

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Port Washington People Put Their Stamp
of Approval on Enlarged Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, back in the early days of our country, a barn raising was the signal for what neighbors there were, to pitch in, and create a building which would, in the long run, benefit the whole community. Rarely is such spirit shown in the modern world.

A sterling example of the fact that this spirit has survived is to be found in the cooperative efforts of the free enterprise system and the local and Federal Government in the opening of the new addition to the Port Washington, N.Y., Post Office. Here was a perfect example of how these three diverse elements can be brought together successfully and creatively, to achieve a result thousands of municipalities would have envied.

The Chamber of Commerce of Port Washington pitched in with a fervor and dedication reminiscent of old. The dedication of the post office enlargement was a product of the efforts of men of the caliber of Charles Shapiro, chairman of

the planning committee; H. Clinton Hegeman, president of the Port Washington Chamber of Commerce; and myriads of other devoted and public-spirited citizens.

Even the inclement weather that threatened to mar the festivities could not dampen the spirits of these men nor their memorable program. Many came nonetheless—all knew it was worth it when they left.

Postmaster Walter Cuminsky and his staff also played an important role in planning the event. They will inherit the building—the symbol of the expansion and importance of Port Washington. There is a trust which they have already proven they richly deserve.

Results of Fourth District Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, about 2 months ago I mailed out questionnaires to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, asking their views on some of the legislation pending before the Congress.

More than 10,000 questionnaires were returned, a large response for a survey of this type. Reading the replies took a good deal of time, but I feel it was time well spent.

To insure complete accuracy, I had the returned questionnaires tabulated at my own expense by an electronic computer. The tabulation is now finished, and today I would like to call the results to the attention of my fellow Members in the House of Representatives.

In addition, I plan to reprint this tabulation and distribute copies to those who received the original questionnaire.

The questions in any survey of this kind must necessarily be brief, despite the many complex features of the legislation, and I am sure many people found it difficult to supply a simple "yes" or "no" reply.

In fact, a large number of people commented that, while they were inclined to favor or oppose a certain piece of legislation and marked their questionnaire accordingly, the final decision would have to be mine.

As many of these people pointed out, a close study of all the available information is needed before voting on the complex legislation that comes before the Congress.

I will continue to make a careful study of legislation in the future, taking into account its effect both on the Fourth District and on the Nation as a whole.

The tabulation of the questionnaire survey follows:

Question	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor a bill I have introduced to prohibit all Federal employees from hiring their relatives?.....	87.9	8.8	3.3
2. Do you favor legislation for medical care for persons 65 or older, financed mainly through a separate trust fund in the social security system by means of increased social security taxes?.....	33.5	59.7	6.8
3. Do you favor legislation providing a cost-of-living increase in social security benefits?.....	69.2	24.8	6.0
4. Do you favor repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to enact laws prohibiting employers and employees to contract for a "union" or "agency" shop?.....	25.5	55.1	19.4
5. Do you favor the administration's bill for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, which puts emphasis on assistance to areas with large numbers of pupils from low-income families?.....	63.2	28.2	8.6
6. Do you favor legislation to expand aid to colleges and universities, including a \$15 million program to finance student loans?.....	53.0	37.9	9.1
7. Do you favor establishment of a National Arts Foundation and a National Humanities Foundation, to be financed by Federal funds?.....	12.0	73.4	14.6
8. Do you favor additional legislation to insure that all Americans, in all parts of the country, are not denied the right to vote?.....	81.5	12.2	6.3
9. Do you favor a constitutional amendment I have introduced to abolish the electoral college in the presidential election process?.....	79.1	10.2	10.7
10. Do you favor legislation to gradually abolish the "national origin" immigration quota system, which favors admission of persons from northern European countries?.....	39.2	41.9	18.9
11. Do you favor a constitutional amendment providing that "factors other than population" could be taken into account in apportioning a State legislature?.....	64.0	23.5	12.5
12. Do you favor legislation that would continue America's foreign aid program?.....	43.6	44.9	11.5
13. If so, would you favor distributing the aid in the form of loans rather than grants?.....	60.2	9.0	30.8
14. Do you favor legislation that would repeal or reduce excise taxes on such items as—			
(a) Telephone service?.....	72.1	18.9	9.0
(b) Furs?.....	15.6	62.2	22.2
(c) Cosmetics?.....	32.5	48.1	19.4
(d) Fountain pens?.....	45.7	34.1	20.2
(e) Trailer hitches?.....	41.2	35.7	23.1
15. Do you favor legislation that would continue the voluntary feed grains program?.....	54.2	25.9	19.9
16. Do you favor legislation to keep the area redevelopment program in operation?.....	48.1	27.5	24.4
17. Do you favor legislation to renew and expand the Federal housing program?.....	43.0	40.6	16.4
18. Do you favor legislation to step up the "war on poverty" in both urban and rural areas?.....	51.5	37.7	10.8

