

and greater income for producers of goods and services who in turn pay a higher standard of living and we will benefit from the increase in skilled and professionally trained manpower.

The N.A.S.A.A. with its 17 years of experience, and its members, many with 20 years of experience, being fully aware of this need, respectfully request that favorable consideration be given to education and training legislation for our cold war veterans.

Sincerely,

MARVIN P. BUSBEE,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
STATE APPROVAL AGENCIES

Whereas education and training programs of readjustment for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have proven to be educationally and economically sound and a tremendous investment in our human resources for the continued benefit of these veterans, their families, and the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas our national policy requiring compulsory military service for certain selected persons is continued; and

Whereas the ranks of the unemployed and underemployed are increasing daily by the release from service of cold war veterans; and

Whereas no legislation old or new has met the special needs of veterans with the satisfaction and success of the GI bills; and

Whereas there is an obvious need for a program of readjustment benefits for cold war veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of State Approval Agencies in annual conference assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., June 19-24, 1964, urgently request the Congress of the United States to enact at an early date appropriate legislation to provide education and training as well as other readjustment benefits for veterans who first entered the military service after January 31, 1955, and for as long as the national interests demand that we maintain a policy of compulsory military service; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees, a copy to each member of said committees, and a copy to other interested groups and individuals.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I urge all citizens interested in obtaining this needed educational assistance to join me in attempting to persuade the administration of the importance of the early enactment of the bill into statute.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me direct a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The pending business, as I understand, is the Javits-McCarthy amendment to the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand it would be agreeable on both sides if a vote on

that amendment were deferred until Tuesday next at 2:30 p.m. There are some compelling reasons for that undertaking, but I think mainly it is agreeable to both sides. I would, therefore, present a unanimous-consent request that, on the Javits-McCarthy-proposal a vote come at 2:30 on Tuesday next.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, it is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], myself, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Aside from that, I think there should be 2 hours' debate immediately preceding the vote, to be equally divided and to be controlled on the part of the proponents by me or the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and on the part of the opponents by the majority or minority leader. Which would the minority leader prefer?

Mr. DIRKSEN. After the convening of the Senate on Tuesday next, I would assume there would be the usual morning hour, and after 2 hours of debate—to be equally divided by the proponents and opponents, without specifying who would be in control, but I think it might be me so far as the opposition is concerned, and either the Senator from New York or the Senator from Minnesota—the Senate would vote, and that vote would be held at 2:30 p.m.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the unanimous consent would include the provision that the morning hour would end at 12:30.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and it is not my present intention to object—I am sure those of us who were active in opposing cloture and who have been charged with filibustering will be happy to vote on Monday, so any delay until Tuesday is not at our request. But if the proponents of the amendment and the majority and minority leaders believe we should vote on Tuesday, we will reluctantly put it over. But we are ready to have a vote on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to direct a question to the Senator from Illinois. Is the understanding of the Chair correct, that the Senator from Illinois is proposing that the morning hour conclude at 12:30?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but it offers one difficulty. There may be one more amendment offered, either before or after the Javits amendment is pending. We shall have to make provision for that, also, because the Tuck bill may be offered as an amendment to the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in view of the last development, why would it not be proper to have this unanimous consent cover any amendment that might be offered and in the meantime have the vote on this amendment immediately follow? In other words, the Senator from

South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has an amendment to offer. We would take a vote on it at 2:30, with this amendment to follow immediately.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it a fact that the amendment I have proposed is an amendment in the second degree and that it cannot be amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore, we had better vote on this amendment. It cannot be amended. If it is turned down, any Senator can offer an amendment to the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I interpose this thought? There will be a religious holiday next week, and I think we should be respectful of what that faith requires as to when the holiday begins. The hour of 2:30 was therefore set so as to accommodate all persons who might be involved. After action on the Javits amendment, an amendment can then be offered. I am sure there is no objection to that.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course not. Any amendment will then be in order.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it proposed to have a vote on the McCarthy-Javits-Humphrey amendment at 2:30 p.m.?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and it is not my present intention to object—I would like a parliamentary clarification as to what will be in order between now and Tuesday noon? Will any amendment to the Javits-McCarthy-Humphrey amendment be in order, or will this unanimous consent supersede that, so no further amendment can be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First the Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that the Javits-McCarthy-Humphrey amendment is not open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, it will be the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate would not be possible on the amendment until 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, and the work of the Senate would be whatever the Senate wished to have before it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the interim, however, no amendment to the Javits-McCarthy-Humphrey amendment could be offered; nor could the Javits-McCarthy-Humphrey amendment be set aside. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Except by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I serve notice that some of us will not give unanimous consent to any motion connected with or variant of the Javits-McCarthy-Humphrey amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously, the Javits-McCarthy-Humphrey amendment is in the second degree; therefore, there can be no amendment of it until it is disposed of. The only way the Senate could

1964

proceed to other business would be by unanimous consent or motion to lay the pending business aside to take up bills on the calendar. To that I would have to object. So, Mr. President, this is going to be the business until the foreign aid bill, with the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment, or amendments thereto, have been disposed of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his clear explanation. I am now able to reinstate an invitation which I have to be in Miami to address the Machinists, which invitation I had to cancel because I thought my duties would keep me here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon can go as far as Stanleyville in the Congo to make his speech and still be back in time.

