

We are not discussing here the complete release of agriculture from Federal control or the restoration of a wholly free and open economy, nor of events which may happen this year or next. But within 5 years, or even less, the development of needs and policy are very likely to bring on new programs of agricultural adjustment which older farmers would find unrecognizable.

This would be doubly significant because it would be the first major withdrawal of the Federal Government from socialized or collective schemes of direct economic control. Freedom of choice would be restored to a large extent in one of the most important sectors of the economy.

Both Vice President HUMPHREY and Agriculture Secretary Freeman are vitally engrossed in this luring prospect. The frustrations and failures of 30 years and much more than \$50 billion propping up the most technically advanced part of the economy fade into history as the new prospects are considered.

The world as a whole has run disastrously low on food. Month by month conditions grow worse. Two-thirds of the world cannot produce now, and will be even less able to produce in the future, the food needed for fast growing populations.

Consider now the kind of response to this catastrophe which is being discussed at the highest levels. An international organization representing the richest and poorest nations would determine the needs of the world for food to prevent widespread hunger and starvation in the year ahead and the years after that.

Production in the United States and the other nations—there are only a few of them—which can produce big surpluses of food would be programmed to meet so far as possible the most critical needs. All needs could not conceivably be met.

When the United States had determined what part of the world demand for food it could satisfy, goals for production in this country would be announced. Those goals would be greater than existing production. They would permit the release of American productive capacity.

Funds now going into loans and other devices for the support of prices and control of production would be diverted to finance worldwide food distribution to the starvation areas.

Only a minimum floor under prices would be maintained at a low level. The free market and freedom of choice by food producers would operate above the low level of support.

This description is greatly oversimplified and impressionistic. Essentially, the billions now being spent for agricultural price support and controlled production would be used for a vastly expanded food-for-peace program.

Existing control programs would be phased out. As these potentials are being discussed, the cost would have to be kept at the same level or below that of existing agricultural programs. There would be no reduction in cost in the purely social problem of relocating the millions of inefficient farmers who will not be able to make a living in the coming years because technology is far ahead of them.

But an area of individual freedom which had appeared lost forever would be restored as the United States used its vast potentials to try to maintain world order in the coming era of famine.

Some may say that the prospects are being overdrawn. The prospects of our response to the problem may be overdrawn but the problem is not. We had better begin to find the response for very practical reasons.

Canada is meeting the demands of Red China for wheat by releasing her productive capacity while we continue to try to hold ours down. Russia, floundering in her agricultural failures, will need more and more food and that need will be filled by others if not by us. These countries are the more advanced of those that will need food in increasing amounts.

Vice President HUMPHREY and Secretary Freeman have not yet reached the point of making concrete proposals which could be considered by President Johnson, who is, of course, familiar with the general trend of the discussions.

But the scope and nature of what is being discussed deserves the most serious attention. When these programs do emerge they will be controversial. Why should we feed the world? Why help hungry Commies? For one thing, we can ease one of our own major problems by doing so.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 7, 1965:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF PATENTS

The following-named persons to be Assistant Commissioners of Patents:

Gerald D. O'Brien, of Maryland, vice Horace B. Fay, Jr.

Richard A. Wahl, of Virginia, vice Ezra Glaser.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

William W. Hagerty, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Communication Satellite Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring at the date of the annual meeting of the Corporation in 1967, vice Clark Kerr.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice John A. Carver, Jr., elevated.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years, vice John C. Bullitt.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Alain C. Enthoven, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Eugene G. Fubini, resigned.

Robert N. Anthony, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Charles Johnston Hitch, resigned.

THE JUDICIARY

Hiram R. Cancio, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 8 years, vice a new position.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Richard P. Stein, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Edmund A. Nix, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice Nathan S. Hefferman, resigned.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Federal Government and Maine—Partners in Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House about the way in which the Federal Government and the government of the State of Maine are joined in promoting crime in Maine by virtue of their ignorant policies of keeping gambling illegal.

Illegal gambling bankrolls organized crime in Maine as elsewhere in the Nation, and the governments which have

kept gambling illegal, and thus available as a mob revenue-raising device, might as well be partners in the crime they are thus indirectly subsidizing.