Lobbying Rules Need Tightening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Rules Committee has released their report on the Robert G. Baker hearings.

I have studied this report and I am now convinced that my bill, H.R. 9626, would be a major step toward eliminating the abuses uncovered by the Senate committee.

My bill would amend sections 305 and 310 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act by turning over administration of that act to the Comptroller General of the United States. At present, all lobbyists are required to file their reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Sen-

ate. But there is a noticeable lack of any law to make an agency or official responsible for the administration or enforcement of the act. I feel that the Comptroller General is the proper authority in that he is not only an arm of Congress itself, but he has an investigative staff at his disposal. Thus the Comptroller General is admirably equipped to determine whether lobbyists' reports are accurate or not and whether the statute's terms are being complied with fully.

H.R. 9626 would authorize the Comptroller General to study and review the reports and then to determine whether they meet the standards of the act. Among the other powers provided for in the bill is the provision that the Comptroller General can ascertain whether all lobbyists have registered in compliance with the law. I think that the Senate report makes it abundantly clear that not all lobbyists have done so. When violations are discovered, the Comptroller General would report them to the appropriate law enforcement agencies of the Government.

The Comptroller General would also be directed to make studies of the lobbying problem and transmit his recommendations to Congress if the recommendations would further the objectives of my bill. The bill would require further that the Comptroller General send to Congress a copy of each lobbyist's report where it would be on public record for 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the Senate committee has laid bare unethical practices by lobbyists to the public's critical eye. Such practices by lobbyists must be stopped if Congress is to deserve public confidence.

Fulbright-Hays Latin American Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of this body an educational and cultural exchange program in the Department of State which was initiated with Latin America 25 years ago, in which university students and faculty conduct exchanges with other American Republics.

This program was established under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, signed in Buenos Aires in 1936. It is the Fulbright Act of 1946 and the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948. The Congress initiated similar exchange activities on a worldwide basis. This program was later broadened in scope through subsequent congressional legislation and is now carried out under the authority of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 through the esteemed Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and my esteemed colleague from Ohio, Congressman WAYNE HAYS.

The general goal of this program is to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic relations between our country and our sister nations in the Americas. As an academic activity, this program engenders understanding through communication on the highest levels. In 1964, under the Latin American program, a total of 3,179 persons received grants, 2,732 were grants to Latin Americans to visit the United States and 447 were for U.S. grantees to travel in Latin America.

I am proud to announce that Mr. Thomas Skola, of Parma, Ohio, whose family resides at 6018 Charles Avenue, is a recipient of a grant, through the Fulbright-Hays Act, to study in Santiago, Chile, at the University of Chile.

Thomas is a recent graduate of the University of Rochester where he was senior class president and captain of the University of Rochester wrestling team. His major during his college career was political science where he participated in the honors program.

Thomas graduated from John Adams High School, located in the 21st District of Ohio, which I am proud to serve. He was equally active during his high school career.

During his high school and college careers, Tom was actively interested in Latin American affairs and became fluent in Spanish, which will now be put to good use.

During the 10-day orientation period in Washington, D.C., in which Thomas and his colleagues participated, the State Department and Government officials provided briefings, lectures, and discussions on various facets of Latin America and Chile affairs, which would be useful during his 1-year stay.

From our discussion, it is my understanding that as a student in Chile, Thomas will receive \$170 a month which will be paid in counterpart funds. He will also receive a set amount each year to provide for his books at the University of Chile.

