caputo, Vito M., xxxxxx.
Caravaglio, Francis J., xxxxxx.
Carder, James R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Carleton, Will A. Jr., xxxxxx.
Carlin, David M., xxxxxx.
Carn, Robert M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Carpenter, Kenneth M., xxxxxx.
Carroll, Howard K., xxxxxx.
Carroll, John L., xxxxxx.
Carter, William P., xxxxxx.
Carver, James I., II, xxxxxx.
Carver, Linwood J., xxxxxx.
Case, Carl T., xxxxxx.
Casey, Walter H., xxxxxx.
Casjens, David W., xxxxxx.
Cason, Carl W., xxxxxx.
Castillo, Richard, xxxxxx.
Cavell, James E., xxxxxx.
Chaklos, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Challis, Ford F., xxxxxx.
Champion, Joel T., xxxxxx.
Chapman, John W., xxxxxx.
Chapman, Peter H., II, xxxxxx.
Charlow, Joseph F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Chastain, Calvin H., xxxxxx.
Chavanne, William G., xxxxxx.
Chavez, Antonio I., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cheeld, Charles M., III, xxxxxx.
Chellman, Edward M., xxxxxx.
Childress, Guy P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Choulet, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Ciesko, Robert, xxxxxx.
Claflin, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Clanton, Norman G., xxxxxx.
Clanton, Paul L., xxxxxx.
Clardy, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Clark, David W., xxxxxx.
Clark, Kirk B., xxxxxx.
Clark, Leonard L., xxxxxx.
Cliatt, Edwin R., xxxxxx.
Click, John E., xxxxxx.
Coady, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Coate, Larry C., xxxxxx.
Cobb, Lawrence D., II, xxxxxx.
Coble, William C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cochran, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Coe, Peter S., xxxxxx.
Cole, Charles M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cole, Ralston P., xxxxxx.
Coles, Louis E., xxxxxx.
Collette, William R., xxxxxx.
Compton, Phil V., xxxxxx.
Congleton, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Congleton, Roger V., xxxxxx.
Conlan, James T., xxxxxx.
Conlan, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Connerat, Edwin B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Connolly, James M., xxxxxx.
Connolly, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Conrad, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Constant, Dennis L., xxxxxx.
Cook, James T., xxxxxx.
Cook, Loyal S., xxxxxx.
Cooke, George E., xxxxxx.
Cooke, Harry D., III, xxxxxx.
Cooksey, Mellwood, Jr., xxxxxx.
Cooper, Frank B., xxxxxx.
Copeland, Jerry, xxxxxx.
Corballs, Fred F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Corey, Cletus A., xxxxxx.
Cornetet, Gerald F., xxxxxx.
Corr, James F., xxxxxx.
Costa, John J., xxxxxx.
Costa, Nicholas P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cottrell, William A., xxxxxx.
Couch, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Coughlin, Donald T., xxxxxx.
Cougill, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Couvillion, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Cox, Claude D., xxxxxx.
Cox, Homer M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Craddock, Joe P., xxxxxx.
Crane, Robert D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cranmer, Roger L., xxxxxx.
Crawford, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Crawford, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Crawford, Roger A., xxxxxx.
Crawshaw, Wharton R., xxxxxx.
Cronin, Philip F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cross, Francis M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Crossley, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Crossman, Charles K., xxxxxx.
Crowley, Jackson O., xxxxxx.
Croy, Otto E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cruickshank, John P., xxxxxx.
Culhane, Peter K., xxxxxx.
Culver, John N., xxxxxx.
Cuneo, William J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Cunningham, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Curtis, Richard E., xxxxxxx.
Curtis, Richard R., xxxxxxx.
Cushman, Clifton E., xxxxxx.
Cuthbert, Bradley G., xxxxxx.
Cutney, John M., xxxxxx.
Czech, Felix, xxxxxx.
Dalton, Ronnie D., xxxxxx.
Danber, Edward B., xxxxxx.
Daniel, Gerald A., xxxxxx.
Daniel, Marsha E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Daniel, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Danigole, Simon A., xxxxxx.
Dannenberg, William J., xxxxxx.
Danner, James E., xxxxxx.
Dardeau, Arthur T., xxxxxx.
Daughterty, Jerry W., xxxxxx.
Davey, Jack N., xxxxxx.
Davey, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Davidson, James A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davie, Thomas E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davis, Allan S., xxxxxx.
Davis, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Davis, David P., xxxxxx.
Davis, James L., xxxxxx.
Davis, Joseph T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Davis, Kenneth D., xxxxxx.
Davis, Lowell K., xxxxxx.
Day, Carroll N., xxxxxx.
Dean, John G., xxxxxx.
Dean, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Deberry, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Debolt, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Decker, Carl G., xxxxxx.
Decosmo, Ronald L., xxxxxx.
Dehne, Denis E., xxxxxx.
Deichelmann, Samuel M., xxxxxx.
Delestine, Gary R., xxxxxx.
Delphin, Barry R., xxxxxx.
Demarco, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Demaret, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Dempsey, David D., xxxxxx.
Dentremont, James A., xxxxxx.
Derks, Eugene L., xxxxxx.
Devaney, James E., xxxxxx.
Diaiso, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Diamond, Verl K., xxxxxx.
Dichtl, Rudolph J., xxxxxx.
Dick, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Dierlam, Mark J., xxxxxx.
Dieterly, Duncan L., xxxxxx.
Dietrich, Frederick L., xxxxxx.
Dillon, Dan V., xxxxxx.
Dinning, Otis O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dinsmore, John C., xxxxxx.
Dix, Alfred C., xxxxxx.
Dobson, George E., xxxxxx.
Dockum, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Donaca, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Dondero, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Donnellan, James L., xxxxxx.
Donovan, Daniel J., II, xxxxxx.
Doonan, William W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dorman, Ralph T., xxxxxx.
Dorsey, James E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Doten, Eric S., xxxxxx.
Doty, Mickey D., xxxxxx.
Downs, Clelland R., xxxxxx.
Draper, Charles T., xxxxxx.
Drinnon, Donald T., xxxxxx.
Dryden, Joseph W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Duckworth, Kenneth J., xxxxxx.
Duell, John V., xxxxxx.
Duell, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Duemmel, John W., xxxxxx.
Duigon, Theodore M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Dulaney, Elliott D., xxxxxx.
Duncan, John K., xxxxxx.
Dunlap, Richard O., xxxxxx.
Dunn, Daniel R., xxxxxx.
Dunning, Thomas B., xxxxxx.
Durham, Harold R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Durrett, John C., xxxxxx.
Duvall, Ronald W., xxxxxx.
Dvorak, James E., xxxxxx.
Dyer, Dana D., xxxxxx.
Dykes, Frederick T., xxxxxx.
Easter, John R., xxxxxx.
Eastman, John W., xxxxxx.
Eaton, James D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Echelberger, Arthur D., xxxxxx.
Eckel, George M., III, xxxxxx.
Eckert, Jon S., xxxxxx.
Edwards, Lloyd A., xxxxxx.
Edwards, Rufus L., xxxxxx.
Egleston, William F., xxxxxx.
Eichorst, Douglas W., xxxxxx.
Eilers, Dennis L., xxxxxx.
Eisinger, Jerry B., xxxxxx.
Elam, John G., xxxxxx.
Elder, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Ellenburg, Kay R., xxxxxx.
Eller, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Ellis, Noel G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ellis, Stephen H., xxxxxx.
Ellsworth, John R., xxxxxx.
Elsam, Eric S., xxxxxx.
