

## MONTANA

Adele M. Coughlin, Helmsville, Mont., in place of W. C. Coughlin, retired.  
Jean F. Pedersen, Lolo, Mont., in place of L. M. Hughes, resigned.

## NEBRASKA

Robert D. Nealon, Wolbach, Nebr., in place of H. E. Berney, retired.

## NEVADA

Ronald F. Gandolfo, Austin, Nev., in place of M. F. Nurmi, resigned.  
Vivian A. Cranmer, Pahrum, Nev., in place of F. L. Turner, resigned.

## NEW JERSEY

Jeanne L. Tamplin, Hewitt, N.J., in place of M. F. Sando, retired.  
Leon J. Madden, Millington, N.J., in place of Charles Mertz, deceased.  
Clarence P. Kinsley, Pemberton, N.J., in place of B. M. Lippincott, retired.  
Warren T. Moulton, Rahway, N.J., in place of M. F. Gettings, deceased.  
John Kane, Jr., South Plainfield, N.J., in place of J. B. Geary, Jr., retired.  
Leonard F. Errico, Stockton, N.J., in place of W. J. Ledger, retired.

## NEW YORK

Harry H. Emmons, Interlaken, N.Y., in place of J. V. Kellogg, retired.  
Philip J. Dittmeier, Manorville, N.Y., in place of T. J. Jamer, transferred.  
Barbara A. Alkinburgh, Nelliston, N.Y., in place of J. W. Van Alstine, retired.  
Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.  
Louis P. Kriss, West Islip, N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Thelma A. Hovet, Buxton, N. Dak., in place of M. A. Ellingrud, transferred.

## OHIO

Harold W. Kinney, Richmond, Ohio, in place of E. L. Clare, resigned.

## OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Phillips, Gore, Okla., in place of E. E. Johnston, retired.  
Beatrice H. Jones, Porter, Okla., in place of Evah Kirksey, retired.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Ernest E. Roberts, Bechtelsville, Pa., in place of W. S. Scheiry, retired.  
Paul B. Vandevander, Bellwood, Pa., in place of R. M. Dysart, retired.  
Harry P. Snyder, Columbia, Pa., in place of H. P. Shreiner, retired.  
Phares C. Cramer, Conestoga, Pa., in place of E. C. Smith, retired.  
Arthur E. Smith, Crooked Creek, Pa., in place of J. A. Brown, transferred.  
Abram B. Lauver, Dalmatia, Pa., in place of P. L. Tressler, retired.  
Raymond G. Mathews, Doylestown, Pa., in place of F. A. F. Fonash, retired.  
Margery B. Lehman, Duke Center, Pa., in place of C. F. Semelsberger, deceased.  
Richard D. Hetrick, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.  
Charles C. Kerlin, Falls, Pa., in place of C. H. Freas, resigned.  
Walter E. Lucas, Fleming, Pa., in place of F. E. Zahniser, retired.  
Adeline M. Waters, Gifford, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Shelley, deceased.  
Ruth L. Funk, Glenwillard, Pa., in place of G. W. Golden, retired.  
Harvey A. Baddorf, Halifax, Pa., in place of R. R. Kinsinger, retired.  
Walter G. Woolbaugh, Hallstead, Pa., in place of F. E. Chamberlin, retired.  
Hazel I. Suain, Hazel Hurst, Pa., in place of M. J. Suain, retired.  
James J. Kelly, Herminie, Pa., in place of Katherine Diamon, retired.  
Charles L. Gilmore, Lahaska, Pa., in place of E. M. Davis, retired.

William E. Nolan, Lake Ariel, Pa., in place of E. A. Deming, retired.  
Warren B. Stapleton, Lewisburg, Pa., in place of G. L. Johnson, retired.  
Edward B. Henning, Mehoopany, Pa., in place of D. R. Sheehan, retired.  
William F. Farrell, Middleport, Pa., in place of Alexander Bubel, retired.  
Alice H. Bustin, Milan, Pa., in place of A. G. Flood, retired.  
Althea M. Best, Neffs, Pa., in place of L. C. Best, retired.  
Raymond E. Hausman, New Tripoli, Pa., in place of F. D. Weiss, retired.  
James T. Rorke, Northumberland, Pa., in place of Charles Gubin, retired.  
Norma A. Stoudt, Palm, Pa., in place of S. R. Stauffer, transferred.  
Irving E. Rath, Pillow, Pa., in place of C. M. Koppenhaver, resigned.  
Robert L. Clink, Snow Shoe, Pa., in place of J. W. Sullivan, deceased.  
Walter H. Hoffman, Strasburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Johnston, retired.  
Everett A. Holmes, Thompson, Pa., in place of P. W. Walker, retired.  
Walter P. Quintin, Thornton, Pa., in place of Lawson Stinson, resigned.  
William J. Shields, Tidioute, Pa., in place of L. B. Atkin, retired.  
William M. Pickets, Tionesta, Pa., in place of Neil Kunselman, retired.  
Charles W. Plunkett, Turtlepoint, Pa., in place of G. L. Carlson, retired.  
Florence E. Miller, Utica, Pa., in place of H. C. Brandt, retired.  
George P. Kraft, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of C. B. Strickler, resigned.  
Carlton I. Olsen, Youngsville, Pa., in place of W. H. Jones, retired.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Jennie M. Swartz, Baltic, S. Dak., in place of C. R. Dregseth, retired.  
Leonard H. Nelson, Miller, S. Dak., in place of W. A. Hall, retired.

## TENNESSEE

Avos B. Halsell, Moss, Tenn., in place of F. H. Osgatharp, deceased.

## TEXAS

Annie M. Whittle, Barksdale, Tex., in place of Lillie Perkins, retired.  
Robert L. Baldrige, Jr., Clifton, Tex., in place of A. L. Bronstad, retired.  
Cloyce W. Floyd, Dawson, Tex., in place of C. D. Barry, retired.  
Austin Skinner, Ferris, Tex., in place of A. T. McCarron, transferred.  
James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.  
Ramon G. Amaya, San Diego, Tex., in place of Trinidad Solis, removed.  
Oleta B. Coleman, Splendora, Tex., in place of P. W. Davis, retired.  
O. C. Sewell, Jr., Sulphur Springs, Tex., in place of Byron Williams, retired.

## UTAH

G. Vernal Seamons, Hyde Park, Utah, in place of Vernon Perkes, deceased.  
Myrtle H. Davis, Mexican Hat, Utah. Office established March 9, 1957.

## VERMONT

James D. O'Brien, Shelburne, Vt., in place of E. T. Sevee, deceased.

## WEST VIRGINIA

George A. Fahey, Wheeling, W. Va., in place of J. J. Mathison, retired.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2, 1965:

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 6: 10: *As we have therefore opportunity let us do good unto all men.*

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou art daily making us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence and never withholding from us anything that is needful for our blessedness.

Thou art our companion, walking with us when we are lonely; our counselor, guiding us in times of perplexity and confusion; our refuge and strength when the winds are contrary and we encounter trials and tribulations.

Grant that as we are continually receiving so much from Thee may we never be penurious and selfish.

Inspire us with the urge to give ourselves to others and share with them our many blessings.

Make us eager to bear the burdens of the weak; extending the hand of helpfulness to the fallen.

May we speak the words of encouragement to the bruised and brokenhearted who find the struggle of life so very difficult.

Constrain us always to manifest the Master's spirit of consideration and compassion.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3. An act to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region.

## MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 88-354, the Chair appoints as members of the National Commission on Food Marketing the following members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. PURCELL, of Texas; Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska; and Mrs. MAY, of Washington.

## TIPS SHOULD BE COUNTED FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to correct a longstanding injustice in our social security system. My bill will allow those who receive tips and gratuities to consider such compensation as income for social security purposes. I introduced a similar bill in the 87th and the 88th Congresses.

Under present law tips and gratuities must be reported as income for income tax purposes, and the recipient of this compensation is required to pay income tax. But he cannot pay into the social security system. In other words, this money is considered as income for the purpose of income tax but not deemed income for the purpose of social security. As a result of this anomaly, millions of wage earners are denied the benefits of social security to which they are rightfully entitled. By excluding tips and gratuities, the amount of the average monthly wage for millions of Americans is reduced—and this is the figure which determines the amount of the monthly benefit. The amount of tips and gratuities received by employees who regularly receive them is estimated at more than \$1 billion a year. Under the present law this \$1 billion of earned income cannot be counted as income for social security purposes.

The social security system is vital to those who are excluded by this inequity. Because of low wages during their working years they are most likely not to have accumulated savings upon which to retire. Yet they are either not covered at all or, because the major portion of their income cannot be counted for a social security purposes, receive minimum benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this social injustice should have been corrected long ago. We cannot create the Great Society without providing our senior citizens with income sufficient to maintain their dignity.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday I was absent on rollcall No. 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### THE HIGH COST OF LENIENCY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have all been very disturbed over the crime situation, and not just juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the Members of the House a poem which I received on yesterday:

#### THE HIGH COST OF LENIENCY

It is plain to be seen, by those willing to look  
That our modern society favors—the crook.  
Of a juvenile criminal, someone will say:  
"The kid was deficient in vitamin A."

If someone's too lazy to work for a living  
His hard-working neighbors are told: "Be  
forgiving."

If mobs "out of hand" commit riot and  
rascality  
Some one will insist: "'Twas policeman's  
brutality."

And when, in a drunken rage, someone will  
kill,  
Excuse is soon offered: "The poor chap was  
ill."

Assaulters leave victims in horrible shape  
But we are assured, "'Twas a slight case of  
rape."

The foulest of crimes and the worst of abuses  
All seem to be coupled with ample excuses.  
Are we getting so callous we are not  
discriminal  
And see how such attitudes foster the  
criminal?

Will some clever "expert" with mental agility  
Rob every known felon of responsibility?  
We're giving the criminals cause to rejoice  
Because they're unpunished for criminal  
choice.

And criminal acts too well planned and  
malignant  
Since public inertia persists; not indignant  
Disgust and prompt punishment. Stupidly  
lenient  
The yield to temptation to crime is con-  
venient.

Whenever no murmur of protest is heard  
It seems that the criminal has "the last  
word"

And the faith of our fathers—a child's right  
to pray—  
Our God-given right is denied in our day.

