

our plans and techniques, but they were relatively uncomplicated and singularly lacking in drama. They consisted primarily of methods of mobilizing the support then latent in the labor movement, in the industrial and financial communities, and in academic circles—and then translating this support into votes in the Congress. The translation process involved a slow, methodical discussion of the issues with virtually every Member of Congress. Of course, the powerful support of two Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, was also indispensable.

None of this detracts, however, from the fundamental premise that it was not stratagems but rather the solid intellectual argument which functioned as our most powerful weapon.

To turn the coin slightly, my experience has indicated that economists generally show no more perception with regard to the legislative process than did the visiting political science students. Time and time again over the past 5 years in the Congress and in the Treasury, I have met with groups of economists who seemed to delight in advancing ideas that had absolutely no basis in political reality.

I would certainly not deny either to the political scientist or to the economist the privilege of exploring freely every aspect of his subject matter. Pure research in these disciplines is at least as valuable as in the physical sciences. But I do suggest that both studies—political science and economics—seem to be out of touch with the working politicians.

In developing my theme today, I plan to pick and chose from the storehouse of economic history. Many of my comments may prove debatable. Perhaps some of you will even find my treatment of this history a bit cavalier, but then imagine for a moment what history will do to us.

In any event, I want to focus your attention on what I deem to be an important current problem, and to suggest one part of a possible solution.

Basically, I want to ask: "What happened to the study of political economy?" From the early 18th century to the beginning of the 20th century—a span of about 200 years—there was a study known as political economy. What has happened to it?

A simple answer is that this study was born to fulfill the need of the times and died when the need ceased to exist. I think this answer is too pat. In my own opinion, the need has continued to exist, but it has been sorely neglected.

This seems to me a particularly appropriate subject to discuss with you. For example, I do not see how complicated financial matters can be presented intelligently to readers without an awareness of the political trends that are running in this Nation and in the world. Conversely, I cannot see how your colleagues who write of politics can do so intelligently without an awareness of economic trends and developments.

In this context, let us take a brief look at relevant history and the subject of political economy.

The end of the Middle Ages in Europe brought about new social, economic, and political states replacing the old feudal-ecclesiastical political orders. The resulting problems, economic and political, were new and solutions were sought by many.

Mercantilism flourished and was exemplified in countless writings and in the restrictive and regulative policies of statesmen such as Colbert of France.

The doctrine of *laissez faire* arose naturally as a protest against the excessive regulation of commerce by Government action. Adam Smith and his contemporaries and followers are to be credited with their attempt to see and analyze a national economy as a whole. In doing so, they asked what

kinds of governmental policies would best promote national wealth and prosperity. Their answers reinforced the fundamental principles of the doctrine of *laissez faire*, and turned this economic doctrine into a political slogan: "That government is best which governs least." The political economists made themselves felt in the world of practical affairs and, indeed, Adam Smith and his followers had a profound influence in almost every part of the Western World.

With the activities of government curtailed and with the general acceptance of the concept that economic history would be written in a free market by competing entrepreneurs, I suppose it was only logical that the study of political economy would divide into the separate studies of political science and economics. After all, if government had little place in economic decisions and economic decisions little place in government, what profit could there be in the study of political economy?

By 1890, Adam Smith and the world as he saw it had long since vanished into the shadowed past. His world consisted of vast underdeveloped areas of the North and South American Continents, Australia, and New Zealand, and a European civilization in the early phases of the industrial revolution. By the end of the 19th century, these areas were settled and the liberating forces of the industrial revolution had nearly spent themselves. Though the problems of politics and economics were—and continue to be—entangled, a sizable contingent of economists withdrew intellectually from interest in the broader aspects of their subject matter. By the 20th century, the term "economics" came into general use replacing the older political economy, the change of name reflecting changes in the discipline itself, which had become subdivided into a number of specialties.

To me, this withdrawal and the division of the study of political economy was most unfortunate and perhaps we are still paying the price.

It took the terrible depression of the 1930's to bring home forcibly the fact that national wealth and prosperity are not the automatic results of that government which governs least.

