

Crop losses have further lightened the market as fields were abandoned—and supplies are down still more.

While growers truthfully say they have lost thousands, even millions of dollars in berries or asparagus or lemons, will their actual net income rise or fall? Only the year's-end reckoning will tell.

And while the season is still early and only time will tell if peak summer harvest demands can be met, so far crops have been harvested. Many growers feel the rest of the vegetables and fruits and melons will be harvested also—one way or the other.

[From the Watsonville (Calif.) Register-Pajaronian, May 27, 1965]

WILL WE BE SERFS?

To the EDITOR:

Let's face the true issue about the braceros. It's the same old story, the big farmers against the small farmers. A small farmer, with his family and a neighbor or two, can get by pretty good, and make a decent living for himself.

The larger farmers have to depend on cheap, slave bracero labor or wetbacks. The large farmers do not want to build labor housing. It costs money to build anything today, also they would be taxed. With braceros, no housing or taxes.

Also the large farmers with a plentiful supply of cheap labor can, and have in the past, flood the market, forcing more small farmers to quit farming.

Now what makes more sense, with our growing population and automation, a large amount of small farmers, making a good living for themselves or a few big farmers, living in San Francisco, New York, or Paris?

Just think, with a large amount of small farmers, the businesses, tractors, tools, autos, trucks, homes, and taxes. I believe that if the braceros are allowed to come in, in a few years we in America will be just like or as bad as Brazil is today, with approximately

125 families owning all the land businesses in the country.

So, I say let's cut out the braceros and give our local people, our small farmers and land-owners and labor a chance, also let's think of our children. What are they going to do in the future? Are we the people of this great land going to be reduced to serfs?

And I thought the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, was supposed to represent labor, not agriculture. Why haven't the farmers hollered at the Secretary of Agriculture?

A native son,

ROBERT V. RASMUSSEN.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1965, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9, 1965:

U.S. MARSHAL

William J. Andrews, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 8, 1965.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Floyd M. Buford, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 13, 1965.

Carl W. Feickert, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 5, 1965.

Milton J. Ferguson, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Harry G. Camper, Jr., resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Edward P. Irons
John W. Albrittain
George M. Davis, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Henry L. Beardsley
Kenneth R. Wheeler

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Henry J. Rotrige.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Walter M. Enger

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Fred J. Nichol, of South Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for South Dakota.

Irving Hill, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 1965 National Award Honorees: Cushing, Graham, and Kronheim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, several distinguished Americans have received National Citizenship Awards from the Military Chaplains Association of the United States for making outstanding contributions in the field of strengthening the spiritual foundations of citizenship.

At the 40th anniversary convention held this year, national award honorees selected were: His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston; Dr. Billy Graham, of Montreat, N.C., and Milton S. Kronheim, Sr., of Washington, D.C.

These three honorees join such illustrious past recipients as: Gen. Douglas MacArthur, John Foster Dulles, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, J. Edgar Hoover, Francis Cardinal Spellman, Col. John Glenn, Jr., Bob Hope, and Dr. Raymond B. Walsh.

The purpose of the Military Chaplains Association is "to safeguard and to strengthen the forces of faith and morality of our Nation; to perpetuate and to deepen the bonds of understanding and friendship of our military service; to preserve our spiritual influence and interest in all members and veterans of the Armed Forces; to uphold the Constitution of the United States; and to promote justice, peace, and good will."

This is a noble purpose, but the association has succeeded in its programs. I congratulate and commend the Military Chaplains Association of the United States and its national award honorees. They have indeed helped make our Nation stronger and greater.

Debt Limit Boost Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the action today of the House in increasing the

public debt limit from \$324 to \$328 billion raises the average amount of this debt owed by the head of each family in America to \$6,936. I voted against increasing the debt limit because I am firmly opposed to continued deficit spending, especially in times of prosperity such as exist today. Having voted against foreign aid and a number of other costly programs, I feel justified in registering my opposition to this debt ceiling increase.

Mr. Speaker, the public and private debt in the United States is \$1,172 billion; that is an average amount owed by each family in America of \$24,936.16. Personally, I remember prior to the crash of October 1929 that my banker warned me against excessive borrowing. He said everyone was borrowing too much money, and he was proved right.

To me the same thing is true today. The Federal Government and likewise State and local governments are not exercising restraint in spending; they are not being prudent or frugal and on all levels our Nation is going deeper into debt.

If the House Ways and Means Committee would give us a meaningful, realistic permanent debt ceiling—something that Congress could live by and would live by—I would support it. There

should be a permanent ceiling which would cause the administration to apply a brake in spending and to end all these new centralized welfare programs.

Until a policy of restraint is offered I must continue to protest deficit spending by opposing this practice of adopting regular periodic increases in the legal debt limit.

**Federal Government and Florida:
Partners in Crime and Vice**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the unfortunate partnership of the Federal Government and Florida in making the Sunshine State a palmy paradise for syndicated crime. I refer to Florida's partnership with the Federal Government in keeping gambling illegal in Florida despite a recognition of the fact that it is widespread and ineradicable.