No wonder the powers of evil rejoice  
When one is not condemned by his criminal  
choice

And our country's known enemy subtle and  
sly  
Is awake and aware while we sit idly by.

If we will not awaken, it may not be long  
Till the toxin of danger will change to a  
gong.

It's all too apparent, to those who will look  
That society favors the Godless—the crook.

—FLORENCE M. STELLWAGEN.

#### FRANK ELEAZER, CHIEF OF THE UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL HOUSE STAFF

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a long-time friend of the House of Representatives received a signal honor last Thursday. Mr. Frank Eleazer, chief of the United Press International House staff, was high man in a contest for three seats on the standing committee of correspondents, the committee which ad-

ministers the Congressional Press Galleries.

I am sure all Members join me in congratulating Frank Eleazer at this time.

Mr. Eleazer has covered the House for 17 years and has been head of the UPI House staff since 1954. A native of Nashville, Tenn., a graduate of Emory University, and the holder of a master's degree in journalism from Columbia University, he has worked on newspapers in Macon, Ga., and Richmond, Va., before joining the United Press in Atlanta, Ga., in 1943.

The House is fortunate to have correspondents of Frank Eleazer's caliber assigned to report upon our labors. He is known by all Members as a friend, yet an impartial reporter. He has our deep respect, because he is true to his profession.

Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate Mr. Milton R. Berliner, of the Washington Daily News, and Mr. Benjamin R. Cole, of the Indianapolis Star, who along with Mr. Eleazer have been elected to the standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to reiterate and second the statement made by our distinguished majority leader on behalf of our friend who has acted so effectively, so ably, and so objectively. I congratulate Frank, his family, and his friends. He is a real credit to the House and to the press. His example is one that might be followed by objective reporters everywhere.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman. I join with him in the comments he has just made regarding Mr. Frank Eleazer, head of the UP staff here in the House since 1954. He has truly been a reporter who understands the workings of the House, and who is loyal to the House. I should therefore like to join the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to him today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I emphasize and reiterate what the distinguished majority leader has just said, and which has been echoed by others. Frank Eleazer's record as a reporter is outstanding. We on our side have enjoyed working with him in the past and I am sure that that excellent relationship will continue in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I, too, would like to extend my congratulations to Frank Eleazer, not only because he is the expert newspaper man he is, but I think all of

us in the House will appreciate he is also an excellent campaigner.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in tribute and congratulations to Mr. Frank Eleazer, of United Press International, who has just been elected to a seat on the standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. Eleazer is a native of my own home town, Nashville, Tenn., and we are proud to note his achievements here in Washington and the honor bestowed upon him by his colleagues. He is a longtime friend of the House of Representatives, having covered this body for some 17 years. He is a gentleman highly respected for his objective and penetrating reporting of the affairs of this body and a man who demands and receives the highest respect.

My congratulations also to Mr. Milton R. Berliner and Mr. Benjamin R. Cole who have also been elected to the standing committee of correspondents.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the Congress in recognizing the high honor that has been paid Frank Eleazer by his colleagues of the press. Frank has directed the coverage of the House of Representatives for United Press-International since 1954. He was elected last week to a seat on the standing committee of correspondents, which oversees the operation of the congressional press galleries. While, as a new Member of this body, I have had to follow his excellent coverage of the House as an observer rather than a participant, I can point with pride to the fact that he cut some of his journalistic teeth in my Congressional District on the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch. Frank joined the Times-Dispatch before Pearl Harbor and left some time thereafter to serve his country. He did not return to Richmond after the war but we are all proud of the fine work he has done here in bringing to the country the activities of the House with the spirit of a man who loves his work and the fairness and integrity of a man who knows his job.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] and all others desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding Mr. Frank Eleazer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I advise the House that this is the birthday of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, certainly one of the outstanding Members in all the history of the House. I am sure I join all Members in wishing the judge a very happy birthday and many more of them.

#### HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 71)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

The restoration of home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia must no longer be delayed.

Our Federal, State, and local governments rest on the principle of democratic representation—the people elect those who govern them. We cherish the credo declared by our forefathers: No taxation without representation. We know full well that men and women give the most of themselves when they are permitted to attack problems which directly affect them.

Yet the citizens of the District of Columbia, at the very seat of the Government created by our Constitution, have no vote in the government of their city. They are taxed without representation. They are asked to assume the responsibilities of citizenship while denied one of its basic rights. No major capital in the free world is in a comparable condition of disenfranchisement.

The denial of home rule to the District creates serious practical difficulties. The District is the ninth largest city in the United States—more populous than 11 of the States. Its government must handle the same problems which press with increasing urgency on the legislative, executive, and judicial arms of city governments throughout the Nation, and it must perform as well many of the functions of State and county governments. Under the present system these duties fall upon busy Members of the Senate and the House who—in addition to their congressional responsibilities—must serve as State representatives, county supervisors, and city councilmen for Washington.

Self-government for the District would not be an innovation. It is a return to the views of the Founding Fathers and to the practice of the early days of the Nation. James Madison wrote in the *Federalist* that the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital "will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

Such a municipal legislature was established in 1802 under President Jef-

erson. It was strengthened in 1812 under President Madison, and in 1820, under President Monroe, it was enlarged to include an elected mayor.

Had it not been for the tragedy of the Civil War, local government would have continued. In 1871 the people of the District, deep in the problems of the Reconstruction period and urgently needing a program of public works, acquiesced in a change to a territorial form of government under which they lost the right to elect their chief executive. The program of public works was badly executed and the territorial government was soon in virtual bankruptcy. In 1874 Congress withdrew the voting franchise entirely and substituted a commission form of government. The intent was to make the change temporary—a receivership which would be replaced by self-government as soon as the fiscal affairs of the city were on a sound basis. But this "receivership" has now lingered on for 90 years.

There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over the seat of the Government of the United States. The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government.

The District of Columbia Charter Act, which I am transmitting to the Congress today, will relieve the Congress, to the maximum practical extent, of detailed legislative direction of District affairs while retaining essential control in the Congress. The bill—

(1) Creates a representative local government for the District;

(2) Provides a link between the Congress and the local government in the form of an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives; and

(3) Preserves intact the powers of the Congress and the President by—

(a) An express provision that the Congress is in no way deprived of its power to legislate for the District, and may repeal or modify any act of the local council;

(b) A provision for an absolute veto by the President of any act of the local council; and

(c) Provisions for supervision of the fiscal affairs of the District by the General Accounting Office.

Home rule for the District has been unfinished business for far too long a time. Presidents of both parties—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—have urged it. Measures to provide it were passed by the Senate in the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 86th Congresses.

The people of the District are ready and eager to join fully in the democratic process. In the presidential election of 1964, more than 90 percent of the registered voters went to the polls.

I urge the Congress to approve at the earliest possible date the legislation which will grant them the fundamental American right of self-government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 1965.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH INTO SPINAL CORD INJURIES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 203) to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

## H.R. 203

A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1971, the Administrator shall set aside not less than \$100,000 of such appropriated funds for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and other disabilities that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities."*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that funds appropriated for research in the Veterans' Administration shall have set aside in each fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1971, a total of not less than \$100,000 for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases and other diseases that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities.

This bill would accomplish this simple purpose stated in the paragraph above and would not cause any additional appropriation.

Section 216(a)(1) of title 38 specifically directs the Administrator to conduct research in the field of prosthetic appliances, prosthesis, and similar devices. The present research program in the Veterans' Administration directly related to spinal cord research alone approaches twice the amount set forth in this bill. Enactment of this bill will serve

to focus attention on the needs of this particular group and will in no way, in the opinion of the committee, interfere with the research program of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 203. This bill will authorize \$100,000 of the funds appropriated for research in the field of prosthetic appliances, orthopedic appliances and similar devices to be specifically earmarked for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases and other disabilities leading to paralysis of the lower extremities. The bill provides that this authority shall exist for a period of 6 years. The Veterans' Administration indicates that its present research expenditures in this area are now considerably in excess of \$100,000 a year. Enactment of the bill will, therefore, not result in the expenditure of additional funds. Instead, it will make mandatory the expenditures of a specific amount for this worthy purpose. Enactment of this bill will serve to focus attention on the specialized needs of paralyzed veterans. I urge its approval.

## REPEAL OF "MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS" SECTION OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 214) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

## H.R. 214

A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.*

(b) The table of chapters immediately before chapters 1 and 31 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out

"43. Mustering-Out Payments.....2101".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate into one Act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration", approved September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-857), is repealed.

Sec. 2. This Act shall take effect as of July 1, 1965.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, strike out all of line 3.

On page 2, line 4, insert the following:

"(d) The amendments and repeals made by this section shall take effect as of July 1, 1966.

"Sec. 2. Section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting the

following new sentence after the first sentence thereof:

"Notwithstanding the first sentence of this section or section 71a of title 31, a member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment who was discharged or relieved from active service as an officer of an armed force under honorable conditions before July 16, 1952, for the purpose of appointment as a warrant officer or commissioned officer in a regular component of an armed force, shall, if application is made before January 31, 1966, be paid mustering-out payment by the Secretary concerned beginning within one month after application has been received and approved."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to repeal effective July 1, 1966, as obsolete chapter 43, title 38, United States Code, entitled "Mustering-Out Payments."

A Presidential proclamation, effective January 31, 1955, ended the right of any individual for mustering-out payments for service after that date.

Mustering-out payments in varying amounts ranging from \$100 to \$300 have been paid to World War II and Korean conflict veterans, pay grade O-3 or below; that is, a captain in the Army, Air Force, or Marines, a lieutenant senior grade in the Navy or Coast Guard. These payments were made on the basis of assistance to aid the veteran in returning to civilian life.

No additional appropriation will be required as a result of the passage of this legislation.

Similar bills passed the House in the 87th and 88th Congresses but failed to win approval in the other body.

The suggestion of the Department of Defense has been incorporated in the bill and would extend the time for filing for this benefit for approximately 200 beneficiaries to January 31, 1966.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 214, will repeal the obsolete mustering-out pay provisions of existing law effective July 1, 1966. Mustering-out pay was authorized by the Korean GI bill for active service in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, for all ranks up to and including captain.

Like other readjustment programs established by the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, mustering-out payments were intended to aid persons who served during the Korean conflict in the transition to civil life. Consistent with this purpose, it was designated to be a temporary program.

Inasmuch as the program has long since served its purpose, H.R. 214 will repeal the authority to make mustering-out payments. I urge its passage.

#### INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 228

A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) If the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech, or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction, the rate of compensation therefor shall be \$47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) or subsection (s) of this section but in no event to exceed \$340 per month; and in the event the veteran has suffered one or more of the disabilities heretofore specified in this subsection, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by \$47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed \$525 per month;"

SEC. 2. Any increased compensation authorized by the amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective as of the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "of a" and insert "one or more".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "organ" and insert "organs".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, existing law authorizes basic rates of compensation which are paid according to degree of disability. For example, in wartime cases basic rates range from \$20 for a 10-percent disability to \$250 monthly for total disability. In addition, certain statutory awards are authorized for specific disabilities. Among such awards is the payment of an allowance of \$47 per month—in wartime cases—in addition to the basic rate applicable, where the veteran has lost the use of a hand, a foot, both buttocks, an eye, a creative organ, complete organic aphonia, or deafness of both ears. However, unless the veteran has a combination of disabilities for which a specific award of \$340—or higher but not exceeding \$525—is payable, he may receive only one additional allowance of \$47 for the mentioned specific losses even though he may have more than one such loss.

This bill would authorize the payment of the additional allowance for each such loss, in addition to the basic rate of compensation.

The VA estimates that about 500 veterans would benefit from the bill's enactment at a cost of about \$278,000 for each of the first 5 years.

An identical purpose bill was reported by the committee in the 83d Congress and in the 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses passed the House but failed of passage in the Senate.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 228 would authorize the Veterans' Administration to pay a statutory award for each service-connected loss, or loss of use, of a limb.

Under existing law the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay statutory awards in varying amounts for different combinations of anatomical loss or loss of use of extremities, creative organs, buttocks, or eyes. Because of the language of the statute, a group of approximately 500 veterans who have suffered two of these disabilities are paid a statutory award for only one.

For example, the veteran who suffers the loss of an eye or an arm or a leg is entitled to a \$47 monthly award. If he has lost both an arm and leg he is entitled to a statutory award which, in effect, compensates him for each such loss. If he suffered the loss of all three, an arm, a leg and an eye, he would receive a greater statutory award compensating him for this combination of disabilities. If he had the peculiar misfortune to suffer the loss of an eye in combination with an arm or a leg the statutory award would only compensate him for one of these conditions. To further illustrate

this disparity in the law, take the case of three veterans, one having lost an eye, one having lost a leg, and the third having lost an eye and a leg. All three of these veterans would be entitled to the same statutory award of \$47 monthly because of the language contained in the statute. There are approximately 500 veterans affected. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that this disparity in the law can be corrected at an annual cost of \$278,000 for the first 5 years. I believe the bill has merit and urge its passage.

#### INTRODUCTION OF SILVER COINAGE BILL

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I pointed out to Members of the House the need for legislation to immediately change the coinage of the United States. At that time I promised that I would introduce a bill to resolve the threat to our coins, which stems from the fact that their silver content is so high and silver supply so low it will soon be economical to melt them down. After intensive study of the various methods of solving this problem, I have today introduced a bill, which, I believe, will provide the country with an acceptable coinage system, and will allow for the smoothest possible transition to the new system. If this legislation is adopted, the United States will have coins of intrinsic value, no expensive changes will be required in the automatic vending machines and future recurrence of the present problem will be eliminated. In short, we will have coins which we can use, be proud of, and have adequate supplies with which to conduct the business of the country.

The key to the solution, which I propose is the reduction in the silver content of our coins. It specifies that the Secretary of the Treasury may reduce the number of grains in the dollar to 120—there now being 371—and a proportionate reduction in the silver content of the subsidiary coins. The amount of silver content is reduced enough to insure an adequate supply for the foreseeable future and is still high enough to allow the sophisticated rejection devices of our vending machines to function. The new coins will look, sound, and perform like our present coins.

By definition, the reduction of the silver content of the coins will raise the monetary value of silver. The consequent increase in monetary value will free approximately two-thirds of the silver now obligated to the backing of silver certificates. Under my bill, the freed silver may be sold to bona fide domestic users at \$1.29 per ounce, the current world market price of the metal. The reason for this provision is twofold: to prevent the market price of silver rising to the point that it would become

profitable to melt down our present coins, and to give our domestic users sufficient supplies of silver at an economic price through the transition period.

There are no requirements in the legislation which I propose that any particular alloy or method of minting be employed by the U.S. Government. Complete discretion is given to the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the weight, composition, and methods of manufacture of silver coins. Only the minimum standard of silver content is established for the foregoing reasons.

The Treasury Department is now studying the silver coinage crisis. It was to have reported to the Congress yesterday, but it may be 2 months before we have the results of its research. I have tried to work with that Department in these past months, and it is my hope that its recommendations will coincide with mine. At this point, however, it is impossible to say what it will propose as a solution. I believe my proposal answers the questions the Treasury is studying and it is my hope that the Congress will act upon it promptly.

#### A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN MINK

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1965, my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Mrs. PATSY MINK, addressed the Washington chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League on the subject "A Greater Society Through Equality." In great eloquence Congresswoman MINK imparted to those present a statement of individual purpose worthy of espousal by all Americans.

It was with a sense of pride one experiences in seeing a teammate excel in performance, that I listened to her that night. So other Members of this House may share that feeling as a colleague I include her speech in whole in the RECORD at this point:

#### A GREATER SOCIETY THROUGH EQUALITY

(An address by Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK before the Japanese American Citizens League, Washington, D.C., chapter, January 30, 1965)

I am deeply honored by this invitation to speak at your installation dinner. I am happy to have this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the officers who have served so faithfully over the past year, and to convey my best wishes to those whom you have selected to guide you over the year to come. I am especially delighted to be your guest tonight, particularly since it included an invitation to my daughter, Gwendy, to join you here upon your inauguration of a junior chapter of your organization. To all of you young people, I would wish to express my special greetings and it is really in particular to you that I would wish to address my remarks tonight for it is really in regard for you that the high purposes of this organization are directed.

Your chairman has asked me to address myself tonight to the subject of "A Greater Society Through Equality," and to add a few comments on the "Sansel Coming of Age." The 35 years history which this organization has built toward responsible citizenship is the envy of like groups across this Nation. This growth has been torrid at times, and the goals must have seemed insurmountable to many. But your leaders have etched for all of us a record which we all can indeed be proud of. We have made giant strides in our assimilation into the total life and community of this Nation. We have achieved high posts in the business world, in the sciences, in the arts and music, in literature, and in government.

The era of displacement and social seclusion are past, and what is past is prolog. In our own struggles for social and legal equality and justice, we must be cognizant of our other fellow Americans who yet must achieve their rightful places in this Great Society. Those rights which our forebears set forth as inalienable, are still alien to many of our fellow Americans. So long as this is so, we must join in this fight for full equality for all, lest the past for us be repeated again in the lives of our children.

We are in an era of great social changes. The President has challenged this Nation with many programs. Many have direct and deep meaning to all of us as a group. We are about to have a monumental change in our immigration laws, which stands up as the final repudiation of the separation of peoples within this Nation by national origins. Let us join in this repudiation and begin to build a union as one people in this great Nation. None of us will deny that the national quota system presently forming the basis of our immigration program was nothing more than an insidious form of prejudice and bias and as the President stated "totally incompatible with our basic American tradition." The basic philosophy enunciated by the President in his proposal to the Congress should be of deep import and significant to all of us. As we remove the legal recognition of national origins as a legitimate criteria of national policy, we are clearly setting forth the fundamental doctrine of equality of mankind as a whole. It is for us to herald as well as to exemplify this egalitarian way of life. That this amendment will become law I have no serious doubt; that this philosophy will become the working tenet of the peoples of this Nation will be our burden, our responsibility, and our opportunity.

We must rededicate ourselves to this new pursuit. We must find our places in this great movement to give it every possible support and encouragement. We must demonstrate the incompatibility of national origins as a criteria of communal living in America.

Our circumstances have saddled us with preoccupation with ourselves. Social and economic pressures have made us self-oriented. As a group we have molded an image of conservatism and conformity, largely predicated upon our all-encompassing desire for acceptance into the mainstream of America.

Now a new generation of Americans is coming of age. I am confident that they know and appreciate their place in this society and that they will assume greater responsibility in the affairs of our country. That they will participate in the discourse involving basic moral and philosophic questions, I have no doubt. With your guidance and counsel, I know that they will lead the fight for greater equality and justice for all Americans within this country.

Make no mistake though, that my definition of compatibility does not include a renunciation of all our cultural traditions, customs, and mores. Rather I am deeply aware of how easily these great values can be lost to us and our children, if we do not

consciously and actively work to keep them alive. The influence of my own parents and my grandparents has contributed greatly to my overall attitude and philosophy of life. This all-important influence of our cultural heritage and values must be preserved and our children given every benefit which we have derived from it.

Of all the measures our President has proffered for us, that which promises the most toward the accomplishment of this Great Society, is his recommendation in the area of education. While it is only a beginning, it places the resources of this country finally and firmly committed to a broad program of support for the improvement of the educational opportunity of so many of our children who are trying to learn under severe handicaps without special help or attention.

Most of us have seen to it that our children have received the best educational opportunity our communities could afford. We have been able to send our children on to higher educational pursuits. We have committed our personal lives and resources to help our children fulfill their intellectual capacities so that all that awaits them in the horizon of the future is their initiative and perseverance to carry them forward to their full measure of success and happiness.

We are being asked to translate our personal goals for our children into national goals for all the children of America who have been thus far deprived of the full educational opportunity that is so necessary for the building of these lives into productive human resources for this country. The President said in his message on education that—

"Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

And he was merely putting into words a basic fact—that unless those of us who are fortunate, see that others have the same opportunities, we must inevitably regress among the community of nations—and our regression must inevitably pull down with it the efforts of those who hope and work for a united world of peace and security.

Consider that one out of every three persons now in the fifth grade will drop out of high school before finishing. Almost a million young people a year will be doomed to a life of poverty and ignorance unless we reverse this trend.

Consider that more than 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year are unable to go to college because they lack the finances.

Consider that the taxpayers of the Nation—and we proudly number ourselves among them—spend about \$450 a year to keep a child in a public school. But we spend \$1,800 to keep a youngster in a detention home, \$2,500 a year to provide relief for a family poverty stricken for lack of education, and \$3,500 a year to incarcerate a criminal in a State prison.

