ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, on April 1, 1965, the junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIKSEN) introduced a bill (S. 1660), which was cosponsored by several other Senators, to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States.

On behalf of the Senator from Illinois, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior and junior Senators from Maryland (Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. TWIGG), and myself, be added as cosponsors at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the order previously entered, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 8, 1965, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7, 1965:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Jack T. Conway, of Michigan, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Glenn W. Ferguson, of Maryland, to be Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Olis A. Singletary, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Theodore M. Berry, of Ohio, to be Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

COAST AND GEOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

John O. Phillips
Robert C. Denning
Miller J. Tonkel

To be lieutenants

William R. Curtis

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General.


Robert B. Green, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1971.

John W. Bush, of Ohio, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1971.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senior Citizens' Health Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of the membership my views on Medicare as outlined in my monthly report to the residents of my congressional district last month.

Senior Citizens' Health Programs

(From Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, 20th District of Pennsylvania)

At long last it appears that Congress—both the House and the Senate—will act favorably on legislation to provide adequate hospitalization, nursing home care, home nursing care and diagnostic services for our elderly citizens, 65 and over, the program will come under the Social Security Act, as I have long advocated.

President Johnson sent the following message to a recent luncheon meeting held in Washington and sponsored by the Senior Citizens Golden Ring Council of New York. In substance, he said:

"The crusade for health care is on the verge of victory. The long debate is drawing to a close. There is going to be a program of health insurance for older people in this country. And the basis of that program is going to be our great social security system."

"For far too long older Americans have had to cope as best they could with the steeply rising costs of hospital care and other health services that you need.

"You have been patient in your actions, progressive in your thinking. Now your patience is to be rewarded by action."

Congressman Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—attended that luncheon and told the guests the health care package would include the following:

1. A basic social insurance program of hospital care, based on the King-Anderson bill.
2. An increase in social security cash benefits.
3. An optional supplementary program covering many health expenses—not included in the basic hospital insurance program—to be partially financed from Federal funds.
4. Improvements in the existing Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged)—to include provisions for medical care to needy children, as well as the needy elderly who cannot qualify under the social security program.

The bill—including the four programs—was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee on March 25. It is now in the Rules Committee awaiting a rule under which it will be considered by the House. (The Rules Committee determines whether a bill comes out under a closed rule—meaning no amendments can be offered from the floor—or an open rule—meaning that amendments are offered by the Members for consideration.)

One thing is certain—however—the bill will reach the floor of the House for a vote. Early this session, Members of the House passed a resolution reinstating the 21-day rule—which authorizes the Speaker of the House to call up for House action any bill approved by a legislative committee that has not been cleared for House consideration by the Rules Committee within 21 days. In other words, the Rules Committee resolved the legislation on March 24, and if it takes no action, Speaker McCORMACK can have the measure placed before the House for consideration after April 14. Therefore, we will soon have the opportunity to vote for the legislation.

In 1956, when I ran for Congress in a special election, I campaigned on a platform stating my support of the Forand bill to provide hospitalization, medical care and drug costs for persons receiving social security and railroad retirement benefits. After my election, I introduced the Forand bill and became a cosponsor (84th Cong.).

I have reintroduced that bill each Congress—up to the present—(89th Cong.).

This session I cosponsored the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1818). The administration backed the King-Anderson program, and while it did not provide broad coverage, I would have voted for it if a better program was not obtainable. However, I felt the provisions of the Forand-Holland measure to be preferable. In an effort to appease the American Medical Association, the administration deleted the portion of the old Forand-Holland measure "to provide coverage of medical and drug costs" and kept the hospitalization and nursing care coverage.

The AMA was not to be appeased, however, and it opposed even the limited version. That organization, over the years, has prevented the legislation from coming before Congress.

Bill S. 779 was not cosponsored, and finally supported—the Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged). This is a welfare program under which all persons 65 and over, who are on relief, can receive needed medical and hospital care, plus dental and eye care, diagnostic services, home nursing care, certain drugs and a welfare program under which all persons receiving Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits are entitled to hospitalization and nursing home care only, provided the pensioner can prove that he and/or his children cannot afford to pay for such care. * * * "His income is below a certain amount * * * and * * * he has no private life insurance or property over a specified amount (Each States different.)"

Pennsylvania citizens—65 and over who are on relief or pensions—do not receive any benefits under the Kerr-Mills Act which they did not already have under the State welfare program.