Our Government was forced to make many economic decisions—considered startling innovations by many. But you and I know there was nothing particularly novel about any of the economic decisions of the 1930's. They had all been the subject of numerous economic studies for years. It took a cataclysm to make them a political reality.

To move on into our own times, I can note that Douglas Dillon is the first Secretary of the Treasury to point out that on occasion good fiscal policy requires the temporary acceptance of Federal deficits as a reasonable price to pay for economic growth and a tolerable level of unemployment. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson are the only two Presidents in the history of the United States to support a peacetime tax cut when the Federal budget is in a substantial deficit.

Lyndon B. Johnson is probably the only leader of a free government, in history, who has attempted to dedicate the energies of an entire nation to disprove the old iron law of Ricardo and Malthus that poverty is the perfectly natural corollary of a free enterprise system. All these economic decisions had been debated and rather generally accepted in the world of ideas years before the event. How, then, do we account for the timelag?

By contrast, 20 years after the detonation of the first atomic bomb, this Nation and a large part of the world—with the active participation of the atomic scientists—had come to the conclusion that some method of controlling the destructive potential of this discovery was essential. The result: A test ban

treaty ratified by this Nation in 1963 and President Johnson's recent announcement of a cutback in the production of fissionable materials. Surely economics is no more difficult than the study of nuclear physics, yet the evidence strongly suggests that the physicists are in better communication with the politicians than are the economists.

The Nation is now facing a debate which involves the eventual eradication of poverty in this country. I agree with President Johnson that it is an attainable goal. Congress will soon be debating the annual foreign aid authorization and appropriations bills. I agree with Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson that the attempt to bring the undeveloped areas of the world up to some reasonable standard of living is feasible and well within the financial and technical competence of this Nation and our allies in the free world.

On the horizon we can see an array of problems that could confront this Nation in the next few years. To name a few, I would list our trade relations with the Common Market, the question of our peaceful trade with the Soviet bloc, the question of what to do about our Federal excise taxes, and—in my particular area—the entire question of what is an appropriate banking structure to meet the rapidly changing needs of the American economy. In the even more distant future, I would list as potential problems the impact of reduced defense expenditures and how to live with automation. This is only a partial list of problems, and some of them may simply go away. However, I believe a prudent man would agree that we will be forced to face some of them and attempt to find answers.

To meet our current and future problems will require the closest understanding and cooperation between economists and politicians. To be blunt, however, I think if we are to attack these problems with vigor and imagination it will take more than cooperation and understanding. It will take trained people. It will take people with the academic background, the intellectual capacity, and the political awareness to analyze the problems, devise the appropriate programs, and then muster the support in the Nation and votes in the Congress to make them a political reality. In my experience, this is a fairly rare combination of talents and experience.

The question that bothers me is "Where are these people coming from?" In the past they have been recruited from the financial community, from industry, from the labor movement, from the Federal Reserve System, from academic circles, and from the political arena. The record would indicate that the Nation has, on balance, been fortunate in its ability to acquire the right man for the right job at the right time. I know from personal experience that at times the recruiting process has not been easy.

I suggest to you that the time has come when this Nation should consider a more orderly method of developing a ready reserve of men and women, qualified in the intellectual disciplines and with the political exposure required to bridge any gap that may exist between economics and politics. The Employment Act of 1946 creating the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress was a useful and hopeful first step in closing the communication gap. But I believe it may be time to take another step.

I would like to see the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of which I am Chairman, devote a substantial sum annually to supporting the training of a corps of men and women who would comprise a national financial reserve. At this point, let me stress most emphatically that I am not talking about another educational or executive development program. Rather I contemplate the creation of an extraordinary group which, by virtue of its training and background,

A3872

will be especially prepared to serve the Nation in areas of high national and international financial and economic policy.

I would like to see trained, at the graduate level, up to five people each year for a 4-year period, or so long as they showed promise. After the completion of their formal studies, these men and women would continue their training in the Federal Government for an additional 4 years. I envisage a program that would rotate them through our Corporation and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Reserve System, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of State, and appropriate congressional committees—to illustrate the scope of the training.