Mr. PASTORE. He can begin to spend his honorarium.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; or he can go to a cattle show.

Mr. MORSE. My friend from Rhode Island is usually right, but in this case I am making a gratuitous speech.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish one other point to be clearly understood. I ask unanimous consent that I shall have the right to modify my amendment until the yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is guaranteed under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Not after the yeas and nays have been ordered. We had that problem the other day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As long as the yeas and nays have not been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the Senate, on Tuesday, September 15, at 2:30 p.m. proceed to vote on the pending Javits amendment No. 1234, as a substitute for the Dirksen amendment No. 1215, with the time between 12:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. on that day to be equally divided and controlled by the proponents and the opponents, respectively, and that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] have the right to modify his amendment until the yeas and nays are ordered thereon.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, by legislating to authorize a program of public works and human and economic developments for the Appalachian region, we will be doing for our own country what we have been generously doing for other countries through foreign aid for the past 17 years, and we will be helping people who want to be useful partners in the expanding economic progress of our great country. In short, the program represents a sound investment in an area which—though

rich in human and natural resources—is going to waste.

The program embodied in the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 should not be looked upon as welfare for the people in the nine States who will participate in the projects. We shall all benefit from this effort by making another area of our Nation more self-sufficient.

I must admit to having a personal interest in the legislation because of its importance to West Virginia and her bordering States. We look with hope to the development of better health and treatment centers, vocational education facilities, long-needed highway expansion, a better utilization of our rich timber resources, and to a revitalization of the coal industry which, we all know, is the economic backbone of the region.

In each case, the proposed legislation would answer specific needs and, in the long run, would increase the standards of living of all Americans.

For the moment, I would ask the Senate to consider the plight of the men and women in this section of our country—men and women who are the sons and daughters of pioneers who, themselves, gave to the United States and the world, in peace and in war, their best years and efforts.

Through the years, children have been taught in schools about the value of coal in the industrial revolution that propelled America into the forefront of world developments. In years to come, history will record the role of Appalachia in rebuilding Europe from the rubble of World War II.

The achievements of coal miners, their daring and bravery in their daily work, and the advancement made by the industry have helped to instill a deep love for America in the hearts of our schoolchildren.

When the coal industry was going full force, Appalachia was also progressing. However, the advancement of science and automation was also moving ahead. In recent years, increased use of residual oil has added to the problems of the coal industry, and unemployment has resulted.

By 1960, the ranks of the unemployed had swelled to 380,000, or 7.1 percent of the Appalachian labor force, compared to 5.0 percent throughout the United States.

With the slowdown in employment, there was an understandable lack of investment in the area by business enterprises looking for expansion. This withdrawal of investment had its effect, too, on job opportunities in the region.

While each pitfall spelled a new hardship for families who were born and reared in these States, these problems, when combined, were even more devastating. They forced a massive outmigration of this native population from its homeland to other States.

Many of the people who remained now find themselves casualties of the era of automation.

The report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission contains an endless number of important facts about this area. These are a few of the most vital:

In Appalachia, almost one in three families lives on an annual income of \$3,000 or less. Elsewhere in the United States, that figure drops to one family in every five.

The average per capita income for the balance of the United States—\$1,900—is 35 percent greater than the Appalachian figure of \$1,400.

For every 100 persons over 25 years of age elsewhere in the United States, 8 have failed to finish 5 years of school. In Appalachia, that figure rises to more than 11, or 45 percent higher than the balance of the United States.

Thirty-two out of every 100 Appalachian citizens over 25 have finished high school, contrasted to almost 42 persons out of every 100 in the balance of the United States.

Retail sales in Appalachia in 1962 were equal to 6.4 percent of national totals, a figure well below Appalachia's 8.5 percent share of U.S. population.

In this area, 26.6 percent of the homes need major repairs and 7.5 percent are in such a dilapidated condition that they endanger the health and safety of the families. The comparable percentages for the rest of the United States are 18.1 and 4.7, respectively.

If it were not for the faith of these people in their land, these figures would certainly have discouraged the most hearty among them.

Let us now look at this program of self-help to rebuild the land of Appalachia—that ribbon of neglect which stretches from Pennsylvania to Alabama.

The milestones are, of course, the projects that will improve health, education, and economics. We will be ever grateful for those efforts to educate both the children and young adults in the grants to construct vocational education centers.

Grants to build vitally needed hospitals and regional health diagnostic and treatment centers will be similarly welcomed.

We have heard much talk about the highway program about which the report from the President's Commission says:

Instead of upgrading or expanding the most heavily traveled routes, a development system seeks to stimulate the flow of people and goods to and through remote areas which have a developmental potential; it seeks, in short, to create traffic and to open up areas where commerce and communication of people with people have been sorely inhibited by lack of ready access.

Those of us who have long believed that highways are the key to economic growth in West Virginia welcome this recognition by our Federal Government.

Important, too, is the \$5 million fund that would be set up to spur the development of the timber industry.

A revitalized timber industry can be a key element to the economic growth of Appalachia. The present growth of timber is underutilized within the region, and its possible contribution to employment and local wealth is far from realized. Measures to expand and diversify the region's forest industries must and will be undertaken by this legislation.