Maine's parimutuel turnover came to \$19 million last year, but this was greatly exceeded by illegal gambling figures. Figures presented to the McClellan committee set off-track betting in the Nation at \$50 billion a year, which figure is only 42 percent or so of the national illegal gambling total, which would then approximate \$120 billion a year. Maine's share of this on a population basis would be \$600 million a year. Ten percent of this stays in mob pockets as profit, so Maine is a lucrative potato patch for the syndicates. If the Federal and State governments would wise up to social realities, they would regulate and operate gambling, rather than leave it,

inevitable as ever, to finance all shades of criminal activities.

I sincerely hope that it will not be long before the unwise collaboration of the Federal and State governments in ignorance will vanish in favor of Federal and State lotteries.

John K. Dungey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1965, Mr. John K. Dungey, of Syra-

cuse, N.Y., passed away. With his passing I have lost a good friend and this Nation has lost one of the foremost proponents of the American way of life. John Dungey was a veteran of World War II; a leader in State and local American Legion affairs and chairman of its Un-American Activities Committee, as well as editor of the American Legion publication, "Spotlight." He was a student of world affairs and remained ever alert to situations which would indicate the possibility of jeopardy insofar as the liberties and principles of this Nation were concerned. His philosophy embraced the dignity of man in every instance, and he exerted every possible effort to assert himself accordingly.

Despite the great amount of time he devoted in this area of interest, he pursued his obligations as a husband and father in an exemplary fashion.

If only more people assumed the responsibility of citizenship as did John Dungey I am sure that the problems of this world would be somewhat lighter through the process of better understanding.

A Bill To Control Highway Cluttering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to support the President's effort to preserve our country's natural beauty.

Many Americans have long been indignant over the unsightliness that has encroached upon our countryside. We have seen once-beautiful areas deteriorate into appalling unattractiveness.

The postwar years in this country have seen a massive effort to build a highway system sufficient to accommodate the flow of traffic which got such a head start on us during the war. This highway building program has apparently preoccupied us to the extent that we have given little or no attention to the scenic blight that has meanwhile enveloped these roadways.

President Johnson has given us a program which would erase some of that blight and transform our Federal highway system so that it will enhance the natural beauty that lies along our Nation's roads. It is my strong belief that the Congress should give the President's proposal its support.

The need for legislation controlling outdoor advertising along Federal-aid highways is especially evident in my own State of Colorado. Every year thousands of tourists come to Colorado to enjoy Colorado's breathtaking scenery. Tourism is one of the State's fastest growing businesses, and it is certainly in the State's economic interests, at the very least, that billboard advertising be prevented from obliterating the natural beauty.

During the last session of the General Assembly of Colorado, strong antibill-

board legislation was sponsored by Representative Richard Gebhardt, of Boulder, and Senator Floyd Oliver, of Greeley. Their proposals would have kept the signboards back 660 feet from the multilane interstate highways and would have been broad enough to enable the State to get the extra highway bonus payments, or one-half of 1 percent of the cost of each section of highway constructed under the terms of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads.

Unfortunately, the Oliver-Gebhardt bill was killed in the State senate, and a much weaker compromise bill was passed in its place.

The unhappy sequel to this matter was reported in the Denver Post on May 31, when the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads ruled that Colorado's new billboard law would not qualify for highway bonus payments since the new measure contained too many loopholes.

It has been my feeling generally that the Federal Government should assume additional responsibility with greatest reluctance. It should undertake new tasks only when there is a clear and present need, and then only when local authority is unable or unwilling to assume the responsibility itself. With few exceptions, Colorado and the other States of our Nation are in great need of action by the Federal Government. If it is our wish that our citizens "see America first," we should make sure that what they see will make them proud.

Poll of New Jersey Second District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, in May, I mailed to 83,000 homes in New Jersey's Second Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, a questionnaire in which I asked my constituents to answer 10 questions concerning international and domestic matters of concern to the Nation.

I am pleased to report that as of today, more than 7,500 of the questionnaires have been returned to me—a total equal to 9 percent of those who received them. I believe the views of my constituents in southern New Jersey will be of interest to my colleagues.

On questions concerning international matters, it pleases me to report that 80 percent of the respondents favor our present policies in Vietnam; 73 percent favor our present policies regarding Cuba; 55 percent favor an increase in the amount of military aid we are providing Israel, and 90 percent favor our continued participation in the United Nations.

Regarding domestic matters, my poll showed 55 percent of the 7,500 who replied favor abolition of the existing national origins' quota system for immigration to the United States; 70 percent favor legislation requiring Federal regis-

tration of firearms; 96 percent support truth-in-packaging legislation, and 97 percent favor truth-in-lending legislation.