After the expiration of their 4-year terms of duty, these men and women would be subject to an additional call for a 4-year term of service during their lifetime at the request of the President of the United States. I do not expect, or even want, all of the people in the corps to remain with the Government. Some of them will return to the academic community, some will enter business or finance, some may prefer Government, some may serve in the labor movement, and, hopefully, some will develop into Democrats and others into Republicans. But this corps will be available as a ready reserve for any future President of either party who needs them.

I am under no illusion that my remarks today will precipitate a remarriage of the political scientists and the economists. Signs of even a mild flirtation between the disciplines are probably more than could be immediately expected. But I do believe that, at this juncture of our history, the Nation badly needs a reservoir of trained men and women who can move with assurance in the world of economic ideas and in the world of political reality while understanding the problems of both. It is for this reason that I am today suggesting that we consider the advisability of creating a national financial reserve.

East Texas and Tourism and Pittsburg Peach Festival

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
 OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Thursday, July 23, 1964

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials, "East Texas and Tourism" and "Pittsburg Peach Festival," which appeared in the Longview Daily News, June 25, 1964:

EAST TEXAS AND TOURISM

How does east Texas fare, in comparison with other sections of the State, in attracting tourists?

Where do Texas tourists come from—what States and regions?

Out-of-State visitors coming to Texas for travel and vacations have destinations that encompass all the State. Some areas, as may be expected, draw better than others.

The east Texas area, for instance, is the destination of 2.5 percent of Texas tourists.

While this may appear to be low, it is exactly the same percentage that is attracted by the Rio Grande Valley area.

East Texas rates above the northwest area of the State, which is the destination of 1.8 percent of visitors.

The Austin area draws 1.7 percent; Beaumont-Port Arthur, 1.4 percent; Waco, 1.4 percent; Amarillo, 1.1 percent; Odessa-Midland, 0.7 percent; Abilene, 0.6 percent; Lubbock, 0.6 percent.

The Big Bend area, which includes the famous Big Bend National Park, attracts 1.2 percent of the visitors.

Padre Island, the well-known Texas seashore which has been designated a national seashore area, draws 0.1 percent of visitors.

Some areas of Texas attract far more visitors than east Texas. The Dallas area leads the State with 15.8 percent, with the Houston-Pasadena area a close second with 14.1 percent.

The east Texas region's 2.5 percent compares with the Southwest area's 2.8 percent, Galveston's 3.9 percent, Corpus Christi's 3.9 percent.

El Paso ranks third in preference with 9.8 percent, while San Antonio is close behind with 9.6 percent, Fort Worth gets 4.6 percent, and Wichita Falls 4.1 percent.

The five largest metropolitan centers thus get more than half of the out-of-State visitors. The most popular nonmetropolitan destination was central Texas—extending from north of Dallas toward Austin and the hill country—attracted 7.2 percent of the visitors questioned.

The great diversity of Texas natural attractions—mountains, mesas, valleys, plains, streams, forests, beaches, lakes, deserts—means that tourists spread out all over the State in search of our infinite variety of pleasures.

Where do the tourists come from?

A surprising number come from adjoining States, attracted by the Texas vacation centers such as metropolitan cities, lakes, and streams.

More than 1,500,000 residents of Louisiana visited Texas last year—more than from any other State. Some 455,000 New Mexico residents visited Texas on vacation travels, while Oklahoma sent us 537,000 visitors and Arkansas supplied another 339,000 tourists for Texas.

In other words, people who know Texas travel and tourist attractions best also like them best and come often to enjoy them.

But two of the most distant States—both considered primary tourist areas in their own right—are among the leaders sending tourists to Texas. Of those visiting the Lone Star State, 13.2 percent were from California and 5.8 percent from Florida.

Every State in the Union, including Alaska and Hawaii, sent visitors to Texas last year. Even the lands of the maple leaf and the sombrero were represented. Nearly 200,000 visitors came from Canada and 58,000 Mexican nationals crossed the Rio Bravo for extended vacations.