I am proud to note that Thomas is 1 of only 150 persons in the United States to participate in this Latin American student exchange program. I am confident that after having met several of the Fulbright-Hays recipients, like Tom Skola of my district, who are to study in Latin America, that our country will be well represented during their period of study at the various universities currently involved in this program.

I wish to extend my congratulations to Thomas' family who must be very proud of their son's academic endeavors.

Communication of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman with Mr. George S. Moore, President, First National City Bank of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a letter which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman wrote to Mr. George S. Moore, president, First National City Bank of New York. This letter points out clearly that the proposed wheat program is in harmony with the goals of the Great Society. Farmers will receive seven-tenths of one cent more for wheat on a loaf of bread. This

will be his first raise in 18 years. The Secretary's letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 9, 1965.

Mr. GEORGE S. MOORE,
President, First National City Bank,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MOORE: Your July newsletter, which you devoted primarily to an attack on the Great Society farm program, has confused consumers, farmers, economists, and the public alike, each for different reasons.

The consumer, viewing your alarm in predicting as much as a 2-cent increase in the price of bread if the Great Society wheat certificate proposal is enacted, is struck by your sudden great sympathy for him. What has brought about this new overwhelming concern for the consumer? The price of bread in the past 18 years has increased by two-thirds, climbing 8 cents a loaf, yet you have raised no objection. Eighteen years ago the farmer was getting 2.7 cents for the wheat in a 1-pound loaf of bread, and consumers were paying about 13 cents for the loaf. Today the farmer is getting the same 2.7 cents for the wheat, and consumers are paying 21 cents for that loaf of bread. So long as the farmer got no increase, you apparently felt no concern for the consumer.

The farmer is asking himself why are you trying to block any consideration for his needs. Does it mean that a bread price increase has your approval if the farmer does not get any part of it, but invites your attack if he is helped? He can only hope that not many other big, powerful financial institutions hold such attitudes.

The wheat certificate program means that the farmer would get 3.4 cents rather than only the 2.7 cents or less than he has received over the last 18 years for the wheat in a loaf of bread. The farmer knows this is very little to cover the increased costs he must pay like everyone else, and he believes the consumer will understand his needs.

The farmer is also puzzled by the assertion in your newsletter that the wheat farmer is well to do. A typical wheat farm in Kansas, for example, which depends on wheat for the primary source of income, provides the farm family a modest income at best.

Last year under the wheat certificate program enacted in 1964, a typical wheat farm netted about \$4,200. If there had been no certificate program, the farm family would have netted less than \$2,000. This farmer has an investment of at least \$80,000. We estimate that the proposed program would increase the net return to about \$4,800 a year—perhaps about as much as you pay a typist.

Would your bank, for example, be willing to loan a farmer the credit he needs to carry out his farming operation if you knew his net return would be less than \$2,000? I doubt if it would, yet you seem to want to put the farmer in the position of reducing both his profits and his chances to obtain the credit he needs.

Your newsletter certainly must puzzle the agricultural economist just as it amuses the consumer and frightens the farmer. You ought to make it clear when you are "playing politics," and when you are making a serious economic analysis. Your July letter is sheer economic nonsense. You made the same alarmist predictions a year ago when the current certificate plan was enacted, and a year's experience has disproved every one of them.

In the first full year of operation with the wheat certificate program, bread prices have remained virtually the same as before the certificate program went into effect. In addition, profits earned by wheat users have increased, the cost of operating the program

was \$300 million less than in the previous fiscal year, and farmers earned \$450 million more than would otherwise have been possible. The program also means that wheat will move at competitive market prices domestically and in world trade—a procedure you have long advocated but now totally ignore.

Finally, your assertion that the agricultural programs are inconsistent with the other Great Society programs of this administration, particularly the excise tax reduction and the poverty program, is a clever play on words, but it doesn't stand up under more than a passing glance. In the first place, there is no bread tax. Instead, the farmer will receive seven-tenths of a cent more for the wheat in a loaf of bread—his first raise in 18 years.

Instead of hindering the poverty program, as you claim, the new wheat program will make more funds available for Great Society programs like the food stamp plan which improves the diet of low-income families by boosting their food budget a third on the average.