Many States, however, do not wish to increase the cost to the State, as the Federal Government now pays half the costs. Several other States with welfare programs similar to ours—New York, Michigan, New Jersey, etc.—also participate in the Kerr-Mills program, since it authorizes the Federal Government to share in the State's costs. It is merely up to the State to pass its share of the cost—so they do not participate in the program; consequently,
their elder citizens (with or without pensions) receive no health care.

In the November 1964 election, the people of America elected a President and Vice President, as well as Congressmen and Senator, who campaigned on platforms including adequate health care for all American citizens. There was little doubt that the limited program—under the King-Anderson bill—would be enacted into law.

However, the American Medical Association—in a hysterical, last-ditch stand—came up with a fancy program, eldercare, and it claims to cover everything at no cost to any individual (just the State and Federal Governments). Who are you and me, but in the fine print—you find out that maybe you will have to pay something after all.

Supposedly, the main concern of the AMA is the lack of health insurance coverage for doctors' fees and medicines, yet, this coverage was provided by the Forand-Holland bill, and the AMA claimed it would result in socialized medicine. Now, it laments for the poor pensioners because inadequate care is not offered under the King-Anderson bill. But under the King-Anderson bill, as amended by the committee, this is not true.

The amended King-Anderson bill has a provision of considerable interest to our pensioners not included in the other bills. It grants a 7-percent increase to the 20 million social security beneficiaries (about $1.3 billion a year).

Another section of the amended bill increases the Federal share of public assistance programs in the various States, helps old-age assistance recipients, blind pension recipients, and persons receiving assistance because of disability (other than social security disability). Needy children—on relief—will also be included.

Federal funds to the States will be increased under this section—for programs conducted in behalf of the aged in mental and tuberculosis institutions.

Following is a résumé of the major medical care proposals. You may judge for yourself, the true facts.

### Résumé

**Provisions**

**King-Anderson bill (medicare)**

- All persons 65 years of age and over.
- $2,100,000,000
- Sixty days inpatient hospital care; patient to pay cost for 1 day (approximately $200).
- Sixty days in nursing home if posthospital care required and patient is transferred from a hospital.
- 240 health care visits at home.
- Outpatient diagnostic service; patient to pay $10 required under inpatient service (approximately $20) for each 30-day period of diagnostic service furnished.
- Optional voluntary insurance to cover doctors' fees, surgery fees, and medicines.
- $33.50 per month by State or Federal Government.
- Social security system.

**Herlong-Curtis bill (eldercare)**

- All persons 65 years of age and over.
- $260,000,000 (without optional insurance)
- Would depend upon type of contract that State would make with private insurance companies.
- Would hope to have all medical and hospital costs covered.
- States, either through the department of welfare or the department of health.
- Federal Government and State government would combine to participate, and in many cases the pensioner would have to pay part of all of the premium, other than Government share, if personal income is so merited. (States will decide maximum income allowed to permit pensioner full benefits, fees of personal cost, like King-Anderson bill.)
- Would depend upon State plan.
- $114 after age 65.
- $3,600,000,000.

**Byrnes bill (GOP)**

- All persons 65 and over.
- Would pay first $1,000 (except for $260 and 80 percent of remaining costs of hospital and 80 percent of medical costs).

### Eldercare: Let's look at it—calmly.

This is a medical insurance program for all persons 65 and older—and would be voluntary on the part of the States and individuals—meaning the State legislatures would have to vote to take part in the plan before it would be available to their citizens (as the Kerr-Mills program). Benefits would differ with the various States (accord- ing to private insurance policies contracted by the States). "matching funds" with the Federal Government paying up to 84 percent to States to help pay costs of private insurance coverage.

Now—here is an interesting item, little publicized or discussed, the legislation provides that "receipts would pay all, part or none of the premium costs, depending on their income and the State plan."

"Participants would certify their income to the State agency administering the program.

Persons paying the full premium would have the benefit of an income tax deduction for payments, as well as statewide bargaining for 95 percent (health insurance" (Congressional Quarterly, Mar. 5, 1965). States could administer the program through their department of health or department of welfare (Kerr-Mills) and private insurance companies—such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield—could also help administer it through contracts with the States.

The cost would depend on, if and how, the States used the plan. It has been estimated, however, that the cost of State and Federal funds would be required.

There is little doubt the American Medical Association is spending millions of dollars on spot announcements on 700 radio stations, the ABC television network and 166 independent channels, on page-size ads in the three national newspapers, small weekly publications, and in the 14 million radio and television discussions in "doctors' offices throughout the Nation."