Surprisingly, more than 105,000 visitors from foreign lands visited beauty spots in Texas.

The record 11,700,000 tourists who visited Texas last year and spent \$532,200,000 in the State gave a real boost to the State's economy. More visitors are expected this year. (Tomorrow in this column—How to influence tourists to visit your city and area.)

PITTSBURG PEACH FESTIVAL

A spirited triservice club luncheon at Pittsburg's swank new Town House Inn Thursday noon officially opened the second annual Camp County Peach Festival. This colorful and entertaining festival will run through Friday and Saturday and will close Sunday with an invitational archery tournament.

In the neighborly spirit of east Texans, Kiwanians, Lions, and Rotarians from many clubs in the area joined Pittsburg members of these clubs for the luncheon meeting where Dr. R. L. Johnson, cochairman of the festival presided.

Pittsburg and Camp County people are to be commended for the way in which they have expanded and improved the program of events for this second annual peach festival. There will be something of interest going on all day and each evening throughout the event.

Of particular interest to many will be the peach jelly, preserve, pie, and cobbler contest on Friday. Prizes of \$220 are offered, but we venture that a taste of some of the delicacies to be displayed would be much more enjoyable than the prize money. This contest will be held at 10 a.m. Friday at Peach Festival Headquarters, 143 Quitman Street.

There will be a peach contest, with many of the northeast Texas area growers of fine peaches displaying some of the best peaches at 9 a.m. Saturday. There is a junior livestock show for Camp County entries. A pageant, a peach queen contest, sky divers show, water show, archery contests, are among the interesting events planned.

A downtown parade in Pittsburg Saturday will feature the peach queen and 19 other contestants who will represent neighboring cities and communities as queens. The Peach Queen's Ball will be held at 8 p.m. Saturday at festival headquarters. The Haywood Shows, consisting of amusement rides, concessions, and other shows, will be at the fairgrounds in Pittsburg City Park all day Saturday.

Started only last year, the Camp County Peach Festival at Pittsburg now appears certain to become one of the premier local and regional festivals in this great east Texas area. It is a worthy project and deserves full support of the people of the area.

We here in Longview extend our best wishes and hope that people from throughout the east Texas area will visit Pittsburg during the festival and help make it the success that it deserves to achieve.

July 23 1964
Immigration Plank of GOP Deplored

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
 HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN**

OF NEW JERSEY
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Thursday, July 23, 1964

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times contains a most illuminating news item aptly describing the 1964 Republican platform's immigration plank just as it is, "innocuous to the point of being meaningless."

The highly responsible American Immigration and Citizenship Conference has recently asked a group of Republican leaders to repudiate the "discriminatory national origins quota system and other inequities that have such a serious effect on our relationships abroad." This citizens' conference is composed of religious, welfare, and labor organizations covering the entire spectrum of American political interests and is understandably concerned about the intolerable immigration laws currently on this Nation's lawbooks.

I am inserting this news article so that my colleagues may see for themselves how one objective group feels the Republican Party is closing its ears and its eyes to the needs of an oppressed world society.

IMMIGRATION PLANK OF GOP DEPLORED

About 35 religious, welfare, labor, and other organizations interested in immigration and refugee matters have sharply protested the immigration plank in the 1964 Republican platform as being "innocuous to the point of being meaningless." Religious News Service reports.

Representatives of the various groups, all members of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, sent a statement to Republican leaders in San Francisco calling on them promptly to issue a forthright statement in support of an American immigration policy that would do away with the discriminatory national origins quota system and correct other inequities in our present law that have such a serious effect on our relationships abroad.

The statement was formulated after discussion of the platform plank during a meeting here of the executive committee of the conference, which was formed to promote change of U.S. immigration policy.

The platform plank, the statement said, "completely avoids the basic issues inherent in our present immigration policy and law."

In its platform, the GOP called for "immigration legislation seeking to reunite families and continuation of the 'fair share' refugee program."