Skeptics say that legalization of some gambling would merely lend respectability to remaining gambling, much of which would still be in syndicate hands. I suggest that the Government ought to jump into the gambling business feet first. I would start with a national lottery, which has had the effect of diminishing other forms of gambling in countries where it has been tried, thus removing potential sources of money from the underworld. The lottery has proven itself in Scandinavia and the low countries to be a useful tool of social progress. It has struck at the crime rings.

The refusal of the Governments of Florida and the United States to institute Government-controlled and regulated gambling has made them partners in the crime they refuse to thus diminish and in the slime they thus spread, for gambling's profits are behind everything from prostitution in Pensacola to murder in Miami and dope rings in Daytona Beach.

Testimony before the McClellan committee pegged off-track betting at about \$50 billion annually, which figure was said to constitute 42 percent of the national annual illegal betting total, which would thus come to about \$120 billion. On a population basis, Florida's share of this would be \$3.6 billion. This is more than enough money to provide profits to support every depth and shade of vice, including perversion of the political and law enforcement process to keep gambling illegal and lucrative for the gangs.

Florida has every known form of gambling—from Miami's bolita, the game of the poor, to the highlife of plush casinos. All of this flows into underworld coffers to subsidize the spread of crime because

the Federal Government and Florida are partners in criminal neglect. I say that it is time to put an end to this tacit alliance of Government and immorality by establishing a national lottery.

Are Farm Prices Too High?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, apparently some groups hostile to agriculture have opened a well-financed campaign to discredit the pending wheat bill. This campaign seems to be based more on prejudice than upon reason, more upon slogans than upon facts. It boils down to the slogan which was used by the former chairman of the Republican conference of this House some 3 or 4 years ago. This propaganda is summed up in the quotation "Bread Tax." The implication is that if the Government is to help the farmer to receive a fair price for the wheat he produces that the Government will be imposing a tax on the "poor man's" bread.

Actually, there is so little to support this kind of theory, it seems to me that I should present a few of the facts. The facts are basically that there is very little direct relation between the price the farmer receives for wheat and the price the consumer pays for a loaf of bread.

A few weeks ago the Agriculture Committee of this House published a bulletin entitled "Food Costs—Farm Prices." I wish that each Member would get a copy of this report, which can be had from the House Committee on Agriculture, and study the charts beginning on page 3 and running through page 12. They are all extremely interesting. But chart No. 4 on page 7 shows the relationship between the index of retail bread prices and the index of prices received by farmers for wheat. This chart shows that as of the end of 1964 the retail price of bread and other bakery and cereal products stood at 145 percent of the 1947-49 base period while the price farmers received for wheat was just above 91 percent of the same base. In terms of money, a 1-pound loaf of bread retailed for 12.7 cents during the 1947-49 base period. In 1964 that same loaf of bread retailed for 20.7 cents—U.S. average.

During this same base period, the farm value of a bushel of wheat had dropped from \$2.29 a bushel to \$2.08. Thus, while the price of wheat was dropping by 9 percent, the cost of bread to the consumer was going up by 74 percent. Certainly, this increase in the price of bread cannot be charged to any excessive farm prices because farm prices were going down—not up.

The present proposal to restore the farmer's price on a bushel of wheat used domestically to just a little above what

it was in 1947 will only add seven-tenths of a cent to the cost of the ingredients going into a loaf of bread. I do not know how much the milling and bakery industry can charge the public, but it is very certain that this restoration of farmer income cannot justify any substantial increase in the price of bread. As a matter of fact, the miller will still be buying their wheat for just a little more than what they paid when bread sold for 11.9 cents per loaf.

I think it is clear to any fairminded person that if there is to be an increase in the price of bread—and there doubtless will be because there has been a constant rise in the price of bread even during every one of 14 consecutive years while the price of wheat was declining—that the farmer and the farm price of wheat will not be responsible for that rise. If the baking industry is to justify these higher prices of bread, they must look somewhere other than to the farmer for the culprit. We are but asking for domestic price on approximately 45 percent of the wheat produced.

We are but asking a restoration of income in behalf of a group whose wages are notoriously low. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, the realized returns per hour to all farm labor and management last year amounted to only \$1.06—only 5 cents per hour more than 17 years earlier—whereas the average real earnings of employees in the food marketing industry averaged \$2.25 in 1964—more than twice their average earnings in 1947. Do you wonder that these farm people are often a little cynical about our efforts to alleviate poverty by helping those, by farm standards, seem affluent?

Finally, let me repeat what should be common knowledge: the American farmer has for years been subsidizing our consumers. He has worked for a substandard wage. He has sold his food far below parity, and the American consumer is today buying more and better food for a far smaller part of his disposable income than are the people of any other major nation at any time in history.

**Congressman Case's Challenge to
Prejudice**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 12, will be the 20th anniversary of a memorable event in the history of this body and in the career of one of our most distinguished former colleagues and present U.S. Senators, my friend and predecessor in this House, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE.

On June 12, 1945, Senator CASE, then a first-term Congressman, took the floor

of the House to reply to the late Member of Congress from Mississippi, John E. Rankin, who the day before had attacked the late Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter and impugned the war record of his State's Negro population.