I read your letter carefully and profit from it. Won't you please return to serious, carefully thoughtout articles and get out of "farm politics." Both the bank and the Nation will be better off.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Results After 14 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, 14 months ago—on May 15, 1964—while I was its chairman, the House Republican task force on NATO unity wrote to President Johnson and asked to meet with the President at his convenience to discuss the possibility of a blue ribbon commission which we urged to study the causes of disarray within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to work for strengthening of NATO, politically and economically, as well as militarily. Although the President did not meet with the task force, I believe that the sentiment of the task force was expressed in the final paragraph of the letter, which said:

Our committee consists entirely of Republicans, but we view this as a responsibility and opportunity which calls for full bipartisanship. We therefore offer our fullest cooperation and would like to meet with you at your convenience.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican task force on NATO unity, under the able leadership of its new chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLER] has continued to work toward two objectives during the 14 months that have passed since we sent the letter to the President.

First, the task force has sought information that might be useful in healing the disarray within NATO. For instance, a most significant contribution was made only a few weeks ago when a task force delegation under leadership of the chair-

man visited France and learned at firsthand some of the views of the French toward the alliance, as well as some of the strengths and weaknesses of the organization itself.

Second, the task force has continued to seek bipartisanship in approaching the problems of strengthening the Atlantic Alliance, for it recognizes that the strength and cohesiveness of the Atlantic Community is a matter of statesmanship vital to the future of the world.

Thus, you may imagine the pleasure of the task force over an action taken yesterday in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and five of his colleagues. These six Senators introduced a resolution calling for a "Special Governmental Commission" to study the disarray in NATO and to work toward strengthening of the alliance.

Mr. Speaker, the Special Governmental Commission suggested in the Senate resolution is identical to the blue ribbon commission suggested on May 16, 1964, by the House Republican task force on NATO unity.

The six Senators who introduced the Senate resolution represent both the Republican and Democratic Parties, since three are Democrats and three are Republicans, lending bipartisan support to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the goals, method, and bipartisanship of the resolution introduced yesterday in the other body are so identical to the proposal made by the House Republican task force on NATO unity 14 months ago, that I am introducing an identical resolution today in the House. It is my hope that it will receive the same bipartisan support that was accorded it in the Senate.

Correction of NATO disarray and its broad-based strengthening along political, economic, and military lines is vital to the future of the world. It is becoming increasingly vital, while the time for action grows short. As Senator CHURCH said in the other body yesterday:

Today, those who make our foreign policy are confronted with challenge and hostility on many fronts. Our increasing military involvement in Vietnam poses problems for our policy in Asia. Revolution in the Caribbean and the consequent intervention of U.S. troops, has complicated U.S. foreign policy in Latin America. Much of Africa is in a state of flux, including the volatile Congo. Ferment unsettles the Middle East.

In the midst of this turbulence, like a solid rock against a seething sea, stands a concert of genuinely free countries, whose stability is certain. I am speaking, of course, about the nations of the North Atlantic.

The formation of the alliance between the United States and the countries of Western Europe is the great success story in American foreign relations since the Second World War.

Mr. Speaker, as Senator CHURCH goes on to point out, we have been sidetracked in recent years from the job of developing the Atlantic Alliance, which has stood "like a solid rock against a seething sea" of world disorder. As the task force has often pointed out, the United States has frequently embarked on a unilateral course, without consultation with our allies. While we have ex-

pressed interest in the military strength of NATO, we have done nothing to develop the economic and political cohesiveness of the Atlantic Alliance. Yet, there are fundamental economic and political problems which, unless resolved, have tended and will increasingly tend to weaken the military aspects of the alliance.

This weakening must be avoided and the alliance must be strengthened if it is to continue to stand as a bastion against Communist subversion, propaganda and military aggression.

Amid increasing signs of disarray, time is running out. The current NATO Charter expires in 1969. France complains that she has not been given an adequate voice in the affairs of NATO. The United States continues on a frequently unilateral course. The European Common Market, a child of the NATO establishment, has encountered difficulties. Yet little has been done to implement the provision of title II of the NATO Charter, which calls for the political and economic development of the alliance.