At this point, I am also including in my remarks testimony I gave before the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on on June 29. I implored the subcommittee to "rectify the injustice of the present immigration law" by enacting H.R. 7700. Our long-respected position of world leader is greatly diminished in the eyes of—for instance—the 104,537 Greeks who are backlogged on a quota list of 308.

Let us eliminate the McCarran-Walter Act from our code of law and then let us feel we are genuinely attempting to promote the concept of liberty and justice—for all.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD J. PATTON ON JUNE 29, 1964, BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, URGING ADOPTION OF REVISED IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee; for 12½ years there has been a dark shadow cast upon the lawbooks of the U.S. Congress. It is a shadow which has harmed America and its prestige both at home and abroad. In a sense, it contradicts the myth of America's open "golden door." It rejects the "huddled masses, yearning to breathe free." It refutes our request for the "tired * * * poor * * * the homeless tempest-tost." To the world's oppressed, the Statue of Liberty is a beacon and harbinger of New World freedom. In reality, though, the present immigration law mocks the worldwide dream of hope, justice, and opportunity.

Our unfair and unpopular immigration law discriminates against most nations of the world, weakening our position of world leadership and handing Moscow ready-made anti-West propaganda on a silver platter.

Under the existing law, known to many as the McCarran-Walter Act, heavy priority is given to the countries of Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany. Yet, there were 41,600 unused vacancies in the British quota for fiscal 1962.

On the other hand, the countries of India, China, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, and many others are allowed only 100 people per year. To people of these countries, "only in America" is a cruel fantasy.

Examine also the backlogs of other countries, where people are lined up on clogged waiting lists. Greece, with a quota of but 308, has a backlog of 104,537.

Other countries in southern and eastern Europe face similar obstacles. Italy's quota of 5,666 must somehow be split up to cover 265,773 prospective emigrants. There are 63,029 who wish to leave Poland and come here; yet only 6,488 are allowed a year. Yugoslavia has an allocation of 942, but has a backlog of 33,729. Hungary lists 11,999 hopeful Americans-to-be with an annual quota of only 865.

This situation is intolerable. I believe the best method of rectifying the injustice of the present immigration law is to enact H.R. 7700.

The measure, which embodies the recommendations of the late President Kennedy and those of President Johnson, would humanize the existing law and ameliorate the conditions for those who wish to gain permanent residence in America.

Let us briefly examine the administration proposal. It would not allow any great increase in total number of immigrants; rather, it would eliminate—over a period of 5 years—the system of national quotas, thereby helping those from countries with high backlogs. The \$50 billion the United States spends on defense and the \$3.5 billion used for foreign aid are negated, because other nations point to our discriminatory immigration law as evidence we are not sincere in practicing democracy.

Close relatives of American citizens and resident aliens, persons who have been on waiting lists for the longest period of time, and those who could benefit the United States because of special skills, would be given highest priority regardless of birthplace. Under the proposed measure, an Immigration Board would also be established to review naturalization policy and to recommend special use of unallocated quota numbers. No country would have more than 10 percent of the annual allocation. Under the present law, three nations hold almost two-thirds of all quota numbers.

The need for new legislation is demonstrated every day by the numerous private bills introduced into the hopper, by the frequent newspaper stories of families separated by the Iron and Immigration Curtains, by the letters each Representative receives every week of friends and relatives that not-so-recent immigrants have not seen for years. Earlier this month I testified before this subcommittee in behalf of Miss Rahel Chelico, of Highland Park, N.J.—just one of the many heartbreaking cases that confronts us so many times.

The late President Kennedy said in his immigration message to Congress, "Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength." I can do little more than echo these sentiments.

Nurse Training Act of 1964

SPEECH
 OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has had the misfortune to be a patient in a hospital, including the best, during the past several years can testify personally to the acute and growing shortage of professional nurses in this country. It is a rare and critical case which today receives adequate professional nursing care, for, as the shortage has grown more and more serious, professional nurses have increasingly been

assigned to supervisory duties and the nursing services which they were trained to provide have been left to often inexperienced and inadequately trained nurses' aids.