Congressman CASE accepted the challenge implicit in Congressman Rankin's remarks and in brief and measured terms he defended those whom Mr. Rankin had attacked. In doing so, the young Congressman from New Jersey's Sixth District demonstrated a persuasive and evenhanded skill in debate, but, more important, he displayed a sensitive and enlightened conscience and the courage to act on the dictates of that conscience.

That speech, Mr. Speaker, attracted and deserved nationwide attention. For those of us who know so well and respect so deeply the senior Senator from New Jersey, the speech still stands as a symbol and a prophecy of a career of great public service, unsurpassed for its consistent devotion to the demands of conscience and to the rights and liberties of all Americans.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it seems most appropriate on this occasion to include the text of the speech as a part of my remarks:

A CHALLENGE TO PREJUDICE

(Speech of Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 12, 1945)

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am native-born, white, a gentile—a Protestant. That I am these things entitles me to no special status or distinction. Indeed I had no choice as to any of them, except the last. But because I am these things, and thus a member of the comfortable majority in this country, I find myself under compelling obligation to express my disagreement with certain remarks made yesterday in this Chamber by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Rankin.

As to Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

I am not personally acquainted with Felix Frankfurter. My last and only direct contact with him was as a student for a few weeks, nearly 20 years ago. But several of my close friends and professional associates have long known him intimately and I have had occasion, of course, to follow his decisions and opinions in my practice over the years.

I am convinced not only that he is not a Communist, but also that he has no more sympathy with the Communists' philosophy or their political, social, or economic beliefs or methods than does the gentleman from Mississippi or than I do myself.

He is utterly devoted to our American democratic system and the great principles of liberty, equality, and justice under law upon which it rests. His devotion, I suggest, is but the deeper because he springs from a race which has known little but persecution since its history has been recorded; because, alien-born, he does not regard the great blessing of American citizenship so casually as his natural right as do many of us to whom it has come by birth.

He is a resourceful and energetic student of the law and our institutions; a fair-minded and stimulating teacher; always a crusader for justice for the individual; he has become one of the outstanding Justices of the Supreme Court, where he is regarded, I venture to say, by his brethren on the bench, as he is by the profession generally, as somewhat conservative in his views. He has the most profound respect for the Court,

for its traditions, and for the law which it has made. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that our American system, our constitutional democracy, will come to no evil at his hands.

Mr. Chairman, one word more.

The gentleman from Mississippi also said that, while in Mississippi the population is about equally divided between whites and Negroes, at least 90 percent of the casualties during this war from Mississippi have been gentle whites.

Mr. Chairman, no group in this country has a monopoly on patriotism. Men of all races, colors, and creeds, whether native- or foreign-born have equally sacrificed their lives or given the best years of their youth in this war. The casualty lists show that, as do the gold stars in the windows of homes, both high and humble, in every city, town, and hamlet, and on the farms throughout the land. I suppose there are not many Jews in the State of Mississippi, but I am convinced that their casualties are in proportion to their number in the population, as they are over the country as a whole. And, if that be not true also of the Negroes, it is due, I am sure, to no lack of courage or patriotism on their part, but rather to these two reasons:

First. That, because of poverty and lack of equal educational and economic opportunity for generations, the percentage of Negro draft rejections on medical and mental grounds is far above the average for other groups.

Second. That, to some extent, they may have been given noncombat service of one kind or another more often than most other groups.

Obviously, both of these factors have been quite beyond the control of the Negroes themselves. I am sure the records of this war will vindicate fully the heroism of the Negro combat soldier.

Mr. Chairman, I did not rise in defense of Mr. Justice Frankfurter or of the courage and patriotism of minority groups in this country. They need no defense by me. I rose because I could not by remaining silent permit any inference that I acquiesced in the sentiments to which I have taken exception. And, more important by far, because of my deep conviction that whenever we of the majority in this country permit such sentiments to be unchallenged, not only are we guilty of a wrong to the minority groups concerned but we risk the greater danger of brutalizing ourselves.

Congress Looks at the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve as a member of the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs which attended the U.S. Conference of Mayors annual meeting in St. Louis on May 31.

The highlight of the conference was an address delivered to the delegates by my distinguished colleague and friend, CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota.

The context of his speech was inspiring, enlightening and well received by all who attended.

I believe Congressman MACGREGOR's remarks merit the attention of everyone

interested in improved urban-suburban affairs. I, therefore, take this opportunity to share his views with my colleagues by including the text of his address at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS LOOKS AT THE CITIES

(Address delivered to the delegates, U.S. Conference of Mayors Annual Meeting, St. Louis, Mo., May 31, 1965)

(By Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR)

There is a growing number of Congressmen who recognize the challenges of our fast-expanding metropolitan areas. Because of this I am hopeful that our efforts on the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs will help bridge the gap which too often exists between those who govern these metropolitan centers and the Congress of the United States.

You do not need an elementary course in urban affairs. You deal with the problems. You are the workshop. You already are aware that approximately 125 million Americans and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. You already know that within 25 years, these urban areas will increase by another 100 million people. I can spare the statistics. You need no further proof that there are multiplying problems of core city deterioration and unhealthy suburban growth.