Consider that, faced with the need for 400,000 new classrooms in the next 5 years, we already handicap our schools with almost half a million classrooms that are more than 30 years old.

And, finally, consider that, if our economic prosperity is to continue, it must be at the price of training more and more people to handle the complex techniques of our modern age, and of retraining those who inevitably will be displaced by automation and mechanization.

All this adds up to a unique challenge in which we may serve. We have for years believed that education has offered us the best route to equality and social justice. And we have proven this to be true for ourselves.

Let us help in this fight to give every child in America at least a chance at happiness and success instead of a life of drudgery, poverty, and despair.

Let us be in the forefront of the battle to improve our educational facilities so that all Americans may benefit.

Let us go out and work. Let us join other civic groups and give to them freely the time and effort they require.

Let us campaign, and talk, and drive—not among ourselves only but among the community at large.

Let us face the conviction that our education and our success are but the stepping stone from which others, less privileged than we, can reach upward to equal opportunity and justice.

Let it never be said that we do not care about what happens to others; that we rest content with our own achievements; that our preoccupation with ourselves sets us apart in any way from the problems of America.

Let us take a leading role in seeing that all Americans, of whatever background, have the education they need to live and work in comfort and dignity; that no child need be penalized because his father is poor or because his home is broken; that no breadwinner must sit idly at home for lack of training or skill.

And, from that effort, let us launch ourselves into the endeavors of a truly great society demands of its beneficiaries.

As I have said earlier, we are in the midst of a massive liberal movement in this country. Democracy is not a static thing. It is an ever-changing concept, that requires the best thought and most energetic efforts of all its people.

Democracy demands a citizenry willing to debate its issues, to form a consensus that benefits all, then to work toward its fulfillment.

The Civil Rights Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the education measures passed by the last Congress, and the new measures now recommended by the President are all landmarks in this Nation's struggle for excellence and humanism.

It is our sacred duty as Americans to take part in this struggle. We owe it to our country with as much urgency as we owe military service or obedience to its laws.

We have much to offer. We have education and time and willing hearts. We have the firsthand knowledge of how the opening of the fountains of education to us all have given us a life of happiness and security.

This, then, is our great opportunity. We can take the theme, "A Greater Society Through Equality," and make it a rallying cry for our determination to help all the underprivileged of this Nation gain their rightful places in their communities.

We can show the world once again that Americanism is a humane and sensitive way of life—that Americans of all backgrounds are not only willing and determined to fulfill their duties and responsibilities but outspoken in their drive to perfect our society for all.

We, each of us, and I particularly, have benefited greatly from membership in collective entities, whether it be this organization, or the local PTA, or a labor union, or in a government body; but let us also realize that collective membership in no wise was ever intended to supplant the individual responsibility each of us has to express our own ideas, to communicate, to evaluate, and to render personal decisions on matters of collective importance.

All the measures that we are working for, whether they be in education, or job opportunity, are designed to elevate the individual in his own evaluation of himself. It is the recognition of the dignity of each individual's mind and being, that is at the heart of all our efforts to render him able to fulfill his

capacities whatever they might be, great or small.

I do not believe that men can all be equal; some will be more talented than others; some will have greater skills than others; but while recognizing the innate differences with which we are endowed, we must work for the development of our institutions in America which will give each and every person the opportunity to achieve to the maximum of his individual capacities. Equality of opportunity in education is what I seek; equality in job opportunity is what I seek; for if the opportunity can be equal, then the vast differences of human mind and will, will generate for us that Great Society where the individual is contributing the most to his own happiness and to the ultimate good of this Nation. May these high goals of our President become our own personal goals.

I thank you for your kindness and for being such a good audience to my brief thoughts.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE PRESENT WHEAT LAW

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Senators MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota; KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota; FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, and GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, in introducing legislation to amend the present wheat law.

This is, of course, extremely important to North Dakota, which derives more of its income from the sale of wheat than any other State in the Nation. But it is equally important to all Americans, since agriculture is in a tough financial situation today. And agriculture is a business whose overall activity amounts to close to \$50 billion a year.

Too many of our city friends fail to realize the great stake they have in the prosperity of the American farmer. Three out of ten persons employed in private industry look to the farm for their income, and illness in this segment of our economy can be a contagious thing indeed.

Our bill provides for the American farmer to get full parity, an American price, for that wheat he produces for other Americans, and this is only fair and reasonable since after all his costs of production are American costs and he is one of the best customers of American industry.

Because half of our wheat must be exported and increased exports of life-giving food could well be the greatest benefit to our foreign policy, the amount of wheat going into export would be priced competitively and its value would be established in the marketplace. This would help our Nation more aggressively regain export markets we so sorely need.

Our bill is a much less complicated bill than the present bill. It removes some of the discretionary powers of the Secretary of Agriculture which have

been so confusing to the American farmer.

I am including in my remarks a short explanation of the bill, as well as a more detailed point-by-point explanation for the interest of my colleagues.

#### EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

1. Repeal existing provisions for marketing quotas;

2. Make permanent the provision for a minimum national acreage allotment of 49,500,000 acres;

3. Provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption, and not less than the higher of (1) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price, or (2) 50 percent of parity, for all other wheat;

4. Repeal provisions for acreage penalties for overplanting or underplanting allotments;

5. Require the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms to equal 1 million acres;

6. Permit producers of excess wheat to store their excess and qualify for marketing certificates and price support;

7. Permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted;

8. Permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation;

9. Repeal the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat;

10. Extend the wheat diversion payment program permanently with a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the non-certificate support price multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted.

Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the national acreage allotment would be the larger of 49,500,000 acres, or the acreage needed to meet the production objective, which could not be less than 1 billion bushels. It would be apportioned among States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that no loss of history would result from the overplanting or underplanting of allotments. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for all certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity for domestic certificate wheat and zero to 90 percent of parity for export certificate wheat. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the noncertificate price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1966 and subsequent crops.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

REPEAL OF MARKETING QUOTA AUTHORITY—EXTENSION OF 49.5-MILLION-ACRE MINIMUM ALLOTMENT

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas, and continues in effect the minimum national acreage allotment of 49.5 million acres.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective

each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota, and the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law, except that, in addition to the 1 billion bushel minimum provided by existing law, this subsection would continue the 49.5-million-acre minimum which existing law makes applicable to 1965 only. The national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as provided by existing law, except that section 2 of the bill would prevent any history loss by reason of underplanting or overplanting in the same manner that the Agricultural Act of 1964 prevented such loss in 1965, and section 3 of the bill would provide a fixed acreage of 1 million acres for the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by the 1964 act. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively, with rice marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (c) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

#### ACREAGE PENALTY REPEAL

Section 2 makes permanent those provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1964 which prevented any loss of State, county, or farm acreage history in 1965 as a result of overplanting or underplanting allotments.

Subsection (a) prevents such loss of history in the case of the State allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (a) was added by section 202(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (b) prevents such loss of history in the case of the county allotment. The proviso to be amended by subsection (b) was added by section 202(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (c) prevents such loss of history at the farm level in the same manner as was provided for 1965 by section 202(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1964.

Subsection (d) complements subsections (a) and (b) by making changes in section 334(g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 necessary to assure that States and counties do not lose history as a result of the overplanting of farm allotments.

#### MILLION ACRE SPECIAL ACREAGE RESERVE

Section 3 provides that the special acreage reserve for old wheat farms created by section 202(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 shall be 1 million acres. At present the reserve may be set at any figure up to 1 million acres that the Secretary determines desirable.

#### FULL PARITY FOR WHEAT FOR DOMESTIC FOOD CONSUMPTION

Section 4 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption, and puts a floor under the support level for other wheat equal to the higher of (1) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price or (2) 50 percent of parity.

Subsection (a) repeals the existing provisions for support of domestic certificate

wheat at 65 to 90 percent of parity and export certificate wheat at 0 to 90 percent of parity; and provides instead for a single support level for all certificate wheat at full parity. Subsection (a) puts a floor under the support level for noncertificate wheat equal to the higher of (1) the farm price equivalent of the previous 3-year average world market price or (2) 50 percent of parity. Subsection (a) also repeals those provisions of the price support law which are related to the marketing quota provisions repealed by section 1 of the bill. In addition subsection (a) preserves the eligibility for wheat price support of producers who exceed their allotments, but store their excess wheat as permitted under section 5 of the bill.

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided). Section 202(10) of the Agricultural Act of 1964 provided for the 1964 and 1965 crops for an adjustment in the computation of the national allocation percentage which was designed to result in issuance to the farmers who complied with the program of certificates to cover the entire wheat marketing allocation. Subsection (b) of the bill would make this provision permanent.

Subsection (c) strikes out the last sentence of section 379c(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which was added by the Agricultural Act of 1964 and provides for two kinds of certificates, domestic and export. By striking this sentence, subsection (b) provides for only one type of certificate. (The other reference in section 379c(a) to two types of certificates is deleted by an amendment made by section 5(a) of the bill.)

Subsection (d) amends the provision of section 379c(c) fixing the face values for domestic and export certificates to provide for fixing a face value for a single type of certificate.

#### CERTIFICATES FOR PRIOR CROP WHEAT IF CURRENT CROP UNDERPLANTED—STORAGE OF EXCESS WHEAT

Section 5(a) would permit marketing certificates to be issued in the full normal amount when the producer reduces his acreage in order to market uncertificated wheat on hand stored in bond from prior crops. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop under section 379cb, or to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any uncertificated wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Subsection (b) of section 5 extends to 1966 and subsequent years the provisions enacted for the 1965 crop by section 202(13) of the Agricultural Act of 1964, which permit a producer who exceeds his allotment by not more than 50 percent to store his excess wheat and remain eligible for marketing certificates. Producers who store their excess in accordance with this provision also maintain eligibility for wheat price support under the provisions of section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Subsection (b) in extending this provision would strike from it provisions relating to storage to avoid marketing penalties, which

would have no meaning after repeal by the bill of provisions for marketing quotas.

#### AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF CERTIFICATES BY PROCESSORS—CERTIFICATES NOT REQUIRED ON EXPORTS

Section 6 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

#### REPEAL OF MONETARY PENALTIES FOR PRODUCTION ON DIVERTED ACRES

Section 7 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage. The Agricultural Act of 1964 made similar provision with respect to the 1964 and 1965 crops.