Yet the sponsor of the AMA's eldercare bill, Congressman HERLONG, rebuked the association last week, as reported by the New York Herald Tribune:

"These advertisements, "Representative Herlong said, "are supplied that if and when H.R. 3727 (the eldercare bill) passed, these comprehensive hospital, medical, and drug benefits would automatically follow."

This is 'not accurate,' he said, 'because such benefits would flow only if a State chose to participate in eldercare."

"I knew what was in the (eldercare) bill before I sponsored it," Representative Herlong said. "I was strongly for it because the States would determine a patient's eligibility and the extent of benefits he would receive. I am still for that principle and I don't think you have to make any exaggerated claims for it."

### Pertinent Facts

1. Our population now has more than 18 million persons—65 and over.
2. Four out of five have some form of insurance.
3. After age 65—over 90 percent are hospitalized at least once, 66 percent are hospitalized two or more times.
4. Persons over 65 usually stay in hospital twice as long (15 days) as younger persons.
5. One-half of aged couples—where one is self-employed—have total medical bills over $800 in 1 year.
6. Fifty-four percent of aged have no hospitalization insurance and many have inadequate coverage. Two-thirds of aged—with incomes less than $2,000—have no hospital insurance.

On the basis of the information furnished, I feel certain you will approve my vote in support of the administration's King-Anderson program.

---

**A Resolution To Declare Election Day a National Holiday**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. PAUL A. FINO**

**OF NEW YORK**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Wednesday, April 7, 1965**

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a resolution to declare election day a national holiday.

In my opinion, there is no reason why election day should not be a national holiday. Even when the election being held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November is a State or municipal election, the day itself is still a day of decisionmaking characterizing the American way.

I believe that this one day a year when the American public makes its great political decisions ought to be a legal holiday. I urge the Congress to make it such.
Small Bank and Small Town in Wisconsin

Show How in Cooperation With the Small Business Administration They Have Created 4 Industries Employing 400 People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, each day I have received half dozen letters from people in small towns asking why the Government does not establish some business in their town to create jobs. If the Federal Government were to build a plant in every small town in our Nation, we would go into bankruptcy overnight.

The people and the banks of the small towns must do the job themselves and the sooner the better. We must awaken to this fact, the better it is going to be for their communities.

The job of obtaining industries and creating jobs can be done if the people in the little towns will cooperate and if the banks in their little towns will cooperate and enlist the services of the Small Business Administration.

My good friend Walter Jensen, president of the First Bank of Grantsburg, of Grantsburg, Wis., has furnished me with a resume of what they have done in their town. There is no reason under the sun why every town in our Nation cannot do the same thing if they just have the will to do it, and if they are determined that their community will not die. I doubt whether there is anyplace in America where a small-town bank has done so much for the attracting of industries as has the little bank in northwestern Wisconsin.

I am putting the accomplishments of this little town and this little bank in the pages of the Congressional Record for the purpose of demonstrating what can be done if there is the will to do it among the people in a community.

Grantsburg is a village of 900 people in Burnett County. The Congress of the United States salutes Grantsburg, Burnett County; Walter Jensen, the First Bank of Grantsburg, and the Small Business Administration for a job well done and an inspiration to the people of our nation.

We have analyzed the results of financing industrial development in our area the past 9 years and we thought some facts and figures may be of interest to other small banks, to Congressmen, State officials, and others engaged in trying to build industry for their community.

We find that most industries need long-term credit to finance the purchase of machinery, land, and buildings and they also need a considerable amount of short-term credit on a seasonal basis for the production of goods and the carrying of inventories.

We are happy to state that excellent help and advice have been given in these activities by Congressmen, the State’s Correspondent Bank, the Small Business Administration, our correspondent banks, and our bank.

From the above information it would appear that the job of building small business is simple. It is not my intention to convey or suggest that building industry in a small town or anywhere else, for that matter, is easy. First of all, we need men and a payroll of machinery, land, and buildings and they also need a considerable amount of short-term credit on a seasonal basis for the production of goods and the carrying of inventories.

We would like to give some facts and figures on three companies all of whom have been assisted by SBA and by correspondent bank financing.