With this phenomenal growth, the problems of urban life—education, employment, housing, transportation, crime, air and water pollution, discrimination, open spaces, planning, and all the rest—have become increasingly complex.

There is no escaping the fact that the role of the Federal Government has assumed increased importance in metropolitan affairs. Competition for industry between the States and a wide variety of other factors have presented State and local governments with an increasingly difficult job in raising the revenues they need to meet their problems—problems which are increasing in magnitude and which frequently cross local and even State boundaries.

Despite all this, is there a mayor here who would say that the States and localities do not have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems? The American system has made the responsibility yours. Who can deal better with the problems than those who know them best?

Each of us at all levels of government needs to help provide you with the muscle it takes to get the job done. And it is not merely bigness, or just money, or only slogans which are going to do it. You know that, too.

I am going to propose here a number of steps which I believe can and should be taken: I don't mean to suggest that this is the policy of the Republicans in the House of Representatives. But it does represent the thinking of many of us. I come from a metropolitan area. My congressional district has added more than 100,000 people since 1960. It will have increased by over 100,000 more persons by the 1970 census. My background is the city.

First of all, Americans need, and need badly, an office of community development in the Executive Office of the President. Nearly 30 Republican Members of the House have introduced legislation to accomplish that purpose. For even if we were to get a Cabinet department of urban development tomorrow, the need for an effective office in the White House to coordinate the proliferating activities of the Federal Government, as they affect urban and suburban areas, would be no less desirable.

Here is why. By ignoring some 80 other Federal programs concerned with metropolitan problems and by simply elevating the

Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet rank, a Department of Housing and Urban Development cannot hope to achieve coordination, efficiency, or economy. Urban problems cut across departmental lines, and as urban life grows increasingly complex, more and more of the problems can be expected to cut across these lines. The necessary coordination can be achieved without any increase in Federal control, and without any significant increase in the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy, by an Office of Community Development in the White House.

A bit later, I would like to return for a closer look at this proposal.

Secondly, as we attempt to improve the capacity of the executive branch of the Federal Government to give more effective help in the solution of metropolitan problems, we would be well advised to give thought to improving the way Congress itself functions in this area. Today, for example, an agreement between States on resolving problems of water and air pollution would be passed upon, not by the congressional committees which deal with health problems or with urban matters, but by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. I am hopeful that the present commission which is studying the problems of congressional organization will provide some answers to the problem of congressional jurisdiction of metropolitan area affairs.

Third, consideration should be given by the Federal Government to the development of metropolitan service agencies in the field. To offer a single agency with which mayors could deal would avoid duplication, would review on a more comprehensive basis than is possible today the applications of local government for Federal assistance, and, in general, could afford all of you the opportunity to discuss your needs with a single repository of information on Federal programs. Too often a project application approved by a field agency of the Federal Government is now rejected, on the same set of facts, by the Washington central office.

Why should Federal regional offices be spread over the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Health Service, representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Aviation Agency, and countless other agencies, each dealing in a fragmented fashion with bits and pieces of urban problems. We should consider a union of Federal agencies at the field level. Since Federal regional offices are, by and large, not decision-making agencies, we should, at the minimum, help simplify the service potential to the communities and States by bringing their functions under a single roof, subjecting local plans to a comprehensive and unfragmented review.

Fourth, renewed consideration should be given to the program sparked initially by Republican Governors for the sharing of Federal tax revenues with State and local governments. This program was given consideration by the administration of President Eisenhower—and reportedly since then—and was recently revived by Dr. Walter Heller. We welcome the bipartisan support. We are pleased that the chief economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson has joined Republican Governors who have, over a period of years, proposed the reallocation of revenue resources so that communities and States would be better prepared to meet their responsibilities.

This proposal needs further public discussion. A more equitable sharing of tax revenues, with no strings attached, can have a profound impact on the future of our cities.

I would now like to take that second look I promised at the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development. To understand why a mere change in the status of HHFA won't do the job, let's look at the relationships of some Federal programs to-

day. Take the Federal Bureau of Roads, under the Commerce Department, and the HHFA, for example. Under the proposed Department, activities of the Bureau of Public Roads would not be included. Highway planners, as you all know, find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs. On the other hand, local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. Clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the HHFA, proposed to change to department status—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

But these objectives can and do clash. And, in some urban places in America, that clash can raise havoc with the dream of a beautiful America. Rather than elevating HHFA to Cabinet level, we need a referee. A White House office, such as we propose, would be an appropriate umpire.

The proposed Johnson administration bill creates neither a Cabinet-level department to coordinate the Federal programs geared to the needs of the urban communities nor a Cabinet-level department to administer the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing. Less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities would be encompassed in the new department.

I have already mentioned that the Bureau of Public Roads is not included. It will stay in the Department of Commerce.

Water pollution and sewage disposal programs will stay in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now. And, the more than 40 separate programs of financial aid for urban development involve some 13 departments and agencies.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions for the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars in meeting overall community needs.