Fifty-three percent of those in the Second District who participated in my poll opposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, and 55 percent of them are opposed to continued Federal farm price supports.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that although I noted it was not necessary for the respondents to sign their names to their ballots and, in fact, I left no space for signatures, 12 percent of the 7,500 who returned their ballots signed their names.

I feel the results of this poll provide an excellent sampling of opinion in my district, and I offer the results to my colleagues for their information and possible guidance.

The 20th Anniversary of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this body today on the topic of the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations. Today, more than ever, we see the critical importance of this international body as the development of nuclear weaponry proliferates. We see how the complexion of international diplomacy has changed since the time when the German strategist von Clausewitz stated that war is but an extension of diplomacy.

The United Nations has served a vital function during the years since it was set up at the Dumbarton Conference following World War II. It has sent peace forces into Korea, Yemen, the Congo (Léopoldville) and the Sinai Peninsula. Currently, the United Nations is maintaining a precarious peace in Cyprus between the Turkish and Greek communities. These forces have been able to take the heat out of strained situations and give nations some time to cool off before bringing them to the conference table.

In the field of technical and economic assistance, the United Nations has perhaps served its most vital role. By giving help and advice to the developing nations, the United Nations has helped to make these states more economically viable. The work of Paul Hoffman, Managing Director of the Special Fund, has been invaluable in this regard and is worthy of the greatest praise. The Economic and Social Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the regional economic organizations of the United Nations have been the sustaining framework for the poorer nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, today the weaponry of this world includes not only arrows and axes and gunpowder but also the hydrogen bomb. We have enough weapons to-

day for the first time in history to eradicate human life on this planet. The question thus becomes not one of the need for a United Nations but how to increase its effectiveness.

Only through a worldwide effort can we ever hope to avoid the ultimate holocaust. If in 1995 we do not celebrate the 50th anniversary of the birth of the United Nations, it is highly likely that there will not be anyone left to celebrate anything on earth.

American-Israel Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point an address I made on June 17, 1965, at the annual installation of the Long Island region of B'nai Zion at the Forest Hills Jewish Center, Forest Hills, Long Island, N.Y.

The speech follows:

I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you tonight a matter of mutual concern and conviction—American-Israel affairs. For the past 6 months, the growing tensions in the Middle East have been very much on my mind. I must be frank with you and say that recent activities there are not comforting, nor do they promise to be comforting if the pronouncements of Arab leaders are any guideline. But let me also say that events in that embattled area are being followed with utmost care and sobriety by the administration and the Congress. In meetings of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, in briefings with State Department officials, including Secretary Rusk and Governor Harriman, who has recently returned from the area, I have repeatedly communicated my own firm belief that our national commitment to Israel must remain fundamental and irrevocable.

The causes and purposes in which we join with Israel, however, are still very much in jeopardy.

At present, fully consistent with the Johnson plan which was sponsored and supported by the United States, Israel is diverting water from the Sea of Galilee to irrigate the arid Negev Desert and to develop hydroelectric power for the entire country. Water is Israel's lifeblood. But, being conscious that the entire Middle East shares that need, Israel is currently diverting no more water than she is entitled to according to the plan once agreed to by Arab engineers and scientists.

In clear opposition to that plan, Nasser and his allies have announced an Arab program against Israel, which would divert Jor-

dan River water above Israel into Arab countries, and thus deprive Israel of her just claims. Work on this diversion scheme is already beginning in Syria. Arab armed forces are being mobilized to defend such projects and others are being planned.

What are we to say to such tactics? How can Israel and this country relate to action thus conceived in hostility and venom? How are we to respond when Arab leaders pronounce, in repeated speeches, that the day is near when Israel will be pushed into the sea? "We are prepared to march into Israel immediately," says the Syrian President. And, to do so, the Arab league now arms and supports a Palestine liberation organization, which is recruiting refugees and other Arabs for combat against Israel. How should men of peace react to such demagoguery? "After waiting 17 years for justice," says the leader of this new army, "we are morally entitled to take the law into our own hands and wage war against Israel." Must Israel, after so many years of lonely tribulation, once again be the victim of men who announce their intention to "take the law into their own hands"?