Emberlin, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Engels, Geoffrey P., xxxxxx.
Engle, Ira, Jr., xxxxxx.
Englehart, William D., xxxxxx.
Epley, Thomas F., xxxxxx.
Erbes, James L., xxxxxx.
Erickson, Vern E., xxxxxx.
Eriksson, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Erkkinen, Albert T., xxxxxx.
Ernest, Ronald G., xxxxxx.
Ernspiger, Richard K., xxxxxx.
Esses, David J., xxxxxx.
Eubanks, Johnny D., xxxxxx.
Evanczyk, Elroy E., xxxxxx.
Evans, Travis L., xxxxxx.
Evon, William J., xxxxxx.
Ewing, John H., xxxxxx.
Faber, Brian R., xxxxxx.
Fabian, Ralph R., xxxxxx.
Faessler, Lawrence J., xxxxxx.
Fahey, William C., xxxxxx.
Fairburn, David R., xxxxxx.
Fairchild, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Fairweather, James D., xxxxxx.
Fallon, Clifford B., xxxxxx.
Faloon, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Farnham, John W., xxxxxx.
Farrington, Arthur D., xxxxxx.
Fassero, Joseph M., xxxxxx.
Fellows, Gary W., xxxxxx.
Fellows, Richard W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Felts, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Fer, John, xxxxxx.
Ferris, Dean L., xxxxxx.
Festerman, Gary T., xxxxxx.

Ficinus, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Fiedler, Frederick A., xxxxxx.
Field, Henry W., xxxxxx.
Fields, Barry N., xxxxxx.
Fields, David A., xxxxxx.
Fields, Walter C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Figgins, Jerry M., xxxxxx.
Finelli, Ralph J., xxxxxx.
Fischer, Alton F., xxxxxx.
Fisher, John C., xxxxxx.
Fisher, Kenneth S., xxxxxx.
Fitzgerald, James D., xxxx.
Flanagan, John F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fleig, Norman G., xxxxxx.
Fleming, Kenneth H., xxxxxx.
Fleming, Michael C., xxxxxx.
Fletcher, William D., xxxxxx.
Floodas, James G., xxxxxx.
Foltz, Warren L., xxxxxx.
Forbrich, Carl A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ford, James N., xxxxxx.
Ford, Ralph C., xxxxxx.
Ford, William R., xxxxxx.
Forrest, Gary F., II, xxxxxx.
Forster, George J., xxxxxx.
Fort, Darrell L., xxxxxx.
Fournier, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Fowler, Charles W., xxxxxx.
Fowler, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Fowler, Vernon F., xxxxxx.
Fox, Allan L., xxxxxx.
Fox, Darrell L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fox, Gordon W., xxxxxx.
Francis, David P., xxxxxx.
Franco, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Franklin, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Freudenberger, Jo W., xxxxxx.
Frisk, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Fritz, Nicholas H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Fritzel, Roger N., xxxxxx.
Fulaytar, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Fullen, Floyd R., xxxxxx.
Fuller, Jerry A., xxxxxx.
Fuller, Philip S. B., xxxxxx.
Fulton, Allan C., xxxxxx.
Fulton, David H., xxxxxx.
Funk, Evan C., xxxxxx.
Funk, Ronald R., xxxxxx.
Funston, David L., xxxxxx.
Gabel, Beau E., xxxxxx.
Gadd, Richard B., xxxxxx.
Gage, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Gallagher, James P., xxxxxx.
Gallagher, John A., xxxxxx.
Gallington, Roger W., xxxxxx.
Galloway, Terrence L., xxxxxx.
Gambill, Jack H., xxxxxx.
Garcia, Denis, xxxxxx.
Garland, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Garner, Hugh T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Garrett, David J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Garrett, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Garrison, Harry E., xxxxxx.
Garvin, William L., xxxxxx.
Gasparro, George G., xxxxxx.
Gates, George O., xxxxxx.
Gaylor, Wayne T., xxxxxx.
Geiger, John A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gerber, Harry D., xxxxxx.
Gerber, William G., xxxxxx.
Gerken, Frederick E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gertsch, William D., xxxxxx.
Gesell, William H., III, xxxxxx.
Gibson, Michael K., xxxxxx.
Giedlin, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Giere, Bernard D., xxxxxx.
Giger, John M., xxxxxx.
Gilbert, James F., xxxxxx.
Gilchrist, John R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gilg, John F., xxxxxx.
Gillson, Arthur W., xxxxxx.
Gillum, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Gilmartin, Richard T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gilmore, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Gilstad, Dennis W., xxxxxx.
Gipson, Walter M., xxxxxx.
Gish, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Gittleman, Arnold J., xxxxxx.
Gleason, Edwin M., xxxxxx.
Gleason, Michael V., xxxxxx.
Gleichman, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Glud, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Gober, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Godowski, John L., xxxxxx.
Golden, Norman G., xxxxxx.
Goldman, Paul T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Goldman, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Goldsmith, May L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gonzales, Jose R., xxxxxx.
Gooch, Lawrence L., xxxxxx.
Goodenough, Russell E., xxxxxx.
Goodhue, Bruce S., xxxxxx.
Goold, Phillip L., xxxxxx.
Gordon, Charles E., II, xxxxxx.
Gordon, William S., III, xxxxxx.
Gorman, Richard V., xxxxxx.
Gortler, Gordon D., xxxxxx.
Graham, Carl G., xxxxxx.
Graham, Elmer A., xxxxxx.
Graham, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Gransewicz, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Grapes, Darrell W., xxxxxx.
Gray, David L., xxxxxx.
Gray, Willie W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Graziadei, John D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Green, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Greene, Albert R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Greene, John V., xxxxxx.
Greenfield, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Gregory, Duane B., xxxxxx.
Griffey, Terrence H., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Griffin, Chester W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Griffith, Alexander J., xxxxxx.
Grigg, Ralph W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Grohn, Dan A., xxxxxx.
Gros, Percy J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Groves, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Grundeland, Haral I., xxxxxx.
Guenther, Michael A., xxxxxx.
Guidry, Roland D., xxxxxx.
Guilmartin, Joseph F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Gunn, Earnest L., xxxxxx.
Gunn, Kenneth C., xxxxxx.
Gunst, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Gura, John T., xxxxxx.
Gustafson, Jarl S., xxxxxx.
Gutierrez, Siro, Jr., xxxxxx.
Haag, George A., xxxxxx.
Haars, Neil W., xxxxxx.
Haberstich, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Haggett, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Hala, Norbert A., xxxxxx.
Hale, Charles E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hall, Graham, xxxxxx.
Hall, Henry V., xxxxxx.
Hall, Jack G., xxxxxx.
Hall, Joel T., xxxxxx.
Hall, Lanny W., xxxxxx.
Hall, William E., III, xxxxxx.
Hall, William H., xxxxxx.
Hallager, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Haller, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Halprin, Edwin A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Halstead, Wood J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hamiga, John V., xxxxxx.
Hamlin, Philip D., xxxxxx.
Hamrick, Gary R., xxxxxx.
Hanby, James W., xxxxxx.
Hand, Douglas K., xxxxxx.
Handy, Burrell R., III, xxxxxx.
Handy, James H., xxxxxx.
Haney, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Hankins, Jimmy G., xxxxxx.
Hanley, Pierce J., xxxxxx.
Hanlin, Thomas G., II, xxxxxx.
Hard, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Harden, James A., xxxxxx.
Haring, David R., xxxxxx.
Harker, Joseph D., xxxxxx.
Harlan, David L., xxxxxx.