This is precisely why I favor the establishment of an office of community development in the White House. Your efforts to overcome the problems of air and water pollution, crime, education, public health, and others deserve equitable assistance, and we are determined to provide that assistance. This Republican proposal, if adopted, would not discourage local and State initiative or direct the development of appropriate solutions, but would provide State and local officials with a coordinating point of reference for all Federal programs. This coordination can be achieved with efficiency and economy.

If we establish an office of community development, if the Congress will improve its handling of metropolitan affairs, if the executive branch will develop metropolitan service agencies in the field, and if steps can be taken to share Federal tax revenues with State and local governments—if these four proposals can be adopted, we will have taken the first steps toward strengthening our metropolitan centers and improving the relations between these centers and the Federal Government—both Executive and legislative.

But the very first step is to build and strengthen the liaison between the city officials and the Members of Congress. This is the primary reason for the creation of the House Republican task force on urban-suburban affairs. Too often we find that the Congress tells the cities what they need without first asking a true cross-section of city leaders. This method of operation must not be allowed to continue. The cities must

tell the Congress what Federal programs the cities properly need and want before the Congress takes action.

The challenge of our great metropolitan growth is a challenge for every American. It is a challenge which must be met with boldness and determination to recognize a problem and to get at the heart of that problem. But the first responsibility is with the local and State governments. It must be with those who know the problems best. The Congress hopes to work more closely with you in helping to meet that responsibility.

Statement Before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, June 3, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the text of my statement before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on June 3, 1965.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, DEMOCRAT, OF INDIANA, BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS, JUNE 3, 1965

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. The hearings and work of this committee are among the most important enterprises before the 89th Congress and I am glad to have been one of the cosponsors of the resolution authorizing this effort. Surely one of the critical tests of the greatness of any institution is its capacity for self-appraisal. That Congress is willing to take a long and careful look at its own procedures and practices is evidence of the continued vitality and viability of the legislative branch of our Government.

We are fortunate indeed that the cochairmen, and other members, of this committee bring such vast experience to this undertaking. Senator MONRONEY has once before in his legislative career contributed decisively to reappraisals of congressional organization, and my fellow Hoosier and dean of my delegation, Congressman RAY MADDEN, brings to this task his many years of experience in Congress and as a member of the important Committee on Rules.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak today not only as a Member of Congress, now serving his seventh year in the House of Representatives. I wish also to comment on the place of Congress in the National Government from my experience as a political scientist and as a college teacher of American government. As a teacher, I used to discuss the role of Congress as a check and balance participant in our National Government. As a Member of Congress, I have come to appreciate that the importance of maintaining an effective check and balance system is matched only by the difficulty. It is easy enough to say that the three branches of the National Government are coordinate and equal; but it is a continuing responsibility, and an extraordinarily difficult one, for the National Legislature to find ways of safeguarding its own place in the check and balance system. Not only in this country, but in governments around the world, legislatures and parliaments are challenged by

the increasing power of executive branches, and my experience as a Member of the House has reinforced the thesis that I used to try to communicate to my students, namely, that one of the purposes of Congress is to be an effective and viable participant in our system of checks and balances.

I want to address myself to one aspect of the congressional role in the checks and balance system that seems to me to be of increasing importance.

I refer to the responsibility of Congress for what the political scientists call "oversight of administration", and I here cite the language of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1947, which declares that Congress shall exercise "continuous watchfulness over administration of the laws".

With the passage of new welfare and education bills which authorize programs of large sums of money and which involve new patterns of relationships among Federal, State, and local governments as well as private agencies, Congress will, in my judgment, find it increasingly important to exercise this task of overseeing the administration of the new laws. I refer, for example, to such programs as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Appalachian Act, and the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

I realize that the appropriations subcommittees, especially in the House, have historically been most active in carrying out this responsibility of oversight. But it seems to me that the legislative or authorizing committees must, for the reasons I have suggested, anticipate a more vigorous role as watchdogs of the administration of the laws they have produced. I would add that the more initiative in the drafting of legislation passes to the executive branch, the more important this function of oversight by Congress will become.

Yet Congress is not as well equipped as it should be to do the job of overseeing the administration. In this respect it is ironic that we authorize the President and the heads of executive agencies to name many advisory councils and committees of experts outside Government to monitor Federal programs but we are reluctant to provide ourselves in Congress with enough qualified staff to enable us to do our own evaluating in a thorough way. I may say that there is a growing feeling among members of the House Education and Labor Committee that if we are going to authorize advisory councils to the Office of Education to review education programs, we should authorize at least one advisory council of nongovernmental experts to our own committee to make studies and recommendations with respect to programs within the jurisdiction of the committee.

But Congress must do more than check and balance the executive branch in the conduct of our national affairs. Surely we have as well the equally important task of making creative contributions to public policy. Congress is not only an institution for overseeing the Executive's conduct of affairs, or for legitimating proposals and decisions arrived at by members of the executive branch. It is also of great importance that Congress play a full part in the legislative process by initiating ideas and offering constructive proposals for dealing with the critical problems our Nation faces.