#### EXTENSION OF WHEAT ACREAGE DIVERSION PAYMENT PROGRAM

Section 8 extends the wheat acreage diversion payment program permanently and provides for a mandatory payment rate equal to 50 percent of the noncertificate support price times the normal production of the acreage diverted from wheat. The existing provision, which terminates with the 1965 crop, is discretionary on the part of the Secretary; and the amount of the payment, within the specified maximum, is also discretionary. Beginning with the 1966 crop the Secretary would be required to formulate and carry out a program providing payments on acreage diverted from wheat by reason of the reduction of the national acreage allotment below 55 million acres, and the payment rate would be fixed by law at 50 percent of the noncertificate support rate multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted. The Secretary could permit diversion of up to an additional 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment at the same payment rate.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 9 would make the bill effective with the 1966 crop. If allotments were established for the 1966 crop before passage of the bill, they would be effective without further action.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which makes important improvements in our social security system.

I believe the 7-percent increase proposed by my bill is justified at this time in recognition of the increased cost of living and other changes in the economy that have taken place since the last general increase enacted in 1958. This in-



crease in benefits should permit the beneficiaries of the program to enjoy minimum standards of health and comfort.

The bill would also provide benefits for dependents in school up to the age of 22 instead of the present cutoff age of 18. This provision should give to children who have suffered a loss of parental support the opportunity to complete their education.

Another important amendment would allow widows to retire at age 60, rather than at 62 as in existing law, provided they decide to accept an actuarially reduced benefit to take account of the longer period over which they will be paid.

Even with the passage of the proposed 7-percent increase in benefits, many elderly persons who are able to perform useful work to supplement their social security payments will be precluded from doing so under the present \$1,200 limitation on outside earned income. Therefore, I have included a provision which raises the amount of outside earnings a social security recipient can receive without penalty to \$3,000.

Finally, in fairness to those persons 70 years or older who were unable to acquire the necessary quarters of coverage, my bill would liberalize the eligibility requirements so that they could qualify for minimum benefits.

I am hopeful that early and favorable action will be taken to make these reasonable adjustments in the social security program.

#### NEEDED HOSPITALS FOR OUR NATION'S VETERANS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has acted hastily and, in my opinion, unwisely in closing 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals and 4 domiciliaries. This action will eliminate approximately 6,000 beds and force many more veterans with serious medical conditions to travel long distances and undergo unnecessary separations from their loved ones.

I have introduced today a resolution expressing the sense of the House against the closing of these hospitals at least until the House Veterans' Affairs Committee holds hearings to determine whether these closings are necessary and in the best interest of the Nation.

The hospitals should not be closed solely as the result of administrative action. Congressmen and the various veterans' organizations should have the opportunity to voice their concern and present pertinent facts that argue against this action. Our veterans who gave up so much in the service of our country deserve a fair hearing.

Statistics show that the veterans' population is growing older. With advancing age medical problems increase and the need for hospital care and services grows.

Is the Veterans' Administration wise to insist on these closings when it is estimated that we will need more hospitals in the future? I think not. It smacks of penny wisdom and pound foolishness by the Veterans' Administration to close these hospitals; at the same time funds are requested to build new hospitals.

And, new hospitals are needed. This is indeed part of the argument for retaining those hospitals now in existence. If the Bath, N.Y., VA hospital is closed, there will be an even greater need for a new hospital in Rochester, N.Y. Rochester is a city which fulfills all the VA qualifications for a new hospital site. It is a world-famous medical center, with a large veteran population which the VA hospitals in the surrounding area are unable to serve. Last year more than 700 veterans from Rochester were transported to VA hospitals in other parts of the State for emergency medical attention. This is unfortunate. Anyone who has had to travel long distances when in need of prompt medical attention knows how terrible such trips can be. We owe our veterans' population decent hospitals, at a reasonable and safe distance from their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this nonpartisan resolution. Whatever the final outcome of the hearings, it is imperative that those who question these closings—and they are many—be given a chance to state their cases. The closing of 11 VA hospitals will have serious effects, both on communities and on many veterans. It is not a step to be taken hastily and without proper congressional consultation.

#### PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there have been quite a diversity of events concerning the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the country.

I noticed in the Washington Post this morning an article which states:

NEW VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL TO OPEN MAY 1

The new Washington veterans' hospital will replace the old Mount Alto hospital to consolidate its outpatient treatment, and is expected to open May 1.

The article goes on to say that this hospital cost \$17.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that I approve of good medical care being given to the veterans of the Washington metropolitan area.

I also believe that the veterans in the rural areas of western New Mexico and western Texas, as well as southeastern Arizona, are entitled to equal treatment.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I have appointed an independent medical board of doctors in New Mexico, chaired by the dean of the University of New

Mexico Medical School, to make an independent evaluation of the medical facilities at Fort Baird, N. Mex. They are there today. But a strange thing occurred yesterday. They have apparently been asked to delay their visit. I hope that the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee will give an early hearing to those of us who wish to testify before his committee on the proposed closing of these VA hospitals in the United States.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New Mexico, I would like the House to know that as soon as possible the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold complete and thorough hearings. The veterans' organizations are on notice to get ready. We have contacted all members of the House and many have indicated a desire to be heard. There will be no one here during the 9th to the 14th period. I would expect by the 17th or 18th our committee will be ready to hold hearings.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's concern about this matter. I also feel that he is a great, a fine Congressman, and his statement, I hope, will prove to be true.

#### PROF. ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Alexander Meiklejohn was a friend and constituent, although it was not my privilege to know him until the autumn of his rich and creative life when he first moved to Berkeley.

Ordinary men in their eighties would have settled down quietly and made the most of retirement in a great university community. But Professor Meiklejohn was no ordinary man.

It was not at all an unusual sight for Berkeleyans to see Alex with his beloved wife Helen tramping the hills surrounding Greenwood Common. These near daily walks were soon considered commonplace. To the utter astonishment of his younger and middle-aged, poorly conditioned, friends, he played a lively set of tennis.

Most important, his writing and his speaking in the cause of justice and human freedom continued until the very end.

It was a high honor to know Professor Meiklejohn as a neighbor and a friend. I shall always cherish the memory of his wise counsel. The values he taught will always be remembered and revered.

On January 15, at a special memorial service in Washington, D.C., several former students and dear friends of this great man paid him tribute. Under permission granted, I include the statements of these noted men—Associate

Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Black; Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Wilbur Cohen; former U.S. Ambassador to NATO, W. Randolph Burgess; author and journalist, Alan Barth; associate secretary of the American Association of University Professors, Louis Joughin; president of Amherst College, Calvin H. Plimpton; member of the faculty of St. John's College, Jacob Klein; and former member of the faculty, the Experimental College of the University of Wisconsin, D. S. Otis—in the RECORD as a further and fitting remembrance of an outstanding American.

REMARKS BY MR. JUSTICE BLACK, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should say at once that I am not here to make a formal speech but to pay my tribute along with yours to a great man and his works. You can understand, I am sure, how much I appreciated the invitation to be with you when I tell you that so far as I can recall this is the first time I have ever left one of our regular weekly conferences to go to some other meeting in the 27½ years I have been a member of the Supreme Court. I could not resist your invitation, however. This is not because I was fortunate enough, like many of you here, to have been a student of Dr. Meiklejohn. I was not that fortunate. It was not even because I was privileged to have enjoyed a long and intimate association and friendship with him, for this was not my privilege. In fact, I saw and talked with him comparatively few times during the years I learned to respect and admire him so much. I do remember and have the fondest recollections of one memorable evening with him in my home when you who were his students would expect, he led me to discuss with him not so much our agreements as our disagreements. Not knowing his teaching methods I endeavored first to emphasize our agreements with one another. I found out very quickly, however, that he preferred first to discuss our disagreements, and it was not long before I discovered why he had this preference. In discussing and analyzing our differences, it soon developed that they were not very many and that in truth we cherished the same basic beliefs in reference to one subject which long had been a near and dear one to both of us throughout the years. This subject was the meaning of a few words in the first amendment which are: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Several books containing writings and lectures by Dr. Meiklejohn were sent out to my home day before yesterday when I returned from several weeks spent in Florida. Once again I discovered that the great ideals of liberty that I find in the first amendment were also cherished by him. While he and I did not see eye to eye as to the exact scope of the absolute terms used in that amendment, we did fully agree that a country dedicated to freedom as ours is, must leave political thoughts, expressions, and discussions open to the people if it hopes to maintain that freedom. Dr. Meiklejohn and I joined in another belief—and I cannot say much more in my 3 minutes. Neither he nor I opposed full freedom to fully discuss both sides of any public question, no matter how unpopular one side may be. We agreed that where a belief can be argued against, there likewise must be freedom to argue for it.

I am here today to express my appreciation, my admiration, and indeed my affection for a man who fought so valiantly—so gently in language but so firmly in conviction for his belief that if this country is to remain free, the minds, the tongues, and the pens of people must not be shackled.

I was impressed in reading one of the biographical sketches of Dr. Meiklejohn that wherever he went from his youth on, his challenge of the orthodox and the conventional frequently brought about heated arguments and passionate criticism of his ideas. Always he met these criticisms with calm reasoning and steadfast loyalty to principles of freedom in which he believed. His books, his writings, his discussions have done much through the years to bring about a better understanding of him and of his ideals. His work and his words have inspired countless people to love their country more and have done much to abate the fears of some that it is dangerous to preserve and to protect freedoms of speech and press guaranteed by the first amendment.

Dr. Meiklejohn, I think, agreed with the idea that I certainly have, that those who love this country should not be afraid of what people may hear or of what they may say about public affairs. Fear is bad enough in any field but in none is it more dangerous than in the area of freedom of expression.

Dr. Meiklejohn left us at an advanced age but his memory and his works live on to comfort and inspire us. His epitaph could well be that which the historian, Diogenes Laertius, composed for an ancient and aged philosopher, Polemo:

"We have buried Polemo, laid here by that fatal scourge of wasted strength. Yet not Polemo, but merely his body, which on his way to the stars he left to moulder in the ground."

REMARKS BY HON. WILBUR J. COHEN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

We were 400 students, and we were young. We were the sons of Wisconsin farmers, of New York businessmen, of Middle West tradesmen and city teachers. We were 400 free Americans, and we were young.