Harmon, George E., xxxxxx.
Harmon, Larry R., xxxxxx.
Harrell, Herbert L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Harris, John D., xxxxxx.
Harris, Max H., xxxxxx.
Harris, Michael W., xxxxxx.
Harris, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Harris, William R., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Foster W., xxxxxx.
Harrison, George B., xxxxxx.
Harrison, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Hart, Joseph T., xxxxxx.
Harter, Carl E., xxxxxx.
Harvey, William T., xxxxxx.
Harwell, Blake B., xxxxxx.
Harwick, Alexander H. C., xxxxxx.
Hathcock, Allan C., xxxxxx.
Haugen, William J., xxxxxx.
Hauschildt, John C., xxxxxx.
Hauser, Jack C., xxxxxx.
Hawkins, Frederick O., xxxxxx.
Hawkins, Thane D., xxxxxx.
Haynie, Charles W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Heacock, Phillip K., xxxxxx.
Heacox, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Heard, Stephen R., xxxxxx.
Heatherly, James C., xxxxxx.
Hebert, Lawrence R., xxxxxx.
Heckman, Ralph P., xxxxxx.
Hedges, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Heim, Donald C., xxxxxx.
Heininger, Marvin W., xxxxxx.
Heiskell, Lucius L., xxxxxx.
Hendryx, Frederic L., xxxxxx.
Henning, Hal P., xxxxxx.
Henninger, Frederick W., xxxxxx.
Henshaw, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Hepburn, Phili R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Herbst, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Hernett, Charles X., xxxxxx.
Herring, Kenneth D., xxxxxx.
Herrington, Horace S., xxxxxx.
Herter, Walter C., xxxxxx.
Hertzog, Randolph B. E., xxxxxx.
Herzog, Gerald W., xxxxxx.
Hickman, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Hickman, John A., xxxxxx.
Hickman, Peter K., xxxxxx.
Hickman, Roger A., xxxxxx.
Hieronymus, Robert E., xxxxxx.
High, John T., III, xxxxxx.
Highfill, Jack D., xxxxxx.
Hilbert, Ronald H., xxxxxx.
Hill, Gayle W., xxxxxx.
Hilliard, George, III, xxxxxx.
Hilton, Russell B., xxxxxx.
Hilvers, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Hines, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Hines, Joseph V., xxxxxx.
Hinkle, Rodney L., xxxxxx.
Hipp, Edward F., xxxxxx.
Hird, William G., xxxxxx.
Hobbs, Fleming C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hodges, Joe W., xxxxxx.
Hodgkinson, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Hoffert, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Hohl, Winton C., xxxxxx.
Holbrow, Wilmer F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Holcomb, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Holden, Albert F., xxxxxx.
Holihan, Larry C., xxxxxx.
Holley, Carroll J., xxxxxx.
Holt, David E., xxxxxx.
Holtz, Ronald E., xxxxxx.
Holway, Walter D., xxxxxx.
Honeycutt Rember L., xxxxxx.
Hooker, Larry L., xxxxxx.
Hoover, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Hopkins, Edward A., xxxxxx.
Hopkins, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Hopkins, Roger E., xxxxxx.
Hornaday, Ralph J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Horton, Frank B., III, xxxxxx.
Horton, Kenneth xxxxxx.
Hoskins, Donald R., xxxxxx.
Hosler, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Houck, Freddie R., xxxxxx.
Houston, John L., xxxxxx.
Hoven Gary H., xxxxxx.
Howell, William P., xxxxxx.
Howes, George F., xxxxxx.
Hrisak, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Huard, Joseph E., xxxxxx.
Hubbard, David B., xxxxxx.
Huber John L., xxxxxx.
Huchberger, Bertran, xxxxxx.
Hudack, Larry J., xxxxxx.
Hudak, Seth J. xxxxxx.
Hudgins, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Huff, Dennis E., xxxxxx.
Huffman, Ronald P., xxxxxx.
Hughes, Thaddeus E., xxxxxx.

Hughes, William F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Hull, Raymond P., xxxxxx.
Hunt, David F., xxxxxx.
Hunt, Leo B., xxxxxx.
Hunt, Raymond D., xxxxxx.
Hunter, Raymond F., xxxxxx.
Hunter, Sammie R., xxxxxx.
Huntsman, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Hurley, Richard S. xxxxxx.
Huston, Lawrence E., xxxxxx.
Hutchinson, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Hutchinson, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Ikelman, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Ivins, Peter, xxxxxx.
Jackson, Edgar A. xxxxxx.
Jackson, Gary R., xxxxxx.
Jackson, John T., III, xxxxxx
Jackson, Peter A., xxxxxx.
Jackson, Rodger N., xxxxxx.
Jacobson, Loren A., xxxxxx.
Jaeckle, John T. xxxxxx.
Jamba, John W., xxxxxx.
Janicke, Jerome T., xxxxxx.
Janka, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Janni, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Jarrell, Thomas H., xxxxxx.
Jeffreys, James V., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, John P., xxxxxx.
Jenkins, Paul W., xxxxxx.
Jennings, Thomas T., xxxxxx.
Jensen, Harold O., xxxxxx.
Jensen, Larry O., xxxxxx.
Jensen, Niels D., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Allan P., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Charles B., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Curtis M., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Dale R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, David C. Z., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Douglas A., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Joe E., II, xxxxxx.
Johnson, Johnny R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Laurence J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Laurie R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Leo xxxxxx.
Johnson, Leonard E., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Richard K., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Ronald N., xxxxxx.
Johnson, Russell C., xxxxxx.
Johnson, William B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Johnson, William N., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Bernard W., xxxxxx.
Johnston, Charles H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jones, Billy S., xxxxxx.
Jones, Lionel T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Jones, Max K., xxxxxx.
Jones, Needham B., xxxxxx.
Jones, Nicholas, xxxxxx.
Jones, Phillip T., xxxxxx.
Jones, Ray E., xxxxxx.
Jones, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Jordan, Malcolm E., xxxxxx.
Josey, James W., xxxxxx.
Judge, Paul J., xxxxxx.
Jue, Kam B., xxxxxx.
Justice, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Kagan, Stanly S., xxxxxx.
Kahla, Jeffery D., xxxxxx.
Karwoski, Robert, xxxxxx.
Kasperbauer, James C., xxxxxx.
Kauer, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Kawamoto, David K., xxxxxx.
Keaney, Thomas A., xxxxxx.
Keck, Harold G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Keech, Marvin E., xxxxxx.
Keighery, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Keller, James G., xxxxxx.
Kelly, Bruce W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kelly, Dennis F., xxxxxx.
Kelly, James M., xxxxxx.
Kennard, Larry E., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, Gerald L., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, Thomas M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kennedy, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Kepner, Dennis A., xxxxxx.
Keppen, Keith H., xxxxxx.
Kerner, George M., xxxxxx.
Kerr, John G., xxxxxx.
Kiehle, James H., xxxxxx.
Kielpinski, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Kiffer, John F., xxxxxx.
Kimble, James L., xxxxxx.
Kimick, Ray W., xxxxxx.
Kincaid, James W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kindurys, Victor A., xxxxxx.
King, George S., Jr., xxxxxx.
King, William L., xxxxxx.
Kingery, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Kinser, Edward L., xxxxxx.
Kirby, George F., xxxxxx.
Kirk, David J., xxxxxx.
Kiser, Billy J., xxxxxx.
Kitchen, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Kitchen, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Kittle, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Klass, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Klimen, Witold P., xxxxxx.