I think it is worth examining for a few moments the experience of Congress and the Nation in the 20th century with respect to achieving both these overriding goals: helping to maintain the check-and-balance system and making creative contributions to solutions of public problems. I am frank to say that I think we are barely holding our own. To be sure, individual Congressmen make important contributions to public policy and to balancing the executive role in national life. But as an institution, I believe that forces are at work that challenge the future of Congress as a creative and ini-

tiating institution in national politics. Many of these forces are inevitable, although the decline of Congress is not inevitable. Around the world, in other countries, parliamentary bodies have confronted the same forces, but with regrettably less success than we have mastered them in this country.

The forces I refer to are not subversive or darkly hidden; they are the inevitable consequences of the complex problems and difficulties of modern policymaking. Let me say that I think there is virtually a consensus among political scientists and students of government that more and more power is being shifted from the legislative to the executive branch.

Let me here interject that I appreciate that there are understandable reasons for the increased power of the executive branch in our Government not only with respect to initiating legislation, but generally. Two world wars, a depression, the cold war, the general acceptance of a wider role for government in modern industrial society—these are some of the factors which have enhanced the power of the President and the executive branch vis-a-vis Congress.

Power in itself is not dangerous; it is dangerous only when it is unchecked and unbalanced by other sources and centers of power. What disturbs me is that Congress is less and less an effective source of new ideas and of the initiation of legislation and more and more has had to fall back on the role of amending, accepting, or legitimating proposals brought to it by the executive. More and more often legislation is drafted first in the executive departments and then submitted to Congress for its acceptance, amendment, or rejection. This is true not only in the immensely complex fields of foreign affairs and defense policy, but in the traditionally domestic realms of national policymaking; such as education, labor, and transportation. If Congress is to be a full partner in the check and balance system, and if it is to make creative contributions to public policy, it must, it seems to me, not only legitimate and check, but it must initiate and propose. The business of Congress is not, in my view, simply to dispose of what the President proposes but to propose as well.

One of the principal factors, of course, that contributes to the threatening decline of Congress is that the problems that now cross the desk of a Congressman and come into the hearing rooms of our committees are more complex and numerous than ever before and involve often highly complicated information and debatable interpretations of that information.

President Kennedy used to say that a Member of Congress in the early 19th century needed to be informed about only three public problems, internal improvements, the tariff, and slavery. If a man came to Congress in the early 1800's and served 20 or 30 years, he would have very few important matters to pass on other than these three. And what he learned about each of them in his first years in Congress served him in good stead for the rest of his congressional career.

Would that the life of a modern legislator were as simple as in the days of Webster and Calhoun. The agenda of Congress not only consists of many more than three perennial problems, but it is constantly shifting. One year it is renewal of the trade agreements program; another year it is education; another year it is transportation. And mixed in with these problems of vast national and international scope are many others of great technicality and immense subtlety. The speeches that we make in our freshman years in Congress soon perish; they are hardly relevant to the needs of our later years.

The implication of the complexity of public problems is that the executive branch,

with its bureaucratic advantages, is better organized than Congress for dealing with such problems. To be sure, Congress is not as bad off as it was in 1946, thanks to the Le Follette-Monroney Act. The reduction in the number of committees, and the reorganization of committee jurisdiction, and the creation of professional committee staffs helped to slow down the decline of Congress, but as the appointment of this joint committee signifies, the tide still runs against us.

That public problems are changing and growing more complex is never more dramatically felt than with respect to those policies and problems relating to science. The world is undergoing a knowledge explosion as vast and troublesome as the population explosion. In the sciences, fields and disciplines merge and change, curriculums go out of date, and much of the education that many of us had before we came to Congress seems less and less pertinent to the demands now placed upon us.

Unfortunately, we cannot expect Members of Congress to bring with them skills sufficient to cover all of the many complex issues that face us. Consider scientific problems again. As we all know, it is relatively easy for a lawyer or a businessman, or even a college professor of government, to move in and out of politics, to spend a few years in Congress or in the service of the executive branch and then to return to his other career. But for a scientist in the laboratory to depart from his natural habitat for a term or two in Congress is virtually to forsake his career as a scientist. For by the time he returns to his laboratory, the structure of his professional knowledge will have so changed that he will have missed out on many important new developments. We are unlikely to expect to have among our colleagues many men with the technical training to advise us on the difficult and knotty questions of science and policy.

We must, therefore, look for ways to provide ourselves with sufficient staff or other forms of assistance to make up for our natural disadvantages.

For if Congress is to contribute effectively and creatively to the shaping of public policy, it is essential that we in Congress as well as officials in the executive branch should be thinking, searchingly and critically, about the great issues that face our country and the world.

It seems to me therefore imperative that we maintain a flow of ideas between the elected politicians in Washington and the intellectual community throughout the Nation.

This is a much more difficult enterprise for Congress than it is for the executive branch. The executive agencies, most obviously the procurers of scientific knowledge, such as the Defense Department, NASA, the AEC, and the National Institutes of Health, have direct links with both university-based thinkers and people at the Rand-type institutes and the great foundations.

I think we must do more to improve the relationship between the scholars and the legislators. I think we should consider, for example, the proposal of the then Senator HUMPHREY in 1963 for a new arm of Congress—what he called a "Congressional Institute"—a group of scholars selected by their peers, who would serve Congress as "a pool of knowledge, thought, and expertise."