President Johnson has asserted his own commitment to preserve a just and honorable peace in the Middle East. "We know that you want to live in peace with your neighbors," he told Premier Eshkol last year, "and we believe it not only possible but imperative that these problems be peacefully resolved." My own judgment is that this commitment is dependable and solid, one which all American friends of Israel can rightly acclaim.

There are, moreover, quiet and less public steps the United States is taking to preserve the integrity of the Israeli people. In diplomatic contacts, our officials can privately communicate our strong support of those Arab voices which evince a willingness to accept the permanence and rights of Israel. Likewise, the considerable political influence which accrues from the foreign aid we issue to Arab countries can be, and is being, used in the cause of calming Arab tempers and promoting there a more realistic view of world realities.

My own patience, and that of many of my colleagues in the Congress, however, is severely strained by the abusive behavior of the United Arab Republic, which still receives considerable American aid. Egypt tells us to "jump in the lake," while accepting food shipments. Its arms support Congo and Yemni rebels; its officers train troops for some mythical occupation of Israel, while its Government accepts our generosity. I see no reason why the United States should underwrite aggression and such threats to peace. I have therefore voted, sponsored, and spoken out on the floor of the House of Representatives for a curtailment of aid to the U.A.R., pending some evidence of its willingness to accept the integrity of Israel and live peacefully with its neighbors. I have likewise voted for resolutions opposing any American aid or participation in the Arab economic boycott of Israel.

Meanwhile, the United States must continue its attempts to aid the development of a healthy and prospering Israel. Handicapped by the absence of normal commercial relations with its neighbors, Israel still has

made enormous progress in its economy. Increasingly threatened by the efforts of those neighbors to stifle such progress by boycotts, Israel is slowly gaining full self-sufficiency in agriculture and industry.

The accumulated wisdom and skill of a rich tradition are slowly bringing a good life to all Israelis. The willingness of Israel's friends to support with patience such growth has been instrumental in its success. Even now, for example, American and Israeli engineers and scientists are cooperating in the development of a nuclear desalting process to bring limitless sweet and fresh water to the entire country. All this must and will continue.

But without the promise of peace, progress is insecure. Israel's armed strength, however sad its necessity, is the guarantor of the country's integrity. American aid to Israel's deterrent will have to continue. Hawk missiles, provided by the United States and combined with Israel's own land forces guard Israeli integrity. The arms balance in the Middle East already implicates the United States. I am confident that we will allow no alteration in that balance.

But men of peace—Israeli, American, and Arab alike—must all look forward to an ultimate resolution of the explosive situation in the Middle East. Premier Eshkol has repeatedly called for a diplomatic confrontation with progressive Arab leaders to resolve existing problems and disputes. "A day will come when the Arab countries * * * will realize that the true division is not between Israel and the Arabs, but between lovers of peace and aggressors." These are the words of the Israeli leaders—they project a detente in the Middle East, a defusing of the time bomb feared by the entire world.

Such a Middle East, if ever we see it, might thrive and grow with a regional common market. Its security might be assured by nonaggression pacts and treaties banning the development of nuclear weapons, an event this country would particularly welcome. But most important, this should be a region where modest nations can focus their ardor and energy on good works of benefit to poor people, whose lives have for so long been victimized by senseless hatreds and aggressions.

I do not pretend that we here will ever really see such a Middle East, one in which Israel will be free to pursue policies and goals never yet open to her. I merely envisage a solution toward which we might all work, a solution toward which my own efforts on behalf of my country might be responsibly directed.

I do not believe, as do some, that the cause of a secure and growing Israel falls outside the proper responsibilities of any American Congressman or private citizen. I endorse the wisdom of Justice Louis Brandeis who said, 50 years ago, "Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent."

The lesson of our meeting is that there is no such inconsistency in our loyalties and the loyalties of American foreign policy. We are and will continue to be Israel's best friend. This is the message I bring from Washington. And this is the reason I am here tonight, among you who share my loyalties and beliefs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1965

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer.

Eternal God, as free people of different religions and persuasions, we bow before Thee, the Creator of all.

Thou hast created us to love and understand each other with peace and good will toward all men. We find that our feverish ways continually lead us in paths of war and distrust. Thus we come to Thee. We earnestly pray for peace among the nations of the

world, beginning in our hearts, this moment.

Strengthen and sustain the untiring efforts, deliberations, and decisions of the President and all other men of national and international leadership. Pour upon them spiritual power and guidance that only God can give.

Far above the clouds of life's problems, we see the sunshine of life's blessings.