Klinger, Chandis L., xxxxxx.
Klos, Alan R., xxxxxx.
Knipp, William N., xxxxxx.
Knowles, Homer W., xxxxxx.
Koch, Theodore H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Komoriya, George M., xxxxxx.
Koob, Stephen J., xxxxxx.
Kooser, Robert K., xxxxxx.
Kormanik, James R., xxxxxx.
Koski, Kenneth G., xxxxxx.
Krajewski, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Kraus, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Krebs, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Krehbiel, Kenneth D., xxxxxx.
Kreutz, James M., xxxxxx.
Kritzler, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Kropf, Arnold N., xxxxxx.
Krupka, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Kruse, Richard K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Kubley, Roy R., xxxxxx.
Kuhlenschmidt, Ke N., xxxxxx.
Kuhns, Dale H., xxxxxx.
Kun, Louis A., xxxxxx.
Kurshan, David, xxxxxx.
Laabs, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Labriola, James M., xxxxxx.
Lacey, Howard T., xxxxxx.
Lacheman, Ernest R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lamaida, Terry A., xxxxxx.
Lamb, William C., xxxxxx.
Lambert, Edgar P., xxxxxx.
Lammers, Kenton E., xxxxxx.
Lancaster, Lann T. G., xxxxxx.
Lance, Henry R., xxxxxx.
Landers, Paul E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Landry, James J., xxxxxx.
Lane, Howard L., xxxxxx.
Langer, Hart A., xxxxxx.
Lannon, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Larabee, Harry W., xxxxxx.
Larkins, James T., xxxxxx.
Larson, Charles A., xxxxxx.
Larson, George W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lasley, Thomas T., xxxxxx.
Laughlin, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Lausten, Lawrence R., xxxxxx.
Lavalle, Arthur J. C., xxxxxx.
Laverty, Theodore D., xxxxxx.
Lavin, James K., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Dana B., xxxxxx.
Lawrence, Harl E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lazzaro, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Leach, Thomas J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Leatham, Anthony L., xxxxxx.
Lee, David R., xxxxxx.
Lee, Raymond H., xxxxxx.
Lehmiller, David J., xxxxxx.
Leib, David B., xxxxxx.
Leich, Frederick H., xxxxxx.
Lenahan, Roderick, xxxxxx.
Lenox, Hamilton T., xxxxxx.
Lester, Owen A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lester, Peter M., xxxxxx.
Lewis, John W., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Russell L., xxxxxx.
Lewis, Thomas E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lickteig, Norbert E., xxxxxx.
Liepins, Andris I., xxxxxx.
Lightner, George W., xxxxxx.
Lightsey, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Lillie, Marvin A., xxxxxx.
Lindbo, Don A., xxxxxx.
Linden, Ronald C., xxxxxx.
Linderholm, James L., xxxxxx.
Lindgren, John O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Linn, Joseph E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lison, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Liss, Walter E., xxxxxx.
Litteer, Albert H., xxxxxx.
Lloyd, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Loberg, David E., xxxxxx.
Locke, George D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lockhart, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
Lockwood, Franklin J., xxxxxx.
Lodin, Dale J., xxxxxx.
Logar, Andrew, xxxxxx.
Logeman, John D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Loney, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Lopresto, Raymond J., xxxxxx.
Lorenzini, Dino A., xxxxxx.
Loupot, David N., xxxxxx.
Lovretich, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Lowe, Chester A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lowell, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Lucia, William A., xxxxxx.
Luckenbach, Peter R. H., xxxxxx.
Ludwin, Raymond J., xxxxxx.
Luebbermann, John N., xxxxxx.
Lukes, Mark R., xxxxxx.
Lumpkin, Donald E., xxxxxx.
Lundvall, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Lutes, Kenneth O., xxxxxx.
Lutes, Paul M., xxxxxx.
Luther, Karl E., xxxxxx.
Lyddane, George H., xxxxxx.
Lynch, William J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lynn, Lawrence A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Lyon, David C., xxxxxx.
Lyon, Larry B., xxxxxx.
Lyons, Michael F., xxxxxx.
MacCraw, Robert B., xxxxxx.
MacDonald, Vincent, J., xxxxxx.
MacGlashan, Donald H., xxxxxx.
Mack, James E., xxxxxx.
MacLennan, Jerome C., xxxxxx.
MacNevin, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Madden, Philip L., xxxxxx.
Mages, James G., xxxxxx.
Magoulas, Jerry M., xxxxxx.
Mahach, Thomas G., xxxxxx.
Mahnken, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Mahon, Thomas M., xxxxxx.
Mahoney, Francis J., III, xxxxxx.
Major, Michael G., xxxxxx.
Makowsky, Joseph, Jr., xxxxxx.
Maloney, Earl F., III, xxxxxx.
Maloney, James M., xxxxxx.
Mandeville, James J., xxxxxx.
Mangold, Richard T., xxxxxx.
Manini, Gary W., xxxxxx.
Mannion, William H., xxxxxx.
Marano, Franklin A., xxxxxx.
Maraska, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Marck, Ronald V., xxxxxx.
Marienthal, George, xxxxxx.
Markham, David A., xxxxxx.
Markham, Gordon E., xxxxxx.
Markle, Gene L., xxxxxx.
Marks, Vincent C., xxxxxx.
Marlar, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Marshall, Larry G., xxxxxx.
Marshall, Lyman W., xxxxxx.
Martin, Harreld P., xxxxxx.
Martin, Jerry D., xxxxxx.
Martin, John L., xxxxxx.
Martin, Peter E., xxxxxx.
Martin, Ronald G., xxxxxx.
Martinelli, Edward A., xxxxxxx.
Masella, James V., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mason, Jerry N., xxxxxx.
Matteis, Richard M., xxxxxx.
Mauldin, Stephen L., Jr., xxxxxxx.
May, Gerald M., xxxxxx.
May, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
McAtee, Thomas P., xxxxxx.
McCallum, James N., xxxxxx.
McCarthy, Joseph V., xxxxxx.
McClintock, Ra M., Jr., xxxxxx.
McClure, Wallace B., xxxxxx.
McColl, Hugh F., xxxxxx.
McConnell, Daniel L., xxxxxx.
McCravy, Dewey H., Jr., xxxxxx.
McCready, Floyd D., Jr., xxxxxx.
McCreary, Galen W., xxxxxx.

McCurdy, Clark B., xxxxxx.
McCurdy, Ronald E., Jr., xxxxxx.
McCusker, Robert J., xxxxxx.
McDaniel, Bobby L., xxxxxx.
McDaniel, Johnny F., xxxxxx.
McDearman, Nancy J., xxxxxx.
McDonald, Clinton R., xxxxxx.
McDonald, Fred L., xxxxxx.
McDonough, Robert L., xxxxxx.
McDowell, Ross G., xxxx.
McElhannon, Virgil B., xxxxxx.
McGlothlin Ronald E., xxxxxx.
McGrath, William J., xxxxxx.
McGregor, Glynn A., xxxxxx.
McHargue, Robert M., xxxxxx.
McHollan, James A., xxxxxx.
McHugh, Eugene D., xxxxxx.
McIver, Alexander, Jr., xxxxxx.
McKee, Edmond M., xxxxxx.
McKee, Frank T., xxxxxx.
McKinney, William F., xxxxxx.
McLester, Jud C., III, xxxxxx.
McMillan, Curt L., Jr., xxxxxx.
McMillen, Donald L., xxxxxx.
McMurray, Louis E., xxxxxx.