Such a group could help Congress to think ahead about the problems we all know will be with us in the coming decade—the Atlantic Alliance, population growth, tax policy, Federal-State relations, China, international peacekeeping machinery.

A group of scholars serving from 1 to 3 years could rotate to Washington from our best universities and thereby maintain a flow

of ideas both in Congress and in the university community. But for such a project to be effective, it would have to be more than a front operation. It would have to be of very high quality.

I think no one would quarrel with the proposition that the Library of Congress, as presently organized, is not able to provide Members of Congress with such knowledge, thought, and expertise, nor, I must add in all fairness, is it expected to. But the problem is still there.

Not only are we overwhelmed by complicated information in vast amounts, and not only is the executive branch much better organized for processing these vast resources than we are, and for initiating access to the thinkers of the country, but in our inevitable specialization to deal with these problems, we neglect another side of policymaking processes. I refer to the capacity of Congress—or lack of it—to integrate and combine our specialties into some relatively comprehensive view of public problems. Often I hear Members of Congress complain that only part of the problem comes before them and their committees. Other parts of the problem fall within the jurisdiction of other committees. We have seen in recent years the way in which foreign policy merges into defense policy and defense policy overlaps foreign policy. Yet we have two committees to deal with these subjects but no single committee to take a comprehensive view of their interrelations. Likewise, tariff and trade policies, with important foreign policy implications, are handled by the Ways and Means Committee. In my own committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, we have jurisdiction over national educational policy, but the work of the National Science Foundation, which makes such important contributions to education and research, falls under the jurisdiction of the Science and Astronautics Committee, and there is little communication between the committees.

I believe that the explanation for the relative diminution of legislative power vis-à-vis the executive lies in large measure in these two conditions, first, the increasing complexity and amount of information about public problems, for which the executive is better organized than Congress, and second, in the overspecialization of Congress and the minimum of facilities we have for integrating policy in a comprehensive fashion.

If we look to the future and assume that no changes are made in current legislative practices, what can we expect? I think we can only expect these trends to continue. I cannot imagine that the problems confronting modern government will grow any simpler or any less numerous. I cannot believe that information available to policymakers will decrease; it can only increase. Fortunately we need not expect things to get worse before they get better. The work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress will hopefully lead to some innovations in legislative procedure that can help us check the tide and contribute to Congress' effectiveness in the check and balance system and as a creative contributor to national policy.

I have already offered a few modest suggestions for strengthening our capacity to handle the problems that confront us.

I have suggested that congressional committees be less hesitant to name advisory councils of nongovernmental experts to advise them on legislative programs within their jurisdiction.

A related suggestion, for which ample precedent already exists in a number of congressional committees, is that committees consider holding seminars or special panels at times other than when specific legislation is under consideration. The Joint Commit-

tee on the Economic Report, the Ways and Means Committee, the Committee on Aeronautical Sciences, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have, in varying ways, instituted such a practice. Sometimes the procedure is for a small panel of experts to gather for the discussion of a paper or a document written by a member of the panel. On other occasions, a larger group convenes to hear a preliminary statement by a member of the committee or a member of the seminar panel, and afterward other panelists and committee members discuss the problems raised in the initial presentation.

I believe that such seminars, drawing upon the talents in and out of Congress, would help us not so much in our day-to-day decisions about legislation but in anticipating problems that we are likely to confront next year or the year after and furthermore would give us broad perspectives, if not concrete details, from which to consider both current and future policy issues.

In a similar vein, I urge that congressional committees make greater use of the research resources in universities and private organizations. What the Rand Corp. has done for the Air Force is something that might profitably be undertaken by some legislative committees. I refer to the commissioning or contracting of studies and reports by private research firms or universities. Earlier I referred to the knowledge explosion that has swept our century. Executive agencies take advantage of contracting for the advice and research of the Nation's leading scholars, but we have not always been so alert to having these materials made available to us in Congress.

There is, of course, precedent for such investigations and studies. For example, the Committee on Foreign Relations several times has conducted excellent studies of current and future problems of foreign affairs. And the Commission on Money and Credit and the Hoover Commissions similarly undertook contract research. This is one way of bringing fresh insight to Congress, without burdening the committees with enormous research staffs.

The suggestions I have made, advisory councils to congressional committees, a congressional institute, committee seminars, the use of research consultants, and also increased staff for individual Members, are intended to contribute to an improvement in our sources of information and judgment about contemporary problems. Such proposals would go some way, I am sure, toward making us more effective partners in the system of checks and balances and in initiating solutions to important public problems.

But as I indicated earlier, I think we also need to find ways of integrating and combining our specialized information in more intelligent ways. As I noted, I am concerned about subjects that fall between two committees. We are all familiar with the disjunction that occurs when the authorizing committees study a matter in great detail and then see the House adopt a policy, only to find that when the Appropriations Committee brings in its bill to pay for the programs, the policy has been significantly altered or the program reduced. I think there is very little we can do about coordinating the authorizing committees and the Appropriations Committees, but there may be some other steps we can take to coordinate the work of the legislative committees.