It was a time of testing then. Not only for us, but for our teachers, our university, and also for democracy. We had come to learn, to be tested. There was much to learn and much to be done. The air was sharp with excitement. The times were hard. And we were free and we were young and we were still untested.

He was our teacher, our adviser. And he asked of every one of us each Monday and then again and again "What do you know of freedom?" And we began to see, in truth, that we knew nothing.

He was our teacher, and we came to him in our raw youth. We were 400 free men, boys, and eager youth come to learn the meaning of freedom.

What is freedom's form, its shape and size? Its color and taste and feel and smell? Is it cold and hard and strong, like steel? Does it course in swift flashes, like a mountain rill, or meander through time as an ancient river? What is freedom? How is it created and how is it contained? What are its uses? What is its power? And what have we to do with freedom? Where do we fit in?

So our search began—and still continues. He was our teacher, and he led us in our search for the meaning of freedom, for the meaning of democracy, for the meaning of life.

He led us to his teachers—to Epictetus and Henry Adams, to Socrates and Plato, to Lincoln Steffens, Thucydides and James Stephens. He led us to a deep well, filled with the nectar of human wisdom and experience. He bade us drink, and we drank. We were young and very brash and thirsty for knowledge, and at his bidding we drank the heady draft of knowledge, and we began to know the anguish of learning as we tasted its sweet rewards.

He was our teacher, a kindly man, a gentle man, fragile and persistent, with the rugged Scot will to be free, and for all mankind to

be free. He was our teacher, and we loved him then as we love him now.

He brought us to an understanding of what we were and what we might be; of what our country was, and visions of what it might become. He bade us read Pericles whose words became engraved on our memory: "Wealth to us is not mere material for vain-glory but an opportunity for achievement; and poverty we think it no disgrace to acknowledge but a real degradation to make no effort to overcome." He gave us insight into the human purpose and understanding of the human order.

We learned from him and from his teachers, from the accumulated wisdom of the ages of man.

We learned the litany of freedom—the guarantee of civil liberties laid down in our Bill of Rights.

We learned the meaning of freedom—and its responsibilities.

We learned the uses of freedom—and its limitations.

We learned the price of freedom—what each of us had to pay. And in this way we found our first freedom, each in his own measure, and each according to his own will.

We were 400 young Americans searching for a meaning to our lives. He taught us with questions, always fearless questions. What is order? What is life? From our search, our questioning, we gained a sense of being, and of always becoming. And we came to know a joyous truth—that the search in fact was freedom. That it was an act of life.

And we learned other things about the act of living. We learned, as he had learned from the stoic Epictetus, "To make the best of what is in our power, and take the rest as it naturally happens." And we learned that in the nature of things there is both joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, exertion and repose.

We learned that freedom has its tyranny, that good has its evil, and that life has its death. We learned these and many other things.

Now this great life has closed, and we mourn its close. But it has not ended.

The teacher will question his students no more. But he is not silent.

His questions will continue to echo. He will continue to prod us into an awareness of ourselves, our country, and our world.

On behalf of his students, we ask, "What, then, is immortality?"

He would argue the question's total irrelevance today, for it is not within our power to know the ultimate answer.

His obligation was to the living, and to those yet unborn, to the future generations of young and free Americans, who must need to know the meaning of freedom and to know where they fit in.

And we are left to pay his debt—to "ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."

REMARKS BY W. RANDOLPH BURGESS, FELLOW, BROWN UNIVERSITY, FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO NATO

My experience covers a little different period of Alexander Meiklejohn's life than most of those here, for I was a student of his at Brown when he was dean and a young man. It was 55 years ago that I took part in one of the most extraordinary classes I have ever known. It was a group about as large as the number present on this occasion today. Such a class according to the educational pundits is too large for active student participation. But this was not, for Professor Meiklejohn somehow stimulated our interest so that every member of the class became a vigorous participant.

The subject of the course was "Logic." But it was not largely engaged with the syllogisms of formal logic. It was rather a vigorous debate on "What Is Truth," and the

members of the class were so aroused as to practically tear at each others' throats to find a solution.

The class was divided up and I was picked with a few others to propound and defend the thesis of the Sophists, which we did with utmost vigor. Before we finished, our position was torn to shreds by the class. In the process we learned to think, hard and sharply. This was Alexander Meiklejohn's great contribution to our generation, that he compelled people really to think.

This was true not only in the classroom but also with his activities as dean, when for example he met around the table with representatives of the fraternities and they had to justify their manner of life.

One day I was in the outer office of the college president and gave tongue to the trite observation that everybody had in the back of his mind some idea of God. Alexander Meiklejohn, who had come into the room, whirled on me and said sharply, though smiling as always, "But how do you know that? And can you really call the crude idea of the savage God?" Thus he carved away the props of loose, but pleasant, notions and compelled one to think.

Two years ago, when I spent a semester at the University of California, I found him again in Berkeley with his wife, Helen, daughter of another of my other great teachers of philosophy, Walter Goodenow Everett. Again I felt the joy of contact with his active mind. As others have testified today, there was not always agreement, but always stimulation to vigorous thought.

From my experience abroad with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have returned with the clear impression that this country is better able to face its great new responsibilities and do its part in world affairs because Alexander Meiklejohn taught so many people to think clearly, incisively, and persistently.

REMARKS BY ALAN BARTH, AUTHOR AND JOURNALIST

There is an element of presumption in my talking about Alec Meiklejohn on this occasion. The truth is that I never met him, socially at least, until he was 85 years old, although in a real sense I had known him for the whole of my adult life.

I was privileged to have a part in that wonderful birthday party given for him 6 or 8 years ago at St. John's College in Annapolis. And then, some time later, I lived for a year in Berkeley just around the corner from Alec and Helen and came to know them intimately and affectionately.

It was for me, as you can readily imagine, an exciting and enriching friendship. The seemingly great gulf created by the differences between us in age and eminence and learning disappeared at once. He embraced me as an adversary and a peer. This was what made him so great a teacher, I suppose. He not only challenged students; he sought challenge from them. He fostered maturity in them by treating them as mature. He elicited responsibility from them by dealing with them as responsible.

I never knew a man who relished argument so much. He loved discussion for its own sake, for the intellectual exercise it entailed, much as he loved tennis for its physical exertion. He valued it even more, however, as a tool for the attainment of truth. He cultivated controversy because he believed that out of the conflict of opinion comes the best assurance of unity and of wisdom in the determination of public affairs.

This was, of course, why he was so stalwart a champion of free speech. He believed unreservedly in the utility of freedom. "Freedom," he put it, "is always expedient."

I do not mean to represent Alec as a simple man. His mind was complex—supple as well as strong. Yet there was an extraor-

inary simplicity in him—a simplicity that grew out of an inner integrity.

I think I have never known a man in whom conviction and conduct were so harmoniously married. What he believed, he acted on. And he was almost wholly free from that kind of self-protecting caution which so commonly passes for prudence.

He was a fierce fighter—but a joyous rather than a rancorous one. There was hardly an intellectual controversy of importance in his time in which he was not an ardent and ebullient participant. Nevertheless, for all his passion, he was a man of the most exceptional sweetness and gentleness and gaiety.

All of us who knew and loved him must feel sadness at his going from us. But we can feel joy as well in the recollection of a life so richly lived, so graced by love, so meaningful and so fulfilled.

Helen, who was closest to him and who loved him most, wrote to me about his death. He was sitting up in a chair after only a day or two of illness, with her on one side of him, his doctor on the other, talking about the troubles on the campus of the University of California—talking, this is really to say, about the twin centers of interest in his life, students and freedom. Suddenly—with no cry, no suffering, no fear—he drew a deep breath and was gone.

What more could we have asked for him? As for us, I think that we shall keep his friendship as long as we live—or as long, at least, as we continue to care about the enduring values he cherished and sustained.

REMARKS BY LOUIS JOUGHIN, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Fifty years ago, when Alexander Meiklejohn was 42 years old, Arthur O. Lovejoy, John Dewey, E. R. A. Seligman and other distinguished scholars were busy founding the American Association of University Professors. Alec, amusingly, could not join the association because he was then in his third year of service as a college president—surely a collateral activity for a man who could never be less than totally a teacher.

But the AAUP and Alec had no trouble in finding out each other. The seminal thinking of the philosopher, over five decades, undoubtedly influenced strongly those association leaders who have been mainly concerned with problems of freedom, and the relationship between authority and the individual. Many in the AAUP have exchanged letters and words with Alec on countless general questions and numerous specific situations.

The relationship between the man and the organization was fittingly and handsomely confirmed by the creation, in 1957, of the Alexander Meiklejohn Award. Alumni and from faculty members of the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin, many of whom are here today, established a fund which would enable the association to honor outstanding contributions to academic freedom by a college or university administrator or trustee, or by a governing board as a group. Between 1958 and 1964 the Meiklejohn Award has been given to five administrators and two trustees, and governing boards as a group have twice shared in the honor. The citations have been for defense of the right of students to hear speakers of their own choice, for defense of professors who have challenged racial discrimination on and off the campus, and for defense of the general right of teachers to have the same freedom as other citizens.

The administrators and trustees cited have been proud to receive the award. The name of Alexander Meiklejohn has gained added significance by being joined to noted acts of principle and courage. The endowers of the fund and the association have been justified in their linking of a profession charged with

the advancement of learning to a man of magnanimous spirit.

I must add a word of personal respects. I first met Alec in 1948, which is really not so long ago. Common interests brought us together with increasing closeness, and to my delighted bewilderment I found myself the object of his affection. No sentimentality, not Alec. But subtle understanding, stimulation, wit, kindness, vivacity, and all else that he could give to make another man feel strong and cheerful. Alec did me worlds of good, and has made me want to be good for other men. I suspect that this is the magic which our teacher and our friend worked in many of us.

REMARKS BY CALVIN H. PLIMPTON, PRESIDENT, AMHERST COLLEGE

Alexander Meiklejohn was the eighth president of Amherst College and served from 1912-23. While he regarded Amherst as a very difficult and a very sensitive part of his life, it is only proper to recognize the truly tremendous contributions he made there.

Perhaps it is singularly appropriate for me as the 13th president to be speaking about this, particularly since my father George was chairman of the board of trustees during Meiklejohn's presidency, and my brother Francis was in college and spoke for the students in behalf of "Prexy."