Company No. 1: This company needed long-term credit to finance the purchase of additional production machinery and vehicles to increase production and to cut the cost of production. The company secured an SBA-bank loan the early part of 1959 for $131,000 and such loan was increased to $70,000 in the early part of 1959 at which time the original loan had been paid down to $15,767, so the total investment by the SBA and bank in long-term finances amounted to $84,232. In the early part of 1956 the company had 32 men working, with gross income that year of $260,446 and a total payroll of $86,974. The following year additional machinery and equipment was added, sales jumped to $406,798, employment increased to 40 men and a payroll of $95,251. During 1964, this same company had a gross income of $1,209,705 with a total payroll of $349,000 and during the period of 1956 through 1964 the company paid Federal and State income taxes of $176,856. At the present time the company is employing 98 men with a payroll of over $370,000. The bank-SBA 10-year long-term loan has now been paid in full.

Company No. 2: This company obtained a bank-SBA long-term loan of $40,000 in the early part of 1957 which was later increased to $60,000 in 1960 and again increased to $95,000 in 1962. Actual total loans after deducting payments during the period has amounted to $310,342. In early 1957, the company employed 28 persons and had gross income of $241,811 with a payroll of $81,188. The company has shown a growth each year since 1957 and in 1964 it had gross income of $269,000 and a total of 36 employees. During the period from 1957 through 1964, the company paid Federal and State income taxes of $74,678.

Company No. 3: In the latter part of 1958 this company was in dire need of additional machinery, equipment, and working capital. A bank-SBA long-term loan was completed for $160,000 and in 1962 such loan was increased to $300,000 and in 1963 an additional loan of $35,000 was granted for the purpose of adding to their plant building and modernizing their heating plant. After deducting interest and principal payments on the real estate and chattel mortgage loan granted by the bank and SBA, total loan to this company is $344,591. In 1959 the company had gross sales of $611,169 with a total payroll of $160,789. In 1964 the total payroll increased to $370,960 and the earnings of the company increased to $1,209,705. Throughout the period of 1957-1964, the company paid Federal and State income taxes of $84,232. In the early part of 1956 the company had 32 men working, with gross income that year of $260,446 and a total payroll of $86,974. The following year additional machinery and equipment was added, sales jumped to $406,798, employment increased to 40 men and a payroll of $95,251. During 1964, this same company had a gross income of $1,209,705 with a total payroll of $349,000 and during the period of 1956 through 1964 the company paid Federal and State income taxes of $176,856. At the present time the company is employing 98 men with a payroll of over $370,000. The bank-SBA 10-year long-term loan has now been paid in full.

Company No. 4: Figures and facts relating to this company are not included in the above figures. We just completed a new $76,500 bank—ARA-SBA participation loan for the purpose of purchasing the plant occupied by the company and for constructing additional manufacturing spaces. Also included are funds for the purchase of modern machinery and equipment.

In this case the bank has handled all the financing for the company for the carrying of seasonal variations in inventory and now they are set up with long-term financing on buildings and machinery and the bank will continue to finance seasonal inventory loans. The company started with 5 employees and will now employ 40 to 50 people.

In all these industries, we must give credit to the banks who have been assimilated into the long-term financing program of our Administration and for creating wealth locally that is beneficial to local governments as well as the tens of thousands of dollars such industries spend each year on Federal and State taxes and supplies which also creates employment and profits to others.

With a continued downturn in farm income and with the prospects of fewer and fewer farms it is highly desirable that we continue to promote industry in our small towns if our towns are to grow and prosper and if our banks are to continue to grow and prosper. Our deposits in the small towns must increase and our small banks must have an increased investment in the Federal Government and must increase their investment in our communities.

On April 7th, 1965, the Congress of the United States salutes Grantsburg, Burnett County; Walter Jensen, the First Bank of Grantsburg, and the Small Business Administration for the job well done and for an inspiration to the people of our nation.
we need men who are willing to furnish risk capital ahead of the banks, SBA.

There is a lot of untapped human resources in every community and men who are willing to risk funds if they are given some cooperation and encouragement. At this time I want to give high praise to the Small Business Administration for the wonderful job that they have done in this community. Besides paying the SBA loans back with interest, in a matter of 5 years these industries will pay in Federal taxes more than the amount of the loans that they have received from the Small Business Administration. In other words, the Small Business Administration is making taxpayers out of Americans instead of tax eaters.

I hope that these examples furnished by this small town of Grantsburg, Wis., will be an inspiration to the thousands of other small towns in America as to what can be done.

