

New Jersey: Peter J. Gannon, chief, Bureau of Navigation, Department of Conservation and Economic Development, State of New Jersey, Trenton.

New York: Cecil E. Heacox, secretary, New York State Conservation Department, State Office Buildings Campus, Albany.

North Carolina: L. C. Bruce, North Carolina Ports Authority, Post Office Box Drawer 149, Raleigh.

North Dakota: Milo W. Holsveen, State engineer, 1301 State capitol, Bismark.

Ohio: Henry J. Crawford, attorney at law, 1857 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland.

Oregon: Donel J. Lane, executive secretary, State water resources board, 500 Public Service Building, Salem.

Pennsylvania: A. J. Sommerville, chief engineer, water resources development, Department of Forests and Waters, room 491, Education Building, Harrisburg.

Rhode Island: Henry Ise, chief, division of harbors and rivers, Department of Public Works, State of Rhode Island, Providence.

South Dakota: J. W. Grimes, State engineer, Pierre.

Tennessee: Edward Nave, senior engineer, division of water resources, Department of Conservation and Commerce, 201 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville.

Texas: E. Jack Turner, Dow Chemical Co., Freeport.

Utah: Harold E. Wallace, 530 Judge Building, Salt Lake City.

Virginia: Col. Donald C. Hill, USA (retired), chief engineer, Virginia State Ports Authority, 1600 Maritime Tower, Norfolk.

Washington: Dorsey M. Martin, Dayton.

West Virginia: Litz McGuire, Logan.

Wisconsin: John F. Sainsbury, Brown County Harbor Commission, courthouse, Green Bay.

Wyoming: C. H. "Cliff" Davis, Gillette.

Puerto Rico: Jose Ysern de la Cruz, Post Office Box 3508, San Juan.

Virgin Islands: Senator Frits Lawaetz, St. Croix.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 52d NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

FOREWORD

We believe that the future of our Nation and its people will have to depend in large degree on an adequate supply of fresh water. Realizing this our congress, now and as in years past, rededicates its best interests to the development of projects proposed by our Federal agencies for the purpose of conserving and expanding the natural resources of our Nation. The time has come for a full realization of the potentials that are evident and our interests are hereby dedicated to the fruition of a full program of such development.

FLOOD PLAIN INFORMATION

Man's encroachment on the natural flood plains of our Nation's streams has, in many ways, lacked economic justification when such encroachment is considered in the evaluation of flood control projects. The Federal program for advising local governments and communities of flood damage prevention through wise and adequate planning for flood plain regulations has been consistent with the funds thus far available for the purpose. We suggest that the Federal appropriation for flood plain information studies be increased, in fact, from the present amount of \$1 to \$3 million which will permit assistance to localities now in need of help in solving their local problems related to flood plain encroachment.

SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS

The program for small navigation projects authorized by section 107, of the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960, has provided many communities in the Nation with projects which otherwise would have had to

wait a matter of years in some instances for specific congressional authorization. The success of the program is limited, however, by annual appropriations. It is appropriate to suggest to our National Congress that the amount for individual projects be increased to \$500,000 and that the annual appropriation be increased to \$5 million. This would permit the adoption by the Chief of Engineers of more worthwhile projects which are for consideration under this authority granted to him.

BANK STABILIZATION

The Federal and State, local and private investment in levees, transportation facilities, bridges, docks, and industrial complexes is so great that it behooves Congress to become alert to the requirements for additional funds to provide a systematic program of bank stabilization in and along our streams.

EXPEDITE THE PROGRAM

Lack of funds or inadequate funds have long been a delaying factor in the development of our land and water resources. Such delays are costly because of price increases over a long construction period. Moreover, early completion provides for realizing benefits sooner and a return on the Federal investment. Increased appropriations to the extent of the Federal agencies' capability to use them are indeed appropriate.