It is not difficult to conceive that many of the problems faced within the alliance could be solved by a top-level special governmental commission dedicated to the task. That is why its establishment is important and why I call today for bipartisan support of the resolution which would help implement its establishment.

For the Members of the House to support this resolution is simply to fulfill the pledges of the 1964 national platforms of the respective parties.

The 1964 Republican Convention adopted a plank which says:

It is a keystone of Republican foreign policy to revitalize the alliance.

To hasten its restoration, Republican leadership will move immediately to establish an international commission, comprised of individuals of high competence in NATO affairs, whether in or out of Government, to explore and recommend effective new ways to strengthen alliance participation and fulfillment.

Mr. Speaker, the 1964 Democratic platform reads:

We believe in increased partnership with our friends and associates in the community which spans the North Atlantic. In every possible way we will work to strengthen our ties and increase our cooperation, building always more firmly on the sure foundation of the NATO treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the full support of the House for the following resolution:

Whereas freedom, enduring peace with justice, and enhanced prosperity require the progressive development of greater unity in the free world; and

Whereas the interests of the United States require the development of greater unity of other free nations with it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the policy of the United States should be to achieve such unity with other nations as will best serve to safeguard the individual freedom and national values of our various peoples, and, at the same time, enable us to deal effectively with those problems with which no nation, today, can deal effectively alone, and that the President be advised of the sense of the House, that this Govern-

ment, by constitutional means, should particularly pursue the following objectives:

1. Development, by exploration and agreement with our allies, of an Atlantic Community adequate to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era.

2. Such a community to be composed of nations which share our basic ideals of freedom, democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law and as are willing to accept the benefits and responsibilities of close political, military, and economic ties.

3. Such a community to be conceived and developed in the interest not only of its own peoples, but of all free peoples and to be open to the admission of others as and when their governments become willing and able to assume the benefits and responsibilities of membership.

To this end it is the sense of the House that the President should promptly seek to establish a Special Government Commission composed, in the first instance, of representatives of NATO nations to study and recommend concrete steps toward the attainment of the foregoing objectives.

One Man, One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] speaks, most of us in Congress are accustomed to listening. For when he speaks—or writes—he always has something important to say.

Senator DOUGLAS' article in the July 1965, issue of the UAW Solidarity is no exception. In the article, "The Struggle Is On To Save Your Vote," the Senator argues very persuasively the case for apportioning both houses of State legislatures on the basis of population.

In view of the timeliness and importance of Senator DOUGLAS' article, I believe all Members of Congress ought to have the opportunity to read it. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE STRUGGLE IS ON TO SAVE YOUR VOTE
(By Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois)

The Senate of the United States has just passed the Voting Rights Act to protect each citizen in the exercise of his right to vote.

It is ironic that only a few weeks later the Senate will be asked to pass a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would take away each citizen's right to have his vote count equally with that of other citizens.

It is particularly unfortunate that some Members of Congress who have supported the right to vote are sponsors or supporters of the proposed constitutional amendments which would arbitrarily take away the right to a meaningful and equal vote.

Now pending in both the Senate and the House (but with committee and floor action expected to occur first in the Senate) are amendments which, if supported by a two-thirds vote in each House of the Congress

and ratified by three-fourths of the States, would permit a State to apportion the representation in one house of its State legislature on "factors other than population"—provided this is somehow submitted to a vote of the people of the State.

These amendments would, and are intended to, repeal the Supreme Court decisions of only a year ago.

In a number of cases, the Court held that the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution requires the apportionment of both houses of a State legislature substantially on the basis of population. The Court also ruled that no referendum or majority vote of the people of the State can deny to each citizen this basic individual right to have his vote count equally with that of other citizens in electing his State legislature.

In its decision, the Supreme Court was upholding a basic principle of representative democracy which has been a foundation of our Republic from the beginning. Unfortunately, this principle has increasingly been abused in the past 70 years by legislators in nearly every State, with the support of certain interests who benefit by having an unrepresentative or minority-controlled State legislature.

It was the persistent refusal of the State legislatures themselves to reapportion, often in open defiance of their own State constitutions, and the refusal of State courts to enforce their constitutions, that finally caused the Supreme Court to respond to the pleas of citizens who claimed that they were underrepresented and to enforce this basic principle of American government.