Voting Rights Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man in either body for whom I have more respect, both professionally and from a standpoint of personal probity, than the venerable senior Senator from Virginia, Harry Flood Byrd. It behooves all of us in both Houses to hearken when he speaks; to consider at length his position on any item of legislation. He speaks with a wisdom that comes only from long years of unselfish dedication to the cause of responsible Federal Government.

His statement of April 2 on the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 is required reading, in my opinion, before any Member of the Congress casts his or her vote on the proposal. There are Members who have not had an opportunity, I am sure, to read all of his statement and, with unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the Record.

I urge every Member to read each sentence. Take this issue of the Record home with you, if necessary, and study Senator Byrd's remarks. We are given, in this statement, every reason any man needs to defeat this proposal, now, before it is too late; before, in future years, we have to undo the mischievousness of this bill will create if it is hastily and unwisely enacted.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965 TO THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY GENERAL

This is a statement about the administration's so-called "Voting Rights Act of 1965." I am making it as a Member of the U.S. Senate representing Virginia under oath to uphold the Federal Constitution.

I am intensely aware of the democratic liberties to be achieved through our form of government, and to be guarded by it. I am also dedicated to preservation of the principles and requirements of our State and local-Federal system and the checks and balances necessary to protect it.

The Federal Government of this country has worked itself into fiscal, monetary and military difficulties which are exceedingly serious.

The administration is allowing itself to be influenced beyond reason by the emotion of domestic hysteria; and by its own words it is inflaming so-called civil rights issues.

The so-called voting rights bill now before Congress is an act of the present administration. It admittedly was drafted by the Federal Attorney General.

It is a vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria. Even Chairman Emanuel Celler, the New York chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has called it "harsh.

The administration has pushed its consideration ahead of everything else. Committee hearings have been arbitrarily limited. Efforts to amend the bill are discouraged.

There is a terrific administration pressure to pass the bill before Easter. But this statement is not made with an intent to impose hardship. Instead, it is made with all deliberate speed.

I have analyzed all provisions of the bill. They are invalid, overreaching and constitutionally impermissible in design. The administration has been advised of the odium in which I hold its proposal.

We have also studied the Federal Attorney General's testimony. He admits drafting the bill. Neither the bill nor the testimony is enlightening. It is either a bundle of incongruities or the admission of a misapprehension.

The proposal is made in the name of voting justice, but the word "justice" was not included in the Federal law designed for vindictive use against six States selected in advance.

It is a proposal grossly to offend Virginia; and not only this. It is subversive of the Constitution of the United States and the written standards by which we are governed.

The Attorney General has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process, and his lack of respect for the writ of habeas corpus.

I quote directly from the prepared testimony of the Federal Attorney General before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 23, 1965. He said:

"The judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

I never expected to hear a responsible member of the legal profession or an Attorney General of the United States take such an attitude or make such a public statement about the judicial process. Relying on the enforcement of government by law and not men, this Federal Attorney General seeks in a voting rights bill to arrogate judicial power to himself in areas of his own choosing.

A written Constitution protects us from despotic rule. For this protection against oppression government we rely on the checks and balances of division of power and separation of powers.

The political Government is divided between State and Federal Government. And in both State and Federal Government, legislative, executive, and judicial powers are separated.

The Federal Attorney General, speaking for the administration, is demanding that the Federal Government be made responsible to the electorate and empower him—a political appointee in the executive branch—to preempt the judicial branch in areas he has chosen to punish.

That is not all. He is demanding power by Federal legislation to usurp the constitutional authority of States that he has already chosen to be his victims.

There is more. He is demanding this power under the claim that his own design is limited to enforcement in only a handful of States.

He decries racial discrimination in voting practices, but he deliberately wrote this bill to exempt all voting discrimination in a fourth-fifth majority of the 50 States from its application.

The Federal Attorney General tortures legal reasoning in the scheme he contrived to include and exclude States from the venal charms of his bill.

The States he wants to incarcerate are caught by his own dictates combined with a devious statistical formula. Under terms of the bill—

The Federal Attorney General—by asserting that the voting requirements in a target area are actually discriminatory—may indict a whole State or any subdivision as violating the Constitution of the United States and Federal law.

If 50 percent of the voting age people in the area were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or if 50 percent did not vote in 1960, the election, the State or locality—with never a day in court—is automatically guilty of the Federal Attorney General's indictment.

When a State or locality is convicted by this kangaroo procedure, the Federal Attorney General orders invasion of the State or subdivision by an unspecified number of Federal registrars.