McNabb, Francis V., Jr., xxxxxx.
McNamara, Roger T., xxxxxx.
McNaughton, Robert J., xxxxxx.
McNeil, Earnest E., Jr., xxxxxx.
McRae, David S., xxxxxxx.
Meade, Charles H., xxxxxx.
Meadows, James O., Jr., xxxxxx.
Merceda, John R., xxxxxx.
Melin, Carl D., xxxxxx.
Mengel, John E., xxxxxx.
Menghini, Raymond L., xxxxxx.
Menning, John E., xxxxxx.
Merkel, Philip A., xxxxxx.
Mettler, Stephen C., xxxxxx.
Metzger, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Meyer, Fredrick C., xxxxxx.
Meyer, Walter D., xxxxxx.
Meyers, Roger T., xxxxxx.
Meyr, Herbert C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Michael, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Mickel, Richard S., xxxxxx.
Miga, Michael J., xxxxxx.
Miko, John F., xxxxxx.
Miles, Gary A., xxxxxx.
Miller, Arthur R., xxxxxx.
Miller, Carl W., xxxxxx.
Miller, Donald G., xxxxxx.
Miller, Gary T., xxxxxx.
Miller, Herbert W., xxxxxx.
Miller, Kenneth J., xxxxxx.
Miller, Michael G., xxxxxx.
Miller, Warren R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Miller, William S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Milligan, Kenneth B., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Jerome F., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Lyle D., xxxxxx.
Mitchell, Theodore L., xxxxxx.
Modolo, Jerome M., xxxxxx.
Mogan, William W., xxxxxx.
Molvar, Jan T., xxxxxx.
Moneyhun, Bobby J., xxxxxx.
Monroe, David R., xxxxxx.
Montgomery, Alan P., xxxxxx.
Montgomery, Joe L., xxxxxx.
Moore, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Moore, Frank E., xxxxxx.
Moore, Thomas K., xxxxxx.
Moore, Warren A., xxxxxx.
Moran, Robert T., xxxxxx.
Morgan, James P., xxxxxx.
Moriarty, Jerald T., xxxxxx.
Mormino, Lawrence D., xxxxxx.
Morphew, Robin T., xxxxxx.
Morrell, David N., xxxxxx.
Morrell, Robert G., xxxxxxx.
Morris, Dan R., xxxxxx.
Morrison, Wayne E., xxxxxx.
Morrow, John P., xxxxxx.
Morse, Howard L., II, xxxxxx.
Morton, Harold E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Morton, John T., xxxxxx.
Moser, Corwin A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mosher, Alan L., xxxxxx.
Muehring, Gene H., xxxxxx.
Mullaney, Gerald A., xxxxxxx.
Mullen, James B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Mullen, Ronald E., xxxxxx.
Mullooly, William E., xxxxxx.
Munro, Kenneth J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Munson, William E., xxxxxxx.
Murphy, Edward V., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Jack L., xxxxxx.
Murphy, Paul F., xxxxxx.
Murray, William L., xxxxxx.
Myers, Jerry L., xxxxxx.
Naftanel, John C., xxxxxx.
Najman, Mirko, xxxxxx.
Nakagawa, Wayne A., xxxxxx.
Namaksy, Adolph J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nash, Philip B., xxxxxx.
Nations, William O., xxxxxx.
Needham, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Neel, Charles B., xxxxxx.
Neel, Wayne J., xxxxxx.
Neff, James F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Neff, Ted A., xxxxxx.
Nelson, David L., xxxxxx.
Nelson, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Nemecek, Glen E., xxxxxx.
Nettleton, John G., xxxxxx.
Netzinger, Don L., xxxxxx.
Nevin, Charles E., xxxxxx.
New, Gary D., xxxxxx.
Newhall, Frederick C., xxxxxx.
Newman, Edwin C., xxxxxx.
Newman, Kenneth R., xxxxxx.
Nicewarner, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Nichols, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Nichols, Howard F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nichols, James B., xxxxxx.
Nichols, James L., xxxxxx.
Nichols, Laymon H., xxxxxx.
Nichols, Neil C., xxxxxx.
Nielsen, Jerry L., xxxxxx.
Nielson, Steve W., xxxxxx.
Niemann, William J., xxxxxx.
Nitsche, George R., xxxxxx.
Nixon, James A., xxxxxx.
Noble, James D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nolen, Michael E., xxxxxx.
Nophsker, Howard G., xxxxxx.
Norris, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Norwood, William B., xxxxxx.
Nottingham, Wesley D., xxxxxx.
Novotny, Frank J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Nuccio, Antonino J., xxxxxx.
Oalmann, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Oberg, Robert R., xxxxxx.
O'Berry, Carl G., xxxxxx.
O'Connell, Donald L., xxxxxx.
O'Connor, Edward A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ogershok, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Ohl, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Ohlemeier, Dennis L., xxxxxx.
Ohman, Nils B., xxxxxx.
Ohmsieder, William H., xxxxxx.
Olesek, Fredrick W., xxxxxx.
Olgeaty, Edward C., xxxxxx.
Oliver, John D., xxxxxx.
Olson, Daryl F., xxxxxx.
Olson, David G., xxxxxx.
Olson, Gerald D., xxxxxx.
Olson, Robert E., xxxxxx.
O'Neal, Donald O., xxxxxx.
Orbeck, Einar A., xxxxxx.
Ordes, Diane E., xxxxxx.
O'Reilly, Patrick J., xxxxxx.
Ormonde, Neil J., xxxxxx.
O'Rourke, William R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Osborn, James F., xxxxxx.
Osborne, Carl R., xxxxxx.
O'Toole, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Otway, Leo R., xxxxxx.
Overby, Walter C., xxxxxx.
Owings, Will L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ozawa, Galen M., xxxxxx.
Ozment, Herbert P., xxxxxx.
Pabich, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Pacina, Gene C., xxxxxx.
Paddon, Harry G., III, xxxxxx.
Page, Embert G., xxxxxx.
Paige, John K., xxxxxx.
Paquet, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Paris, Jack F., xxxxxx.
Parish, Richard V., xxxxxx.
Parker, David A., xxxxxx.
Parker, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Parker, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Parkhurst, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Parrett, Rufus N., xxxxxx.
Pastor, Ronald C., xxxxxx.
Patrick, James R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Patrick, Rayford P., xxxxxx.
Patrie, Stanley A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Patterson, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Patterson, William B., xxxxxx.
Payne, Bobby J., xxxxxx.
Payne, Edwin C., xxxxxx.
Payne, Glenn D., xxxxxx.
Payne, James H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pearce, Frederick H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pearson, Benjamin J., II, xxxxxx.
Peck, Frank E., xxxxxx.
Peck, Gaillard R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pederson, David J., xxxxxx.
Pederson, Donald F., xxxxxx.
Pemberton, Daniel H., xxxxxx.
Penasack, John P., xxxxxx.
Penczer, Rudolf E., xxxxxx.
Pendray, John J., xxxxxx.
Perlmutter, Jay M., xxxxxx.
Perlotto, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Perry, David C., xxxxxx.
Perry, Glenn G., Jr., xxxxxx.
Petersen, Roland N., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Nelda M., xxxxxx.
Peterson, Peter F., xxxxxx.
Petrie, Frank L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Pewthers, Morris G., xxxxxx.
Pfeifle, Ward A., xxxxxx.
Pfrang, Kenneth M. C., xxxxxx.
Phillips, James C., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Lawrence G., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Otis D., III, xxxxxx.
Phillips, Will E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Piepenburg, Dwayne D., xxxxxx.