Through most of the 19th century, while the United States remained primarily an agricultural and rural country, equality of representation in the State legislatures was observed in most States in both houses of the legislatures.

But in the late 19th century, an ever-larger percentage of the people came to reside in cities. As the population of the Nation shifted to the cities and suburbs, the State legislatures increasingly began to ignore their duty to reapportion because the legislators from the rural and relatively less populated areas did not want to give up their control of the State legislatures.

The result of this by 1960—when nearly 70 percent of the American people were living in cities and their suburbs—was extreme malapportionment of the legislature in nearly every State of the Union.

In Michigan before its recent reapportionment, for example, it took in 1960 only 34,000 persons in the smallest district to elect a representative for the lower house, while it took 135,268 in the largest district.

In other words, one person in the smallest district had four times the representation which was had by one person in the larger district.

And for the Michigan senate, a person in the smallest district had 12.4 times the representation as did the person in the largest district.

In Illinois, a minority of only 29 percent of the people could elect representatives to the State senate having a majority of the votes. This situation was repeated in State after State with as few as 8 or 10 percent of the people electing a majority of the votes in a house of the legislature.

And often a small minority controlled not only one house but both houses.

As a result of the Supreme Court decisions, a number of States have already reapportioned one or both houses of their legislatures. Perhaps as many as 18 States have now reapportioned in a satisfactory manner.

But at the beginning of this year, the figures showed that for the lower houses

there were still two States in which less than 20 percent could elect a majority of the chamber and 17 States in which from 20 to 40 percent of the people could elect a majority of the lower house. With respect to the upper houses, there were about 10 States in which less than 20 percent could elect a majority and 13 States in which between 20 and 40 percent could elect a majority.

There probably are still more than 30 upper houses and lower houses in which a majority of the representatives is elected by less than 45 percent of the people.

The proposed constitutional amendments now before Congress have been properly labeled the "rotten borough amendments," because they seek to preserve the representation in the State legislatures of wealth, land, possessions, or other interests besides people, just as did the infamous rotten boroughs of early 19th century England which sent representatives to the Parliament even though they had very few people or no population whatsoever.

These amendments, however, appear deceptively attractive. One of the chief deceptive arguments is that it is proper that "other factors" be represented in just one house of a bicameral (two-house) legislature when the other house represents people. While there are many other dangers in these proposals, I think that the practical effect of what could happen under the amendments is frequently not understood and I want to emphasize what this practical effect would be.

Because legislation and appropriations must be passed on by both houses of a two-house legislature, we must not fail to realize that however well apportioned one house may be, if the second house is not representative of the people, it permits a minority, in effect, to have a veto over the entire State government.

The evidence on this could not be more clear. Last year, August Scholle, president of the Michigan State AFL-CIO, documented this fact before the House Judiciary Committee. He gave many illustrations from the experience of Michigan, prior to its reapportionment, of what happens when a minority of the people not sympathetic to the problems of the cities and suburbs, controls one house. For example:

A bill to provide free polio shots for needy children was blocked by State senators representing 2.8 million people despite the fact that senators representing 3.2 million voted for it.

A bill to provide an unemployment insurance increase of \$3 was killed by senators representing only 2.4 million people despite support for the bill by senators representing 3.5 million.

Workmen's compensation amendments were killed by senators for 2.9 million people despite support for them by senators for 3.5 million people.

The addition of several hundred desperately needed mental health beds was blocked by senators for 2.8 million people despite the support for this legislation by senators representing 3.1 million people.

A bill to help small business by letting development credit corporations secure the benefits provided by the Federal Small Business Investment Act was killed by Senators for 2.6 million people despite support for the bill from Senators representing 3.6 million people.

A bill to exempt food and medicine from the 4-percent sales tax in order to help retirees and others with fixed incomes was killed by Senators representing 3.3 million people despite the fact that Senators representing 5 million people voted for it.

In my own State of Illinois, where the malapportioned State senate permits 29 percent of the population to elect a majority

of the members of the senate, we have the same problem each session. The Illinois House, which in recent years was more fairly apportioned and for this session is elected at large, passes needed legislation on labor, welfare and city home rule matters, but the malapportioned senate, in effect, vetoes them.