The committee report cites a number of impressive statistics to document the shortage of professional nurses. In some hospitals, for instance, the shortage is so severe that nursing aids provide as much as 80 percent of the direct nursing services, and in New York City over half the positions for professional nurses in the public hospitals were unfilled in 1961.

This is not a new situation, Mr. Speaker; many of us recognized the growing crisis as far back as the mid-1950's and publicly urged a program to encourage the training of more nurses and nursing educators. Legislation for this purpose has been pending in Congress for several years. The astonishing fact about this bill is the length of time it has taken to bring a proposed program to the floor of the House for action. In early 1961, the Surgeon General appointed a Consultant Group on Nursing to study the nursing needs of the country and recommend an appropriate role for the Federal Government in helping to meet these needs. Despite the urgency of the matter and the fact that a reporting date of later that year had been set, the study dragged on and it was not until December 1962, that the group reported. I recall the many inquiries I made of the Public Health Service about the progress of the study during this period only to be told on each occasion that, "It won't be much longer."

In February 1963 the President included recommendations based on the group's report in his message to Congress on the health needs of the country, at which time he announced he would send draft legislation to Congress. Yet, another full year elapsed before an administration bill was drafted and introduced. Throughout this period, of course, the nursing shortage was getting worse. Implementation of the Kerr-Mills law further strained the Nation's nursing resources, and the administration continued to press for enactment of health care for the elderly legislation—a measure which could be made nearly inoperative by the lack of nursing personnel to provide the services called for in the legislation.

Finally, in the latter half of 1964, we have a bill, a good bill which I strongly support. Nevertheless, it is a significant measure of the dimension of the nursing shortage that in 1962 the Surgeon General's Consultant Group determined it would not be feasible to recommend a goal of more than 130,000 additional nurses by 1970 even though they identified the need as being more than twice that number, 300,000. The present bill accepts the group's recommended goal of 130,000 nurses, but the committee has been frank to warn in its report that even if this goal is reached the country will remain seriously short of nurses in 1970.

In the face of this shortage—and undoubtedly contributing to it—the number of nursing schools awarding 3-year diplomas has steadily declined, from 1,-

134 in 1949 to 875 in 1962. The hospitals which operate most of these diploma schools have reported heavy deficits which they are forced to meet through higher charges to their patients, a not very happy arrangement especially in view of the already high costs of hospital care, and many have been forced to abandon their nursing schools as a result.

The pending bill, Mr. Speaker, will help to deal effectively with the nursing shortage in several of its aspects. The program of grants for construction of teaching facilities will help encourage the major expansion of such facilities which is necessary if the annual production of graduate nurses is to be increased from the present 30,000 to the projected 53,000.

The new program of project grants will help stimulate nursing schools to experiment with and develop new methods of training more nurses, in less teaching time and learning time, and with a resulting higher degree of technical and scientific competence.

Because of the heavy deficits incurred by hospitals which operate nursing schools, and because other provisions of this legislation will inevitably increase such operating losses, a new program in the bill will partially reimburse these institutions for costs arising from increased enrollments and from the presence of students receiving assistance under the bill.

Another provision of the bill will continue and expand the professional nurse traineeship program which, since 1956, has focused attention and support on the preparation of nurses in leadership positions—administrators, supervisors, and instructors—upon whom we must depend in large measure for the increased quantity and quality of professionally trained nursing personnel.

Perhaps the most significant part of the bill will establish a student loan program for prospective nursing students who need financial help in order to continue their educations past the high school level. This program, I believe, reaches the heart of the problem of too few nurses—the young women, and men, themselves who can become our future nurses, if they find the incentive, the opportunity and, where necessary, the financial assistance, to pursue this objective.