Pinckney, Scott S., xxxxxx.
Pirtle, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Pittman, Howard W., xxxxxx.
Pittman, Robert, xxxxxx.
Platts, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Plunkett, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Poates, John T., xxxxxx.
Poley, Paul W., xxxxxx.
Polick, Melvin E., xxxxxx.
Pool, Nicholas E., xxxxxx.
Poole, Jerry A., xxxxxx.
Pope, William B., xxxxxx.
Porter, David W., xxxxxx.
Porter, Jimmie, xxxxxx.
Porter, William J., xxxxxx.
Post, Delbert A., xxxxxx.
Poth, John E., xxxxxx.
Powell, Arthur A., xxxxxx.
Powell, Douglas W., xxxxxx.
Powell, John P., xxxxxx.
Powell, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Powell, Vernon C., xxxxxx.
Power, Charles F., xxxxxx.
Preiss, Terry D., xxxxxx.
Preston, Harry T., xxxxxx.
Previty, Anthony P., xxxxxx.
Pribus, Glenn F., xxxxxx.
Price, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Priebel, Elmer A., xxxxxx.
Prima, Paavo, xxxxxx.
Pritchett, Kenneth G., xxxxxx.
Przygogki, Julius V., xxxxxx.
Pulicella, George J., xxxxxx.
Pylate, Patrick W., xxxxxx.
Pyle, Charles R., xxxxxx.
Quann, Byron G., xxxxxx.
Quantock, Russell A., xxxxxx.
Quick, David H., xxxxxx.
Quinton, Michael E., xxxxxx.
Rackiewicz, Daniel C., xxxxxx.
Radloff, James L., xxxxxx.
Ramella, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Ramm, Edmund C., xxxxxx.
Ramsey, Richard A., xxxxxx.

Randazzo, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Rank, Lawrence M., xxxxxx.
Ranson, William J., xxxxxx.
Rapalee, Ernest W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rausch, John T., xxxxxx.
Raven, John B., xxxx.
Raymer, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Readnour, James L., xxxxxx.
Reagan, William C., xxxxxx.
Rebstock, James E., xxxxxx.
Record, James F., xxxxxx.
Rector, Edwin, xxxxxx.
Redding, Michael J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reeves, Raymond J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reid, Albert R., xxxxxx.
Reid, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Reid, Daniel F., xxxxxx.
Reid, James M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Reining, Rodney J., xxxxxx.
Rekart, Jerome A., xxxxxx.
Remington, Bobby R., xxxxxx.
Rentenbach, Thomas M., II, xxxxxx.
Repak, Harry J., xxxxxx.
Reschak, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Reynolds, Phillip L., xxxxxx.
Rhame, James L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rhoades, Roger S., xxxxxx.
Rhoades, Thomas S., xxxxxx.
Rhodes, Harold W., xxxxxx.
Rice, Lawrence C., xxxxxx.
Richards, Fred F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Richards, Lon D., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Colin, xxxxxx.
Richardson, David A., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Evere B., xxxxxx.
Richardson, Tommy L., xxxxxx.
Ridgway, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Riedel, Jay E., xxxxxx.
Rigg, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Riggs, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Riley, James T., xxxxxx.
Rinehart, Herbert M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rist, David J., xxxxxx.
Robbins, Eugene L., xxxxxx.
Robbins, Warren G., xxxxxx.
Roberson, Paul L., xxxxxx.
Roberts, Cyrus S., IV, xxxxxx.
Roberts, David E., xxxxxx.
Roberts, James E., xxxxxx.
Roberts, James E., xxxxxx.
Roberts, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Paul K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Robinson, Peter D., xxxxxx.
Robinson VI A. A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Robnett, Dean E., xxxxxx.
Rocky, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Roderick, Norman F., xxxxxx.
Rodgers, William M., xxxx.
Roe, David H., xxxxxx.
Roeder, George L., xxxxxx.
Rogers, Dana B., xxxxxx.
Rogers, John H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rohrer, Ralph H., Jr., xxxx.
Rokke, Ervin J., xxxxxx.
Rosenbach, William E., xxxxxx.
Rosencrans, He C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ross, Bruce E., xxxxxx.
Ross, James A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rossiter, William W., xxxxxx.
Rossley, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Roth, Louis L., xxxxxx.
Rothell, Ross D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Rothrock, Kent G., xxxxxx.
Rounds, Gordon M., xxxxxx.
Rowell, Arlington L., xxxxxx.
Ruana, Rudolph M., xxxxxx.
Rubstein, Peter A., xxxxxx.
Ruffcorn, Carroll L., xxxxxx.
Ruggles, Bertrand F., xxxxxx.
Runnels, Joseph D., xxxxxx.
Ruschmeier, Peter F., xxxxxx.
Rushforth, Ch P., III, xxxxxx.
Ryan, Edward J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ryan, William A., xxxxxx.
Ryer, Richard T., xxxxxx.
Saber, James A., xxxxxx.
Sadovsky, Edward M., xxxxxx.
Sailer, Allen J., xxxxxx.
Sample, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Sanders, Jack N., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sanders, Richard D., xxxxxx.
Sanders, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Sanders, William D., xxxxxx.
Sanford, Frederick E., xxxxxx.
Sanford, Glenn F., xxxx.
Sanford, Jack R., xxxxxx.
Sanford Lonn T., III, xxxxxx.
Santore, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Sather, Harold D., xxxxxx.
Sawyer, Leon E., xxxxxx.
Sawyer, William E., xxxxxx.
Scauzillo, Robert J., xxxxxx.
Schachman, Alan, xxxxxx.
Schaefer, Edgar N., xxxxxx.
Schaefer, Gary O., xxxxxx.
Schaefer, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Schaller, Robert C., xxxxxx.
Schamberger, Rand., L., xxxxxx.
Schang, Joseph F., xxxxxx.
Schatz, Harold R., xxxxxx.
Schaumberg, Robert S., xxxxxx.
Scheu, Robert A., xxxxxx.
Schieber, Michael T., xxxxxx.
Schlue, Joseph W., xxxxxx.
Schmidt, Frederick E., xxxxxx.
Schmitz, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Scholes, William O., xxxxxx.
Scholz, Alfred F., xxxxxx.
Schoof, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Schott, Delyle J., xxxxxx.
Schrade, Bobby D., xxxxxx.
Schredl, Michael G., xxxxxx.
Schulz, Raymond E., xxxxxx.
Schulze, Carl J., xxxxxx.
Schuneman, Stephen T., xxxxxx.
Schwalm, Arthur E., xxxxxx.
Schwam, Stephen R., xxxxxx.
Scible, Robert H., III, xxxxxx.
Scifers, Leonard V., xxxxxx.
Scott, Lynn P., xxxxxx.
Scott, William T., xxxxxx.
Searl, Clinton W., xxxxxx.
Seasholtz, Gary L., xxxxxx.
Seastrom, Dale E., xxxxxx.
Seidt, Richard J., xxxxxx.
Sell, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Sellers, David A., xxxxxx.
Sessoms, William R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shade, Eugene W., xxxxxx.
Shamberger, Douglas E., xxxxxx.
Shane, Larry L., xxxxxx.
Sharp, Gary L., xxxxxx.
Sharp, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Sharpe, Walter R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Shea, Robert, xxxxxx.
Shefi, Frank O., xxxxxx.
Shelton, Harold A., xxxxxx.
Shenk, Howard F., xxxxxx.
Shepherd, Robert L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sheppard, Richard R., xxxxxx.