This year, for example, the Illinois Senate is watering down or killing a proposed new revenue article to replace our archaic revenue article adopted in 1870, fair housing practices bills, a minimum wage bill, a gun registration bill, and a bill to give the city of Chicago authority to raise sufficient money to conduct its affairs.

Antilabor legislation, such as the so-called right-to-work laws, or the lack of fair labor legislation, is typical of the States with malapportioned legislatures. Most of the States which have right-to-work laws are among the most badly apportioned in the Nation.

It was interesting to note that when the Indiana Legislature was reapportioned fairly, one of its first accomplishments was the repeal of the right-to-work law. But as long as even one house in the other right-to-work States remains under minority control, it is very unlikely that we could get repeal of the State right-to-work law or obtain other fair labor legislation.

And this leads to another interesting point about the practical effect of the rotten borough amendments now pending in the Congress. Because many of the State legislatures are malapportioned, they are unable to deal with the needs of cities and other modern problems. Consequently, the cities and others are forced to ask the Federal Government to do many things the States can and should do.

Those who truly believe in States rights and a stronger Federal system ought to realize that the State governments will continue to remain weak and be bypassed as

long as they are unrepresentative of the people.

Fair apportionment of the State legislatures is the essential requirement of building strong and modern State governments.

As my good friend Pat Greathouse of the UAW recently told the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments: "Minority rule of the States is the surest way to atrophy the remnants of strong State government that still remain."

I hope that the people of the United States will come to understand the full meaning of these insidious rotten borough amendments.

I hope they will let their representatives in the State legislatures and in the Congress of the United States know their opposition to any interference in the great opportunity we now have to achieve fair representation in our State legislatures through the orderly carrying out of the Supreme Court's magnificent decision on behalf of the people.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 1965

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

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

Eternal Spirit, unfolding events in our times bearing on their swift streams the promise of human attainments and discoveries, if rightly grasped and channeled, will transfigure the future into an Eden of health and plenty for all mankind.

Save us, we pray, from being so blind to the dawning glory which gilds our sky as to be bored by routine, of groping with uncertain steps in a world where fewer and fewer rainbows of hope arch the heavens.

May the crashing to earth of outworn things not hide from our expectant eyes the coming of a new era struggling to birth—a fairer earth bright with brotherhood for whose coming we are now privileged to contribute something of the stuff of good will with which the radiant future must be built.

In the dear Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 13, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of

the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 24. An act to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 686. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate; and

S. 1390. An act for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 627. An act to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes; and

S. 893. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rosendo Barahona;

H.R. 1609. An act for the relief of Mrs. An Fu Wang Lee;

H.R. 1638. An act for the relief of Uichi Kayahara;

H.R. 1820. An act for the relief of Winsome Elaine Gordon;

H.R. 1873. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Werner;

H.R. 1942. An act for the relief of Hilda May Eave;

H.R. 2277. An act for the relief of Louis Stephen Edouard St. Laurent;

H.R. 2551. An act for the relief of Branca da Gloria Franco Freitas;

H.R. 2570. An act for the relief of Mul Kim Chen Liang;

H.R. 2695. An act for the relief of Norman McLeod Rlach;

H.R. 2871. An act for the relief of Dorota Zytka;

H.R. 2940. An act for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska);

H.R. 3128. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi;

H.R. 3345. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Meneshian;

H.R. 3505. An act for the relief of Beverly Helen (Smith) Bowers;

H.R. 3900. An act for the relief of Jong Wan Lee;

H.R. 4027. An act for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 4028. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 4029. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 5209. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pavica Labetic;

H.R. 5911. An act for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and Capt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 6902. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eurina O. Richards;

H.R. 7137. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7138. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7233. An act for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7355. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Claude E. Tabor, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7435. An act for the relief of Col. Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7439. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7440. An act for the relief of Col. William W. Thomas and Lt. Col. Norman R. Snyder, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7673. An act for the relief of Yeghsa Ketengjian; and

H.R. 9041. An act to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 559. An act to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes;

S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood;

H.R. 4185. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5246. An act to amend sections 20a and 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.