USER CHARGES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress reaffirms its opposition to the imposition of charges in any form on the waterways of our Nation. The elimination of the historic free use of these waterways can only result in a reduction if not the extinction of this valuable asset to our economy. In effect the imposition of taxes or charges for the use of our waterways is glaringly inconsistent with the basic principle that tax reductions stimulate our economy. This resolution is not applicable to the St. Lawrence Waterway, the Panama Canal, or any other international waterway supported wholly or partially by user fees.

MANNING AND INSPECTION OF TOWING VESSELS

This Congress is opposed to any legislation which would require the inspection and certification of certain towing vessels and give the U.S. Coast Guard authority to specify the number of crew members for such vessels. The present system of self-policing by the towing industry on inland waters has worked well and should continue.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas adequate water supplies of satisfactory quality are vital to the economic and social well-being of every American; and

Whereas pollution abatement has long been a primary concern of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; and

Whereas the continued degradation of our water resources by pollution is a barrier to the Nation's full social, economic and recreational growth and its scenic beauty; and

Whereas this degradation of water resources is most prevalent in the urban areas of the country; and

Whereas the construction grants program of the Water Pollution Control Act has demonstrated its value by stimulating the building of treatment works; and

Whereas the existing program does not meet present-day needs; and

Whereas the present allocation formula and dollar ceilings on construction grants limit participation by local governments especially in urban areas where waste treatment facilities are most needed; and

Whereas the States should retain responsibility and authority for setting standards of water quality for waters within their boundaries and cooperatively with other States and the Federal Government for interstate streams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recommends:

1. Legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to provide for allocation of funds among the States so as to reflect more adequately the needs for pollution abatement facilities.

2. Legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to eliminate existing discriminations against large cities and urban areas and to encourage States and localities to take decisive action to end water pollution.

3. Legislation to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to require that States establish acceptable standards of water quality as a prerequisite to the approval of Federal grants-in-aid for water pollution abatement facilities.

4. A substantial increase in Federal appropriations for grants-in-aid of local water pollution abatement facilities.

The resolutions committee has considered the proposed North American water and power alliance program and requests the executive vice president to submit available information on the project to the members of the board of directors prior to the next annual meeting in order that the board may recommend appropriate action on this comprehensive project.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BENEFITS OF INLAND WATERWAYS

It is resolved, That, while the national defense benefits of inland navigation have long been recognized in principle they have not been accepted in fact to the extent the National Rivers and Harbors Congress believes to be justified.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress therefore recommends that national defense benefits be included in the evaluation of inland and intracoastal navigation projects.

THE 200-BILLION-ELECTRON-VOLT ACCELERATOR

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest regarding the location for a proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, I introduced into the record on July 9 a list of 110 proposals that the Atomic Energy Commission had received recommending sites for the location of this proposed facility. Today I wish to up-date that list by adding seven additional proposals that have been received by the Atomic Energy Commission since that time. I ask that the list of additional proposals be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I mentioned in my July 9 statement that the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif., under the direction of Dr. Edwin McMillan, had completed a design study for a 200 Bev accelerator. Summaries of that design study will soon be on their way to the proposers of a site for this accelerator facility. According to the LRL design study the total construction authorization required for this facility is now estimated to be \$348 million. The report on Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics submitted to the Joint Committee by President Johnson in January 1965, estimated the cost for this facility at \$280 million; the policy report, however, did indicate that a more firm construction cost estimate would be avail-

July 26, 1965

able at the time that the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory studies were completed. Included in this \$348 million estimate is an estimate of \$40 million for initial research equipment for this facility.

I would like to reiterate what I said in my July 9 statement, the proposed 200 Bev accelerator has not been authorized for construction nor has it been authorized for engineering design work. The current fiscal year 1966 Atomic Energy Commission authorization does permit, however, a continuation of research and development on this accelerator. I do not anticipate that a request for authorization of engineering design for this facility will come up before the Congress prior to next year's authorization hearings on the Atomic Energy Commission's Fiscal Year 1967 budget. The report on Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics does not contemplate a request for construction funds until Fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I am making these comments and entering this additional list of site proposers because I know of the great interest in this proposed facility by many members of the House of Representatives. I shall continue to try to keep this House fully advised as to the developments that occur in the consideration of this project.