I first met Dr. Meiklejohn early in 1960. I had just accepted the presidency of Amherst but was still in the practice of medicine. The telephone rang and it was Dr. Meiklejohn consulting me on a medical problem. We arranged the technical problem, and I indicated I wanted to meet him. He invited me to his hotel and after looking at each other somewhat suspiciously, we began to talk.

He said, "Dr. Plimpton."

I said, "Call me Calvin."

He said, "Alright, Dr. Plimpton, call me Alex."

I said, "Alright Dr. Meiklejohn."

He said, "I am so glad that you are going to Amherst. When you get there you may hear some things about my term as president."

I said, "Yes, Dr. Meiklejohn."

He said, "Furthermore, you may hear some things about me and your father."

I said, "Yes, Dr. Meiklejohn."

"Well," he said, "Just remember one thing, Calvin, no matter what you hear, your father was always extraordinarily kind and fair to me."

With that we froze together and never thawed apart.

So it is with the deep humility of one who is trying to follow in his footsteps that I reflect with great admiration on his achievements at Amherst. He was truly incredible—running the gamut from beating a varsity tennis player named John Jay McCloy, to attracting one of the outstanding faculties of the day. For example, it was Meiklejohn who really discovered Robert Frost and brought him to Amherst in 1916. He attracted Stark Young, Walter Stuart, Hamilton, and a host of others.

He was one of the most moving and eloquent speakers. No one listened to him without being inspired and stimulated. He loved a debate, and loved an argument, and he loved a fight.

In an interview in 1923, he said several key phrases. "Mr. Erskine has just said, 'Keep the best of the past, be sure of that,' and I say 'Yes, and the best of the past is change. For change is life. Life that does not change is dead.'" "I differ from most of you on most of the issues of life and I am going to keep it up."

"The point is that I am a minority man. I am always wanting change. On most of the great issues, I am usually against the greatest number."

Yes, he was controversial and he was lively. Too lively in fact for Robert Frost who occasionally spoke affectionately of dialectics as "Meiklejaundice." But on balance there is no question that he was one of America's great teachers.

I suspect that nothing pleases a teacher more than to know his words go marching on. I can think of no better tribute. Let me conclude by reading Alexander Meiklejohn's letter of welcome to the class of 1919:

"A WELCOME

"(By Alexander Meiklejohn)

"Members of the class of 1919, we welcome you to Amherst.

"When a man chooses to go to college he declares that he wants to be different, that he is not satisfied to be what he is.

"If any one of you is satisfied with himself, he had better go back and keep still for fear something may happen to disturb his perfection.

"If those who stay are rightly dissatisfied with themselves, they will satisfy us."

These words are as true today as they were then. We can give thanks for Alex Meiklejohn who made us want to change, want to be different, to seek dissatisfaction, and finally want to improve.

REMARKS BY JACOB KLEIN, MEMBER OF THE FACULTY, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE

St. John's owes a great and unredeemable debt to Alexander Meiklejohn. In the years 1924-27, that is, long before the new program was instituted at the college, Dean Walter Agard, who had been Meiklejohn's pupil at Amherst, would invite him to lecture at St. John's. Later Scott Buchanan, who had also studied at Amherst and, as Dean of St. John's College, had been one of the initiators of the program now in force, found in Alexander Meiklejohn a stern but benevolent critic of the college's ways. From 1940 to 1948, Meiklejohn used to come to St. John's almost every year on "inspection" tours, as it were. He delivered formal lectures, attended classes and seminars, talked to students and faculty. He also served on the college's board of visitors and governors from 1943 to 1947.

None of us, engaged in teaching and learning at St. John's, will ever forget Meiklejohn's upright stature, his gentleness, his indomitable and uncompromising spirit, his seriousness and his intellectual vigor. He often disagreed with us, but this very disagreement was a fruitful one. He challenged our goals and sometimes our methods. He thus compelled us to clarify our assumptions and to view our tasks in a better perspective. Faithful in deed to his own words, he taught us how to become better men. For throughout all his life he proclaimed the inseparability of word and deed, of thought and action. Unyielding on principles, he hated any rigidity that might tend to limit the freedom of thought and action of any individual.

In a speech delivered at St. John's College in 1957, at a meeting called to mark the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the University of Wisconsin's Experimental College and the 85th anniversary of Meiklejohn's birth, he spoke of the combat which, during the 60 years of his teaching, had been waged in the American college. He described this combat in terms of a medieval mystery play in which God and the Devil contend for the possession of the souls of men. To quote him directly: "The Devil, one of whose favorite devices is that of raising for men the standard of living, thereby succeeds in lowering the standard of human intelligence." We should take these words to heart, especially today.

One of my most cherished memories is a lecture he gave at St. John's in 1947, I believe. He spoke of human excellence as the goal to be pursued through education, as the

high ideal one should never lose sight of. This ideal was embodied in Meiklejohn himself. He commanded respect. One could not help admiring him. Above all, one could not help loving him. His friendship was a precious gift, to deserve it—a high reward. Nothing could match the purity of his heart. His memory cannot and will not fade.

REMARKS BY D. S. OTIS, FORMER MEMBER OF THE FACULTY, THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

I speak for all of us teachers who were associated with Alexander Meiklejohn in the experimental college—when I say we know how privileged we were. We were daily immersed in the vigorous intellectual excitement of that undertaking, which has so greatly influenced the course of higher education in America ever since.

This excitement was native to the college which Mr. Meiklejohn conceived. Free inquiry into men's thoughts and deeds in ancient Athens and modern America replaced the traditional curriculum of discrete courses of study. Group discussions of students and faculty replaced formal lectures. And Mr. Meiklejohn furnished the essential stimulus to this lively enterprise. His brilliance illumined every problem which the college faced—in teaching, in administration and in personal relationships. He approached every problem in terms of principle, in terms of clarifying issues—never in terms of expediency. To him, this was the approach all intelligent people should make and this was essential to true education.

This man of ideas and principle was also a man of quick and gentle wit and the most personal of friends. He often said, in his writing and speeches, that men are friends and brothers. This conviction underlay his dealings with individuals. Members of the college community felt the warmth and genuineness of his interest in them as persons.

The impact of Alexander Meiklejohn upon those who worked with him was immense. He stimulated their intellectual powers to the utmost and he gave purpose and direction to their thought. To him, man was an ethical being—with moral commitments which he must understand and fulfill. His heroes were Plato, Epictetus, and Immanuel Kant, whom he dearly loved to read to his students and friends.

He never preached but Alexander Meiklejohn imparted this moral imperative to those about him. He was capable of high indignation but it was directed at ideas and actions and it was tempered by his sensitive understanding of human frailties. It is my guess that many of us have long thought and shall continue to think—in coping with involved personal problems or public issues—what would Alexander Meiklejohn's approach to the situation be? That is one of the ways in which he will remain with us through the rest of our lives.

#### AIR FORCE ACADEMY INVESTIGATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with commendable effectiveness and deep understanding, our highly competent Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, determined that the cheating incidents which have recently

been uncovered at the Air Force Academy call for more than an investigation of the specific incidents. Therefore, he has established a special advisory committee composed of distinguished citizens, headed by former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, retired Gen. Thomas D. White, who will review the entire Air Force Academy program, to see if they can determine any underlying causes of the problem. Members of the committee are Dean Hardy Dillard, professor of law at the University of Virginia; Dr. Robert L. Stearns, former president of the University of Colorado; Mr. Charles B. Thornton, president of Litton Industries; and Lt. Gen. J. J. Nazzaro, vice commander of the Strategic Air Command.

Secretary Zuckert will keep the Committee on Armed Services fully informed on this matter and he has told me that he will personally review the record of each individual who is involved. Because he is taking personal action on the individual cases as part of his statutory responsibility, he has instructed General White's committee to take a wide long-range look.

Although the greatest number of cadets were not involved in breaches of the honor code, I am pleased with the positive action of the Air Force and know that Secretary Zuckert will continue to keep us informed.

#### HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, during the past month or so, there has been considerable comment in the press and other news media about the fact that, on December 10 of last year, the Committee on Un-American Activities recommended that three witnesses who had appeared before it be cited for contempt of Congress.

Based on what I have seen and heard of this comment, I would say that all of the facts in the case have not been presented to the public and there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding about the matter. It is my hope that in these remarks I can set the record straight and eliminate such misunderstanding and confusion as may exist about the committee action.

In February 1964 the Committee on Un-American Activities authorized an investigation by a subcommittee into a matter clearly within its jurisdiction. It involved the administration of an important statute by the executive branch.

The subject matter of the inquiry was such that the committee preliminarily decided the witnesses should be heard in executive session. In accordance with its rules, however, it left the final determination of this point to the subcommittee.

I think every Member knows that there is nothing unusual about executive hearings, which are required by the rules of the House in some circumstances and are discretionary in others. Executive sessions have been held in certain cases by most committees of the House, particularly when it has been determined that the national interest required it or that the testimony received could well involve matters of national security.

The subcommittee's determination on the question of executive hearings coincided with that of the full committee. Accordingly, commencing in March 1964, it received the testimony of a number of witnesses in executive sessions. Nine such sessions were held. No one objected or complained and nothing concerning the hearings was "leaked" at any time. As a matter of fact, except for the committee members, certain staff personnel necessarily involved, and the witnesses who had previously appeared, no one even knew the hearings were being held.

At this point the subcommittee subpoenaed the three witnesses in question to testify in executive session, just as the previous witnesses had. The subcommittee called them because it had—and still has—reason to believe they could give information on certain of the matters under inquiry.

Within a few days after the subpoenas were served upon two of the witnesses, both of them women, the committee began receiving phone calls about the matter. They came from the offices of Members of this House, from newspaper reporters, editorial writers, and private parties. The callers wanted to know why the women had been subpoenaed, what the purpose of the hearing was, why it was executive rather than public, and so forth.

I regret to say that, in some instances, callers who said they were employees of Members refused to give their names and, after being informed by the staff that committee rules forbade comment on the matter, continued to press for information and made it clear that they were opposed to the committee action.

The committee has a rule which provides:

No member of the committee or staff shall make public the name of any witness subpoenaed before the committee or subcommittee prior to the date of his appearance.

I have issued strict orders with respect to enforcement of this rule, and it has never been violated since I have been chairman of the committee.

About a week before they were to appear before the committee, the two women who had been subpoenaed issued a press release on the matter.