Occupation of the State or subdivision by the Federal registrars will incapacitate for an unspecified and indefinite period of time.

The purpose of the Federal registrars is to impose and enforce the will of the Federal Attorney General with respect to voting laws, ordinances, and practices in the State or locality.

The practices, operations, and locations, etc., of the Federal registrars are limited only by the whim of the Federal Attorney General. Any individual who is held in a voting booth to be the State, general and primary, and the Federal registrars to collect annual fees.

And the Federal registrars will collect annual fees. (And the Federal Attorney General says he will extend his authority to all elections—primary, general and primary, and local and district, including those for bond issues and the like.)

The State or locality has no rights to any sort of judicial appeal until it is actually incarcerated by the Federal Attorney General's drumhead court. Then it may enter an appeal from the position of a culprit already convicted and sentenced.

The appeal in that position cannot be to test the validity of the Federal Attorney General. It is in the nature of an appeal for a pardon which is necessary before the State or locality can be released from the clutches of the Federal Attorney General and his Federal registrars.

But like the State or locality, the pardon appeal is virtually prejudged by the terms of the bill.

The appeal can be made only in a remote specially selected three-Judge Federal court. (The Attorney General says this is desirable for uniformity of decision.)

The State or locality is convicted by the Federal Attorney General of racial discrimination in voting practices, but much more than this is involved in getting a pardon by the Federal Attorney General's special court at the doorstep of the Federal Justice
Department in which Washington, which is headed by the Federal Attorney General. This court is allowed to grant a pardon to a State or locality only when it is able to prove to the court's satisfaction that for 10 past years—

Not only the State or locality, but also everybody in it, "acting under color" of its laws or ordinances, has been totally innocent.

Not only of racial discrimination in voting practices, but also totally innocent of all discrimination suggestive of voting discrimination.

(The Federal Attorney General says complying with the "equal but separate education" doctrine of the Federal Supreme Court would be the result of the Federal administration for half a century would be an example of a practice suggestive of voting discrimination.)

Until a State or locality convicted by the Federal Attorney General is given such a pardon, under such conditions, by such a court, it is not allowed to enforce any change in any of its election laws or ordinances without permission from a district Federal court in Washington.

The extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason.

In Virginia the administration has misused the bias and prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced. The bill itself is literally based on discrimination as between States.

There is nothing in the Virginia constitution or statutes which can be honestly interpreted as discriminatory with respect to voting rights or registration.

I doubt that the Federal Attorney General can find a State where it is simpler or easier for the Federal Attorney General to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority.

If there is any evidence of discriminatory voting practices there exists that which I am unaware of it.

If there is any evidence of racial discrimination in the registration laws or voting practices in Virginia, the Federal Attorney General has not given it the usual Federal fanfare.

But the Federal Civil Rights Commission, with all of its bias and prejudice and sniping—has found that—

In Virginia there appears to be no racial discrimination in voting practices to voter discrimination, and that Negroes "appear to encounter no significant racially motivated impediments in voting.

Doing all the activity of his own agents combined with that of the Civil Rights Commission agents, the Federal Attorney General says there is no widespread voting discrimination in Virginia.

But the Federal Attorney General persists in misrepresenting Virginia as a State with discriminatory voting laws or engaging in discriminatory voting practices.

He admits that this bill which he has drafted for the administration is fixed so that it will discriminate against Virginia.

He admits also that he has designed this administration bill so that he can exempt Texas from its application.

In advance he has said that he will indiscriminately exempt Texas.

He says Virginia is caught in its numbers game because 41 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964, is enough to bump the bill to the application of his numbers racket.

When the Federal Attorney General was asked why Texas was to be exempt, he said:

"Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test. The literacy tests are the devices that have been primarily used by the Federal Government to prevent Negroes from registering."

For those who may be misled by the Federal Attorney General into believing that Virginia has a literacy test, I shall compare the so-called voting tests and other requirements for voting in Virginia and Texas.

Both States have subjected 30 percent of the voting-age population in the presidential election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of illiterates among their population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

If the people of Texas were to pay their $1.75 poll tax, or wish to have it paid by their Federal registrars, they would do so with a process which included that of extracting an oath for a sum of money.

Both States have correctly convicted the Federal Attorney General of misrepresentation in the registration laws or engaging in discriminatory voting practices.