Shepperd, Donald W., xxxxxx.
Shera, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Sherman, Frederick G., xxxxxx.
Sherman, Jay D., xxxxxx.
Shields, David L., xxxxxx.
Shine, Anthony C., xxxxxx.
Shivers, Walter W., xxxxxx.
Shockley, Jackson C., xxxxxx.
Shonts, John M., xxxxxx.
Short, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Shotz, Donald S., xxxxxx.
Shuler, Henry K., xxxxxx.
Siders, Marvyn J., xxxxxx.
Siegel, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Sigman, Allen, xxxxxx.
Sikorski, Paul M., xxxxxx.
Simpson, Laird E., xxxxxx.
Sims, John N., xxxxxx.
Sinclair, George M., xxxxxx.
Singleton, Jerry A., xxxxxx.
Skanchy, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Skeels, Ronald D., xxxxxx.
Slater, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Slessler, Larry W., xxxxxx.
Slowikowski, xxxx F., xxxxxx.
Smart, Wayne G., xxxxxx.
Smeby, Alan J., xxxxxx.
Smedley, David R., xxxxxx.
Smedley, Gerald F., xxxxxx.
Smith, Arthur D., xxxxxx.
Smith, David W., xxxxxx.
Smith, Francis K., xxxxxx.
Smith, Gary R., xxxxxx.
Smith, Jerry L., xxxxxx.
Smith, John C., xxxxxx.
Smith, John E., xxxxxx.
Smith, John L., xxxxxx.
Smith, Morris D., xxxxxx.
Smith, Reeves P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, Richard P., xxxxxx.
Smith, Roger T., xxxxxx.
Smith, Rowland F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smith, William C., xxxxxx.
Smith, William H., II, xxxxxx.
Smithe, Lee B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Smull, Richard N., xxxxxx.
Snyder, Warren D., xxxxxx.
Solum, James L., xxxxxx.
Sommer, Arthur B., xxxxxx.
Sowa, Joseph P., xxxxxx.
Spaan, James T., xxxxxx.
Spargur, Robert E., xxxxxx.
Spence, Maynard R., xxxxxx.
Spencer, Bennie F., xxxxxx.
Spencer, Gary K., xxxxxx.
Spencer, John C., xxxxxx.
Spicer, Edward L., xxxxxx.
Spodnick, Joseph S., xxxxxx.
Spory, Ralph M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stachelczyk, Victor S., xxxxxx.
Staden, Arthur L., xxxxxx.
Stafford, Roy W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Staggs, Kenneth E., xxxxxx.
Staib, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Stanbery, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Stanton, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Staples, Jon R., xxxxxx.
Starbuck, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Starkey, James F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Starnes, Thomas E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Steck, Charles G., xxxxxx.
Steckler, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Stefferud, Curtis M., xxxxxx.
Steinig, Norman B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stenback, Paul R., xxxxxx.
Stenson, Stephen S., xxxxxx.
Stephens, George E., xxxxxx.
Stetson, John A., xxxxxx.
Stevenson, Samuel J., xxxxxx.
Stewart, James R., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Leslie W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stewart, Roger I., xxxxxx.
Stice, William H., xxxxxx.
Stock, Harold S., xxxxxx.
Stock, Ronald P., xxxxxx.
Stolp, James T., xxxxxx.
Stouder, Kyle, xxxxxx.
Strehle, William H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Stremlau, Leon E., xxxxxx.
Strickland, Bryan D., xxxxxx.
Strong, Lowell B., xxxxxx.
Strong, Ronald D., xxxxxx.
Studer, William A., xxxxxx.
Stuecklen, Klaus H., xxxxxx.
Stump, Kenneth H., xxxxxx.
Suits, Norman L., xxxxxx.
Sumner, William A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Sunderman, Charles K., xxxxxx.
Sung, William K., xxxxxx.
Surles, Becky F., xxxxxx.
Susi, Ronald A., xxxxxx.
Svitenko, Leonard, xxxxxx.
Svitenko, Lewis C., xxxxxx.
Swanson, Harold J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Swanson, John W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Swartz, Carl, III, xxxxxx.
Swartz, William J., xxxxxx.
Sweazy, Stewart B., xxxxxx.
Swiler, William G., xxxxxx.
Swonson, John C., Jr., xxxxxx.
Symes, Albert R., xxxxxx.
Symons, John R., xxxxxx.
Tall, Raymond R., xxxxxx.
Tash, Allen R., xxxxxx.
Tateishi, William N., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Charles S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Taylor, John H., xxxxxx.

Taylor, Lee, xxxxxx.
Taylor, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Ronnie G., xxxxxx.
Taylor, Thomas L., xxxxxx.
Teague, Harold K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Teasdale, Irvin C., xxxxxx.
Tellier, Jean G., xxxxxx.
Terry, Sidney C., xxxxxx.
Teuten, Thomas J., xxxxxx.
Thackray, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Thatcher, Paul D., xxxxxx.
Theobald, Robert E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thomas, James G., xxxxxx.
Thomas, James H., xxxxxx.
Thomas, Richard W., xxxxxx.
Thomes, James T., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Gary W., xxxxxx.
Thompson, George M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Robert T., Jr., xxxxxx.
Thompson, Ronald, xxxxxx.
Thomson, David W., xxxx.
Thuma, Thomas C., xxxxxx.
Thursby, William R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tice, Charles D., xxxxxx.
Tidrick, Ralph L., xxxxxx.
Tietge, Michael R., xxxxxx.
Tilford, Philip B., xxxxxx.
Tilghman, Dorothy J., xxxxxx.
Tilton, Frederick E., xxxxxx.
Tilton, William T., xxxxxx.
Timmerman, Joe A., xxxxxx.
Tinsman, John L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tocado, Douglas M., xxxxxx.
Todd, Jerry C., xxxxxx.
Todd, Rodney L., xxxxxx.
Tokar, Paul, xxxxxx.
Toler, John R., xxxxxx.
Tomb, Robert, xxxxxx.
Tomlin, Troy N., xxxxxx.
Tonda, Harold K., xxxxxx.
Torbenson, Robert V., xxxxxx.
Torkelson, Roger A., xxxxxx.
Torline, Norbert K., xxxxxx.
Toth, Harrold A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Travis, George S., Jr., xxxxxx.
Tribo, Ronald J., xxxxxx.
Trimmer, Ray A., xxxxxx.
Triquart, William A., xxxxxx.
Tubbs, Ronald C., xxxxxx.
Tumey, Lincoln E., xxxxxx.
Tupper, Nathan G., xxxxxx.
Turner, Charles L., xxxxxx.
Turner, Louis W., xxxxxx.
Turner, William M., xxxxxx.
Tweddle, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Tyson, Ralph M., xxxxxx.
Underdal, Stanley J., xxxxxx.
Urban, Frank R., xxxxxx.
Uribe, Henry T., xxxxxx.
Usher, Harry A., II, xxxxxx.
Vanbrunt, Donald L., xxxxxx.
Vanbrunt, Peter R., xxxxxx.
Vanderbilt, William D., xxxxxx.
Vanderhyde, Kenne D., xxxxxx.
Vandeventer, J. H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vansant, Bradley, xxxxxx.
Vansickle, Lawrence J., xxxxxx.
Vaughan, David K., xxxxxx.
Vecchio, Raymond R., xxxxxx.
Ventura, Joe E., xxxxxx.
Verneski, John C., xxxxxx.
Vesely, Charles J., xxxxxx.
Viau, David L., xxxxxx.
Viccellio, Henry, Jr., xxxxxx.