Finally, the bill will set up a National Advisory Council on Nurse Training, a step which will help assure expert guidance to the Surgeon General in establishing regulations and developing policies for the administration of this legislation.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Congress can expedite enactment of this extremely important bill and that the Surgeon General can be prepared to implement it as soon as possible. We have lost too much time as it is in seeking to overcome the shortage of nurses. The demand for professionally competent nursing services is not now being filled, and we cannot bring the full benefits of our advanced medical-scientific discoveries to the people who need them until we remedy this critical deficit. This bill is a good, though belated, beginning.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my Washington Report for July 18, 1964:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JULY 18, 1964.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The second most controversial section of the Civil Rights Act is title VII, dealing with the freedom of an employer to hire and fire. Last week we discussed title II, public accommodations. This week, I present the highlights of the FEPC section to acquaint employers with the problems which will now face them under the new law.

PART II—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

When the law becomes fully effective, it will be unlawful for any employer engaged in any business "affecting" interstate commerce who employs 25 or more workers, or any labor union with 25 or more members, or any employment agency to commit any of the following so-called unlawful employment practices:

1. Failure to hire a job applicant on account of his race;
2. Refusal to hire a job applicant on account of his race;
3. Discharge of an employee on account of his race;
4. Discrimination in compensation against an employee on account of his race;
5. Discrimination in terms of employment against an employee on account of his race;
6. Discrimination in conditions of employment against an employee on account of his race;
7. Discrimination in privileges of employment against an employee on account of his race;
8. Limitation of employees on account of race in such a way as to tend to deprive an individual employee of employment opportunities (promotions) or otherwise adversely affect his employee status;
9. Segregation of employees on account of race in such a way as to tend to deprive an individual employee of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his employee status;
10. Classification of employees on account of race in such a way as to deprive an individual employee of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his employee status;
11. Discrimination against any job applicant or any employee who makes a charge under this title or assists or participates in an investigation or proceeding conducted pursuant to this title;
12. Publication of any notice or advertisement relating to employment which indicates "any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based on race * * *"; and
13. Discrimination on account of race against any individual in an apprenticeship program.

ENFORCEMENT

A worker can file a complaint with a new Federal agency known as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC instead of FEPC). If, after investigation, the EEOC finds probable cause for the complaint, conciliation is attempted. If this fails (and

there is no State FEPC law), the worker can file suit against the employer and the Attorney General can intervene as a party to help prosecute the case. However, if the Attorney General decides that a general "pattern or practice" of discrimination in employment exists, he may file suit against the employer in the name of the United States without waiting for conciliation efforts and even though the worker does not bring suit himself.

PENALTIES

If the judge rules against the employer, he will order him to hire, reinstate, or promote the worker. If the employer does not obey the court order, he can be punished by a \$1,000 fine and/or a 6-month jail sentence for contempt of court and ordered to pay back wages. Penalties can also be imposed for failure to keep the records and make the periodic reports required by the EEOC.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

Allegedly, this new law is based on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. However, coverage is not limited to industries "engaged in interstate commerce" but extends to all business enterprises "affecting interstate commerce." The Supreme Court has ruled that a farmer who produced 239 bushels of wheat, all of which was not sold in the market but consumed on the farm was "affecting" interstate commerce. The same was true of a local drug-store and a neighborhood bakery.

If the Supreme Court should sustain the constitutionality of this new law by applying the same definition of the reach of the interstate commerce clause, then the EEOC can and will assert complete jurisdiction over the hiring, firing, work conditions, and promotion policies of every restaurant, hotel, gas station, drug store, grocery store, manufacturer, bank, barber shop, funeral parlor, beauty salon, and other local retail, service, trade, and professional establishment in the Nation if it employs the statutory number of employees. In such case, there is no longer any such thing as interstate commerce.

Clearly, the authors of our Constitution never intended the interstate commerce clause to give the Central Government such blank check power to regulate, regiment, and control private enterprise in this country.

Employment of Youth in the Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 21, 1964

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been properly concerned about the employment opportunities of youth, especially youth who, unfortunately, have dropped out or who lack necessary employment skills. I have always believed that plain, old-fashioned work was honorable and good experience for young people.

Fieldwork on the farms of America would seem to be one of the most nearly perfect opportunities for young people—requires limited, easily learned skills; outdoors, little responsibility; ample work; satisfactory wages and working conditions; fits with school vacations.

I was pleased when most California growers agreed to cooperate fully with