Not only of racial discrimination in voting practices, but also totally innocent of all discrimination suggestive of voting discrimination.

The extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason.

In Virginia there appears to be no racial discrimination in voting practices because 41 percent (not 50 percent) of the voting-age population voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of illiterates among their population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

In Texas, the so-called voting test is applied to prospective voters by the tax collector when they undertake to pay their poll tax; or when they formally apply for a certificate of exemption.

In Virginia the prospective voter is billed for his poll tax along with other taxes. He is asked simple questions of identification when he registers to vote at the office of a registrar.

In Texas the prospective voter must be able to understand the questions asked by the tax collector, and give the answers. In certain cases a husband can apply in behalf of his wife, if a wife can apply in behalf of her husband.

In Texas, article 6.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?
Age?
Sex?
Race? (This is presumed to have been outlawed by a recent Federal court decision).

Occupation?
Length of residence in the State of Texas?
U.S. citizenship?
Native-born or naturalized citizen?
State or country of birth?
Length of residence in county?
Texas post office address (if residence in any one of the town, city, or county)

State or county of birth?
Place of residence?

Ethnic party affiliation?

In Virginia, title 24, section 68, of the code requires the following questions to be answered in writing by the person registering, without assistance:

Name?
Age?
Sex?
Place of birth or birthplace?
Race?
Residence?
Occupation?
Have you ever voted before?
Name?
State or county of birth?
Date of birth?

In Texas, article 6.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?
Age?
Sex?
Race?
Residence?
Occupation?
Have you ever voted before?
State, county and precinct where you last voted?

members of armed services are required to give their service, serial number and discharge date where pertinent.

(Naturalized citizens are required to give date, country and place where they received their naturalization papers, along with their petition and certificate numbers.)

All persons registering are required to sign the following oath:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am entitled to register under the constitution and laws of this State, and that I am not disqualified from exercising the right of suffrage by the constitution of Virginia." He admits also that he has designed this administration bill so that he can exempt Texas from its application.

If this can be done for this administration, for the purposes of this bill, to punish the
States it has chosen, it can be done at other times for other purposes to destroy the constitutional rights of others, the Constitution notwithstanding.

It is significant that this bill would extend Federal control over all elections—Federal, State, local, and party primaries.

Federal agents are not to confine their control only to elections for political office. They extend it to State and local elections with respect to public finance—bond issues, credit, expenditures, etc.

Simply by changing the statistical formula the Federal administration and its Attorney General can be empowered to extend their control over all States they wish to give this treatment.

What would remain of our form and system of government, of all the State's rights and localities were controlled by the Central Government.

Only last month 99.9 per cent of the people in Moscow voted in an election of candidates who had no opposition. And when Mr. Khrushchev voted, he was not required even to produce identification.

Congressman Zablocki Discusses General de Gaulle's European Policies

EXTRA SESSION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a statement broadcast yesterday over station WAUK in Milwaukee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, gave a thoughtful and informative appraisal of General de Gaulle's policies toward Germany and Eastern Europe.

Congressman Zablocki's talk also includes a concise description of the European policy proposed for the United States by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs.

I believe that Representative Zablocki's remarks will be of wide interest in the House:

DE GAULLE, FRANCE, AND THE WESTERN ALLIANCE

(Broadcast by Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, on WAUK's "Report from Washington," April 4, 1965)

One of the most significant trends of the early 1960's has been the growing breach between France and the United States—two traditional allies. Today, I would like to explore this conflict, the causes, and implications of this growing foreign policy problem.

France today is led by one of the great men of his history—President Charles de Gaulle. He is a strong leader who has brought France into the ranks of the world's prosperous nations, while liquidating its colonial empire.

For many years this otherwise brilliant man has had an unreasonable prejudice against those he calls "Anglo-Saxons," that is, the British and the Americans.

Part of this attitude may result from still-smoldering control over his colonial empire by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt during World War II. Those two leaders often acted in ways that enraged the General.

There is more to the rift in the Western Alliance than what is in De Gaulle's personality. He views France as a great nation with a glorious past and an even more promising future. He believes that France can best work out its destiny as the leader of a Europe which is free of the influence of England and the United States.

The Europe which De Gaulle envisions goes far beyond the six nations of the Common Market—France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

His vision encompasses also Eastern Europe and at least that part of the Soviet sphere of influence in western Europe and central Asia. To this end France has been developing friendships with East European states, including Poland.

Through this policy he hopes to help Germany to achieve reunification within a European framework.