For example, I would urge the Joint Committee to recommend that the leaderships of both Houses increase the staff facilities and resources available to the majority and minority leaders. I think we have to look to our leadership to consider the work of the committees not committee by committee but in a somewhat comprehensive and universal way. In the days when the present occupant of the White House was the majority leader

of the Senate he began to create precisely this kind of staff that could comprehensively follow the work of the Senate. He was, however, obligated to create such a staff out of his various committee assignments instead of employing a staff directly at the service of the majority leader.

I hope that when the Joint Committee meets with the leadership of the two Houses it will explore ways in which their staffs may be augmented to monitor the work of Congress as a whole.

Likewise, I think there are some other steps that can be taken to coordinate effectively the work of committees with similar responsibilities. Without radically altering the committee structure, I think something might be done by which committees such as those on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services could meet together from time to time to consider ways in which their policies intersect with each other. Of course, I do not propose that one committee dominate the other, but rather that the two committees discuss subject matters that are related to each other.

I have already suggested meetings at which at least some members of the Education and Labor and Science and Astronautics Committees of the House could on occasion discuss problems that touch directly the work of both their committees.

Opportunities for joint discussions of other problems by other committees will easily suggest themselves.

I wish to conclude my remarks by urging upon the committee the value of undertaking additional research on Congress. I am sure that the committee will draw on the wisdom and experience of many Members of Congress. I am sure that it will also draw on the work of students of Congress. In addition to this, I recommend that the committee seriously consider commissioning further research on Congress. As a former teacher of government, and as an admirer of the work some political scientists have done to date in studying Congress, I cannot help saying that we are still short of the adequate knowledge we need to assess the strength and weakness of this body.

The American Political Science Association, under a grant from the Carnegie Corp. of New York, has already taken a major step to increase the availability of scholarly and scientific research on Congress. I refer to "The Study of Congress," under the direction of Prof. Ralph Hitt, of the University of Wisconsin. Those studies, however, are reasonably small and are not likely to be completed by the time that this committee completes its work. I am sure, however, that the committee could engage, in consulting capacities, the research skills of a number of able political scientists to participate in committee studies that could be completed during the 89th Congress.

In any such research, I would urge this committee to collect information on the way other legislative bodies conduct their business. An inventory of the parliamentary practices and procedures of democratic legislatures around the world might be quite useful to the committee. Something like this has already been undertaken in a study for the New Jersey State Legislature by the Eagleton Institute of Politics.

Mr. Chairman, many other Members of Congress have testified before this committee and have made suggestions for improving the organization of Congress. I have made no effort to repeat all the laudable suggestions you have heard but have touched on only a few ideas that seem to me worthy of consideration.

I would like to go on record, however, as endorsing the proposed 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives. I shall not here rehearse all the arguments

for this proposal; they must be familiar by now and I think they are compelling.

I would like also to endorse the proposal of our colleagues, Congressmen BOLLING and UDALL, for a modification of the present se-

niorty system in selecting committee chairmen. The suggestion that members of the majority caucus should be able, on a secret ballot, to vote for one of the top three majority members as chairman of each com-

mittee seems to me at once to respect the real values of the seniority system while providing a greater degree of responsiveness on the part of the committee chairmen to the Members of the House of Representatives.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Most merciful God, our Father: Standing in these fields of earthly toil, we bow our heads and still our hearts, to listen in reverence to distant bells which speak of our kinship with the eternal.

Make us, we pray, vividly conscious—even in the drab surroundings of time and sense—of the divine reality which ever and anon breaks through the seen, in bright shafts of everlastingness.

Give us to see what the long travail of the ages makes crystal clear: that where there is no vision, the people perish, as idealism goes down and the false gods of selfish force ascend the throne. Set our eyes on the far-off goals, many of which cannot be reached in our brief day, but to whose final coronation we can give the stubborn ounces of our devotion, as we spend our fleeting years here as a valiant tale that tells for Thee and Thy coming kingdom.

We bring our prayer in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 9, 1965, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose in having the Senate meet early today is to give the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] an opportunity to make a report on his recent trip to the Far East. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut be recog-

nized for an indefinite length of time to deliver his scheduled speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 266, and that the remaining items on the calendar be considered in sequence thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first item.

EUGENINSZ LUPINSKI

The bill (S. 16) for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugeninsz Lupinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MEHDI HERAVI

The bill (S. 68) for the relief of Mehdi Heravi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mehdi Heravi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

VIOLET SHINA

The bill (S. 248) for the relief of Violet Shina was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Violet Shina shall be held and consid-

ered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIO JESUS SENRA AND WIFE

The bill (S. 372) for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra, may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to their residence and physical presence within the United States since August 13, 1959.

DR. GUILLERMO CASTRILLO (FERNANDEZ)

The bill (S. 374) for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez) may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since September 17, 1960.

MARIA GIOCONDA FEMIA

The bill (S. 521) for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Gioconda Femia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 13, 1946.

PATRICK ANTHONY LINNANE

The bill (S. 550) for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of