Vicknair, Rene M., Jr., xxxxxx.
Viele, Brian N., xxxxxx.
Vilensons, John J., xxxxxx.
Vining, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Vinup, Glen W., xxxxxx.
Vipond, George H., xxxxxx.
Virden, Robert N., xxxxxx.
Visel, David P., xxxxxx.
Vitito, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Vogtli, Joseph H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vojir, Joseph L., xxxxxx.
Voland, Paul M., xxxxxx.
Voorhis, Byron E., xxxxxx.
Wagener, Wayne F., xxxxxx.
Wagley, Ardith N., xxxxxx.
Wagner, Albert M., xxxxxx.
Wagner, Gervase J., xxxxxx.
Wagner, Robert Z., xxxxxx.
Wajda, Walter L., xxxxxx.
Walder, Glen W., xxxxxx.
Waldron, Lynn K., xxxxxx.
Waldron, Thomas R., xxxxxx.
Walker, Edgar S., xxxxxx.
Walker, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Wall, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Walla, Gerald J., xxxxxx.
Waller, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Wallgren, Garner G., xxxxxx.
Wallin, Robert G., xxxxxx.
Walter, Larry R., xxxxxx.
Walters, Arthur E., xxxxxx.
Walther, Glen P., xxxxxx.
Walton, James M., xxxxxx.
Walton, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Walton, Willis R., xxxxxx.
Wantiez, Harold N., xxxxxx.
Ward, Lucius M., xxxxxx.
Ward, Willis N., xxxxxx.
Warner, Edward L., III, xxxxxx.
Watkins, Franklin W., xxxxxx.
Watson, Donald D., xxxxxx.
Weatherhead, Herbert J., xxxxxx.
Webb, Keith W., xxxxxx.
Webb, William J., xxxxxx.
Weber, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Wedemeyer, Austin C., xxxxxx.
Weight, Robert H., xxxxxx.
Wellington, Le E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wells, Frank F., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wells, John H., xxxxxx.
Wells, Robert F., xxxxxx.
Wells, Sidney R., xxxxxx.
Wells, Walter E., xxxxxx.
Wells, William A., xxxxxxx.
Welsh, Warren P., xxxxxx.
Wendt, Douglas M., xxxxxx.
Wessinger, Lon H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Westbrook, Albert E., xxxxxx.
Westenhaver, Herbert J., xxxxxx.
Westerman, Robert R., xxxxxx.
Westhorp, David C., xxxxxx.
Wetherington, Phi R., xxxxxx.
Weyland, Drew C., xxxxxx.
Whaley, Edward K., xxxxxx.
Whaley, John M., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, Edd D., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, Joseph C., xxxxxx.
Wheeler, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Whelton, Matthew B., Jr., xxxxxx.
Whichard, Will K., Jr., xxxxxx.
Whidbee, Clifton L., xxxxxx.
Whisonant, Clinton T., xxxxxx.
Whitcomb, Francis G., xxxxxx.
Whitcomb, Harold C., xxxxxx.
White, George W., xxxxxx.
White, Gurney D., xxxxxx.
Whitehead, Lauris E., xxxxxx.
Whiting, Evans K., xxxxxx.
Whitman, David S., xxxxxx.
Whitted, James M., xxxxxx.
Whitteker, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Whittier, Henry R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wick, Daniel W., xxxxxx.
Wickham, Kenneth J., xxxxxx.
Wicklein, Walter A., III, xxxxxx.
Wicks, Fredrick C., xxxxxx.
Wilks, Linus R., xxxxxx.
Willard, John D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, Fred A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, Jerry C., xxxxxx.
Williams, Jimmy L., xxxxxx.
Williams, Merle R., Jr., xxxxxx.
Williams, Michael R., xxxxxx.
Williams, Perry E., xxxxxx.
Williams, Richard A., xxxxxx.
Williams, Richard L., xxxxxx.
Williams, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Williams, Robert W., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Frank S., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Fred A., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Glen D., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Gordon S., xxxxxx.
Wilson, J. Leon, xxxxxx.
Wilson, James A., xxxxxx.
Wilson, John L., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Lyle E., xxxxxx.
Wilson, Murle A., xxxxxx.
Wilson, William R., xxxxxx.
Wimpee, Victor R., xxxxxx.
Winkler, Anthony J., xxxxxx.
Winstead, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Winston, Charles C., III, xxxxxx.
Wise, Phillip R., xxxxxx.
Wiser, Joe B., xxxxxx.
Witt, Jay H., xxxxxx.
Wittekind, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Woempner, Stanley W., xxxxxx.
Wojcik, Joseph J., xxxxxx.
Wolf, Richard G., xxxxxx.
Wolfe, Bruce R., xxxxxx.
Wolff, Allan E., xxxxxx.
Wood, Daryl P., xxxxxx.
Wood, Douglass G., xxxxxx.
Wood, Jerry D., xxxxxx.
Wood, Thomas W., xxxxxx.
Wood, Vern M., xxxxxx.
Wood, Wayne L., xxxxxx.
Woodcock, Larry A., xxxxxx.
Woodman, Donald K., xxxxxx.
Woods, William J., xxxxxx.
Woodson, Raymond E., xxxxxx.
Woodworth, Clifton E., xxxxxx.
Woolley, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Wright, Jack E., xxxxxx.
Wright, Larry J., xxxxxx.
Wright, Leonard L., xxxxxx.
Wyatt, Ralph E., xxxxxx.
Wyatt, Richard H., xxxxxx.
Wylie, Allan R., xxxxxx.
Wyman, James P., xxxxxx.
Wyman, Robert D., xxxxxx.
Yannarella, Anthony M., xxxxxx.
Yeagle, Paul H., xxxxxx.
Yoder, Frederick D., xxxxxx.
Yohe, Wayne I., xxxxxx.
Young, Duke A., xxxxxx.
Young, Ernest L., III, xxxxxx.
Young, Gerard T., xxxxxx.
Young, James W., xxxxxx.
Young, Larry N., xxxxxx.
Young, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Zaleski, Joseph R., xxxxxx.
Zalewski, Zigmund W., xxxxxx.
Zamolyi, Laslo L., Jr., xxxxxx.
Zeltman, Francis E., Jr., xxxxxx.
Ziegwied, George O., xxxxxx.
Zine, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Zumbro, Paul E., xxxxxx.
Zylstra, Corliss E., xxxxxx.

MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Moorhouse, Marianna, xxxxxx.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Aldrich, Terrance C., xxxxxx.
Cochran, Roger W., xxxxxx.
Dexter, John E., xxxxxx.
Dyer, Richard F., xxxxxx.
Egan, Donald J., xxxxxx.
Graham, Roger B., xxxxxx.
Gregg, Bruce P., Jr., xxxxxx.
Iott, Robert O., xxxxxx.
Jaroszewski, Leo F., xxxxxx.
Kazmar, William J., xxxxxx.
Lentz, Gary D., xxxxxx.
Mills, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Polk, Joseph E., xxxxxx.
Reilly, Neil B., xxxxxx.
Sanders, Lawrence T., xxxxxx.
Savoy, Joyce A., xxxxxx.
Scarbrough, Jessie F., xxxxxx.
Smith, George D., xxxxxx.
Stover, William L., xxxxxx.

NURSE CORPS

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Allen, Nancy L., xxxxxx.
Bobko, Stephen E., xxxxxx.
Holtz, Jerry G., xxxxxx.
Payton, Ruth G., xxxxxx.
Wilder, William M., xxxxxx.