On the day they were supposed to testify, they appeared at the hearing room with a support delegation of about 30 people. Twenty or so baskets and bouquets of flowers had been delivered to the committee office for them earlier in the morning. As a result of their earlier press release, television and radio news media had set up their equipment in the hall outside the hearing room. The subpoenaed witnesses made state-

ments for the news media both before and after they were called into the hearing room.

They asserted that merely to be subpoenaed by the committee was damaging to them and that they could, therefore, "protect" themselves only by being heard in public with the press present. This request for an open hearing—soon made a demand—was made to the subcommittee in its executive session by all three witnesses and by counsel representing two of them—one witness did not desire to have counsel present.

The witnesses and their counsel were fully heard by the subcommittee over a period of several hours, and after most careful consideration, and after consultation with the office of the Parliamentarian, the subcommittee determined that because of the nature of the hearing and the possible impact of the witnesses' testimony on the inquiry as a whole, particularly at that point in it, the questions to be asked the witnesses and the answers which they might give had to be in executive session in the national interest and because they might "tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate" other persons—to quote the words of rule 26(m) of the House, binding on all its committees.

All three witnesses refused to testify, one even refusing to be sworn or to affirm to tell the truth. Had they acted in this manner in any court, the judge could immediately have held them in contempt. A congressional committee, however, does not have the power to hold anyone in contempt, to try, or to sentence.

Therefore, in the interest of maintaining and preserving the dignity of the House and fulfilling the duties and obligations we have under the rules of the House, which was not then in session, the full committee, exercising its best judgment, unanimously recommended to the Speaker that the matter be referred to the U.S. attorney for appropriate action. In the performance of his duty under the applicable United States Code provision, the Speaker—as has often been done before—cited these witnesses to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. The latter presented the matter to a grand jury as required by statute, and the grand jury returned indictments. Under the law, the offense is a misdemeanor.

These three persons will be accorded due process of law and will be tried. Whether they are found guilty or not guilty is a matter which is left up to regular judicial proceedings over which we have no control. Full appellate procedures will, of course, be available to them if they are convicted in the trial court.

I have no control over what has been said, is being said, or might be said in the future about this matter, but I think it might be well for me to add these observations for the benefit of the vast majority of the American people who are always interested in getting the facts before forming a final judgment, who do not want to go overboard in either direction, in regard to any issue.

In the past, the same people who are now criticizing the subcommittee for

holding an executive session in this instance, have taken us to task even more severely for holding open hearings. Their argument then was that we were publicity seekers; that we held open hearings to expose people for the sake of exposure, to humiliate them, and to bring them to public scorn. They claimed then that our hearings should have been executive.

Today, they are conveniently closing their eyes to the fact that the committee maintained complete and absolute secrecy about the subpoenaing of the three witnesses, while the witnesses deliberately made the matter public. They have been the publicity seekers. The committee's critics are failing to point out that in this instance—as in others before—it was the witnesses who not only leaked the fact of their being summoned, but also took steps to focus national attention on the matter.

In the future, it will not surprise me at all to see these same critics shift from one position to the other on this question, depending on whether we hold open or executive hearings. Of one thing I am sure: No matter what we do, we will never be able to please them. We can never be right in the eyes of these people. They will always find some excuse to criticize everything the committee does and to call for its abolition.

By the same token, however, I can assure you the committee will continue to hold both executive and public hearings. In determining which type any particular hearing will be, it will exercise its own best judgment after giving full consideration to the national interest and relevant House and committee rules.

The Committee on Un-American Activities was created by this House. It is mandated by the House to carry out certain duties, following procedures spelled out in the rules of the House and consonant with decisions of the courts on matters affecting committee operations.

As chairman of the committee, I take this occasion to inform the House and the American people that, as in the past, the committee will continue to do what the House, speaking for the people, has told us to do. We will not be deterred by carping critics, no matter who they are and no matter how much and on what issues they may agitate.

We on the committee are answerable for all our actions, ultimately, to the House, to the courts, and to the people. We welcome this responsibility. We are confident that, as in the past, our actions will be approved and upheld by them.

#### POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in support of a bill to award posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor to our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy was a man dedicated to the cause of freedom. His life stands as a monument to his willingness to place the welfare of his Nation as a leader of men during World War II; his creativity while a patient in the hospital; his forthrightness as a legislator and his willingness to assume the tremendous demands of leadership as President of the United States have endeared him to all of us.

If any man has served his Nation above and beyond the call of duty it has been John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I concur with my fellow Members of the House of Representatives in urging the granting of this honor to him.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HALL, for 5 days (February 22 through February 27), on account of official business—Armed Services—Hospital Construction Subcommittee (Fort Brook Medical Field Service School, Texas).

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROUSH, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, February 4, 1965.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs" (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

480. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Council for the period January 1 to June 30, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

481. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

482. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the 1964 report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

483. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on accumulation and retention of excess missile spare parts due to inadequate supply management practices of the U.S. Army, Europe, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

484. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on activities outside the national domain carried on by the Geological Survey during the period July 1 to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 87-626; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

485. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to section 7(b) of Public Law 88-206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

486. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens together with a list of the persons involved and the reasons for ordering suspension, pursuant to 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

487. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens together with a list of the persons involved and the reasons for ordering suspension, pursuant to 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

488. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

489. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on the estimated amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) incurred by the postal service in the performance of public services for fiscal

year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 87-793; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 13. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; with amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 19. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 44. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of the organization, management, operation, and administration of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 84. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; with amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 68. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations and studies; with amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 89. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations; with amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 104. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota: H.R. 4140. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY: H.R. 4141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount allowed as a child-care deduction, and to eliminate the income ceiling on eligibility for such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4144. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent benefit increase, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widows' benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to liberalize the retirement test, and to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4145. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4146. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the number of years which may be dropped out in computing the benefit of an individual who is forced by a Federal agency to retire at age 60 or earlier; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to claim a personal exemption for his spouse, where such spouse is a student being supported by the taxpayer, regardless of such spouse's gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4148. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4149. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4150. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for certain expenses incurred by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university, to the extent that such expenses exceed the personal exemption or exemptions to which he is entitled for the individual or individuals involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4152. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87-383), so as to permit the use within Canada of certain funds appropriated pursuant to such act for the conservation of migratory waterfowl; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity

to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4155. A bill to prohibit trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4157. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4158. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4159. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4160. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to eliminate the provisions requiring termination of annuities of surviving widows or widowers upon remarriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4163. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4165. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4169. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow

under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4170. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4173. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4174. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4177. A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary schoolteachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4178. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4179. A bill to create a joint commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to specifically provide for the guarantee of loans made to veterans to purchase dwellings in multifamily structures which are owned cooperatively or are condominiums; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4183. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment may be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 4184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the silver content of

certain coins of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4185. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4186. A bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 268. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 103 of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H. Res. 170. Resolution to authorize a review of the needs for airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 171. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the extension of further foreign aid to the United Arab Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 172. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 173. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H. Res. 174. Resolution authorizing a review of national policy for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Dr. Violetta P. Samoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juliana R. Usison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Marcia Patricia Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4190. A bill for the relief of Tony Law, also known as Kam Mon Law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4191. A bill for the relief of Michael Willatt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4192. A bill for the relief of Yee Chow Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4193. A bill for the relief of Nikola Kojich and Nevenka Kojich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4194. A bill for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4195. A bill for the relief of Mariuccia Italia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4196. A bill for the relief of Henry Mansoor Abdel Sayed, also known as Henri Mansoor, and Roxani Mansoor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Horacio De Brito Viegas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yehudith Tenenhaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4199. A bill for the relief of Marjorie and George Denich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4200. A bill for the relief of Bedri Gurbuzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4201. A bill for the relief of Bernard M. dos Remedios, and his son, Titus dos Remedios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4202. A bill for the relief of Irene Sankey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 4203. A bill for the relief of Alton G. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4204. A bill for the relief of Christos Papayianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 4205. A bill for the relief of Simon Der Simonian, his wife, Hossannah Der Simonian, and their children, Knel Sebouh Der Simonian, Rebecca Der Simonian, Haroutune Der Simonian, and Nishan Der Simonian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4206. A bill for the relief of Morice E. Ovadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H.R. 4207. A bill for the relief of Phillip Mazzella, his wife, Anna Buono Mazzella, and their minor children, Michele Mazzella and Libera Maria Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 4208. A bill for the relief of Lida Pira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Geraci, his wife, Antonietta Geraci, and their four minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Ki-soon Park and his wife, Ryo-bong Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Nadeshda Heidelberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Filemon C. Yao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Carmencita Montalvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Miss Valentini Pastris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Joao Manuel Borges Soares Da Mota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4217. A bill for the relief of Octavio Francisco Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4218. A bill for the relief of Gaetano La Bella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Maria Urso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H.R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Gitter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bennici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 4223. A bill for the relief of Dr. Andres Perras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Groundhog Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day in this Nation which will deserve the attention of this Congress. It is Groundhog Day—and as is his custom the groundhog emerged this morning from his burrow on Gobbler's Knob at Punxsutawney, Pa., at sunrise.

I have been informed that he saw his shadow and after a while again disappeared into his comfortable den to await

the arrival of spring. This ominous retreat by Mr. Groundhog is, as you all know, an infallible forecast of 6 more weeks of winter.

As Mr. Groundhog reappeared today for the first time since he entered his burrow to sleep away the winter months, he could not help but notice the many changes that have occurred.

For instance, we have inaugurated a new President of the United States amid pomp and ceremony, and for the first time in 14 months, this Nation has a Vice President. The new Congress is in session and is busy at work on many new programs.

The new President has announced plans for a new way of life which he calls the "Great Society." This new era is of great interest to the Punxsutawney groundhog because he is very proud of

his lineage. He is the one and only pure groundhog in the world, and the only one that can claim the distinction of being an infallible weather prophet.

Of course there are imposters and those who challenge his supremacy but in every challenge of his pedigree, the Punxsutawney groundhog has emerged the winner. So this aristocrat of groundhogs will eagerly await the arrival of spring so that he can participate in this glorious age that the new "Great Society" will usher in.

The Punxsutawney groundhog has brought fame and renown not only to himself, but also to his native home—the Borough of Punxsutawney.

No place in the world on this Groundhog Day will receive the attention and acclaim as will this borough. Radio commentators, television reporters, news-