Although France and Germany have been age-old enemies, De Gaulle has attempted to bind the two nations closely together. He apparently believes that a reunited Germany, led by France and dependent upon French nuclear protection, would no longer be a threat to Europe, but rather the opportunity for Europe to rise as a power for peace in the world.

At the same time, De Gaulle opposes any organized unity in Europe. He seeks to keep ties between Western European nations loose in order to prevent the inclusion of the eastern bloc countries into his federated states of Europe.

To achieve both the unification of Germany and free intercourse with Eastern Europe, De Gaulle knows he must have the agreement of the Soviet Union.

For that reason he has made efforts to enlist the Soviet Union as a collaborator. The Russians, eager to exploit any trend which would weaken NATO, the Western Alliance, and the position of the United States in Europe, have been receptive to these moves.

France and Russia appear to be aligning their policies on the future of Germany.

Both want to exclude the United States and Great Britain from discussions on German unification, the frontiers of the German state, and the level of armaments which it will be allowed to maintain.

They want to substitute as negotiators the neighbors of Germany—France, Italy, and Russia—instead of the United States, Great Britain, and East Germany.

The United States, of course, vigorously opposes such a development.

The present German government—and the opposition German Socialists—recognize the necessity for continued American influence in European affairs. Germany, therefore, has not been enthusiastic about De Gaulle's so-called grand design for Europe.

While the United States has opposed initiatives by President de Gaulle, our own initiative, President Johnson's Alliance, has been frustrated—often largely because of the hostility of the French leader to any concepts that originate in Washington.

President Johnson's European policy largely centered around the concept of encouraging increased economic and political unification in the Eastern European states, including Great Britain. This integrated Europe would then deal closely with the United States in a political and economic alliance.

This strategy, however, was wrecked by De Gaulle's refusal to allow Great Britain to join the Common Market.

Also thwarted have been U.S. efforts to fortify NATO by creating a nuclear-armed fleet of ships to operate in European waters with the stationing of U.S. missiles in England. Once again, France refused to cooperate.

Our other European allies—with the exception of Germany—also were generally reluctant and indifferent to these approaches.

That is the situation today. We are attempting to stop initiatives by France, and to promote initiatives by the United States to bring about some order in Europe. The result has been virtual stalemate and the deterioration of the Western Alliance.

Many feel that there is a great danger that America may cease to be relevant or important to the future of Europe, and that Europe may become increasingly dominated by narrow nationalism.

Among them is Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, the noted Polish-American expert on communism. Dr. Brzezinski, who is director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs, recently testified before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee of which I am chairman, during hearings on the Sino-Soviet split.

In his testimony, Dr. Brzezinski presented a program for American initiatives in Europe which he proposed as a Johnson plan. Although I do not agree with all aspects of this proposal, I think it deserves careful study at the highest levels of policy-making in our Government.

Dr. Brzezinski believes that American policy in Europe should have five main objectives:

First, to convince the East Europeans—particularly the Poles and Hungarians—that East Germany limits their freedom without enhancing their security. This would require greater contacts with Eastern Europe by the United States while isolating East Germany.

Second, to promote Polish-German reconciliation. This would require an American declaration that the present Oder-Neisse frontier would be formally and finally recognized at the very moment that Germany is reunified.

Third, Dr. Brzezinski proposes that U.S. policy should aim to minimize Russian fear of Germany by encouraging West Germany to assure the Russians that under no circumstances will it develop a nuclear capability.

Fourth, in this regard, it should relate the expansion of trade with Eastern Europe to more extensive cultural and social contacts with the people of that area. Dr. Brzezinski believes, the position of the Communist governments can be undercut.

Fifth, he believes that the United States should promote multilateral ties with West Europe and in East Europe. As Soviet control wanes and Eastern European nationalism asserts itself, it should be the goal of American policy to promote political and economic integration—both in East and West Europe.

To achieve these goals, Dr. Brzezinski proposes a general all-European economic development plan which would cut across present East-West partitions, in which the United States would take the initiative and participate.

The Columbia University professor believes that by solving the goal of American interest in unifying Europe, the United States would thwart the ambitions of President de Gaulle and reestablish our influence on the Continent.

This is one proposed solution to the present impasse in Europe—caused largely by President de Gaulle's short-sighted policies in other approaches. The President and the State Department presently are giving the situation careful study.

I am chairman, during hearings on the Sino-Soviet split.