The additional seven proposals are from Colorado; Mesa County; Kentucky, Carrollton, Murray, Paducah; Minnesota, Duluth; New Jersey, Millville, Warren Grove.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for the humane treatment of laboratory animals. The bill which I am introducing has the endorsement of the Nation's largest humane organizations, the American Humane Association and the Humane Society of the United States. Without restricting or reducing much-needed medical research this new legislation will require a high standard of humane treatment of animals used in research, thus fulfilling the moral obligations of our society.

All Americans have been shocked by the deplorable conditions existing in some laboratories, and the manner in which these animals are acquired, transported, and kept. We are all aware of the sometimes cruel and endlessly repetitious experimentation. A society which adopted humane slaughter legislation years ago to curb abuses and unnecessary cruelty in the meat-processing industry cannot sit by any longer and permit these conditions to exist in a field which justly prides itself in trying to relieve pain and sufferings of humans through research. The great failure has been in the inability of any responsible authority to provide minimum standards of care which would insure the daily humane treatment of these animals, and which makes this legislation necessary.

My bill would establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare, which would be headed by a Coordinator and would be responsible for insuring that adequate humane procedures are followed in the handling, care, and use of laboratory animals which are used in research financed through Federal Government funds.

Leading laboratories have already discovered that the proper care and treatment of animals greatly aids research and actually reduces costs. These researchers are as concerned about this problem as the American public, and I am sure will join in the support of legislation to regulate those in the industry which seek to profit from the sufferings of animals in their custody.

It is of primary importance that this country's many vital research projects continue their fight to prevent disease and eliminate human suffering. It is also of importance that we guarantee humane treatment of laboratory animals used in this research. Responsible researchers agree that these two goals are not incompatible. It is my sincere hope that the legislation which I am introducing today will be an effective step toward the achievement of these objectives.

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

[Mrs. BOLTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WAR ON WASTE

(Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since this administration is waging wars on so many fronts, I would like to suggest a massive escalation in its alleged war on waste. The confusions, conflict of programs, and lack of policy are most clearly revealed by only two examples of waste and dollar loss in the foreign aid program. While our Government tries to limit overseas travel and purchases by Americans, the Government itself wastes millions of our dollars and contributes to the outflow of gold.

In Brazil, we paid \$3.8 million for the shipment of Brazilian sugar to other AID recipients, when we had Brazilian currency which could have been used and the dollars saved.

In the United Arab Republic where we had sold millions of dollars worth of tallow for American dollars, our AID agency through Public Law 480 has replaced the dollar payments by giving the Arabs surplus tallow for soft currencies which we cannot use.

In Brazil we gave away dollars. In the Arab Republic we displaced \$5.3 million of transactions which would have improved our balance of payments and our gold reserve.

Though the methods they use are diverse, they are consistent in their ability to waste our gold. If the administra-

tion wants more than a fictional war on waste, there is no better place to start than right in the foreign aid program, and no more appropriate time than now.

I am preparing a resolution designed to stop such absurd and wasteful contradictions.

For On Callaway
VIETNAM

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, to all of us keeping a cautious eye on our foreign policy, the news today from Vietnam is particularly ominous. Saturday's downing of an Air Force Phantom, 40 miles west of Hanoi, would in any event be sobering news; yet in this instance, the news is chilling, for the Phantom was probably shot down by a Soviet surface-to-air missile. Should this prove true, Americans will have to face the fact that our Government has long known of the Hanoi area SAM sites, yet has never seen fit to destroy them. Members of Congress and responsible citizens throughout the country have repeatedly called for the destruction of these sites. Why should it require the loss of American lives and American planes to awaken us?

The downed Phantom was engaged in a bombing mission against the Lang Chi explosives plant 55 miles northeast of Hanoi. I have long been among those advocating this type of offense as the surest means of preventing an escalated all-out war. Recent reports of stepped up activity in this area are, of course, heartening. But more important, I would hope that they are an indication of our Government's decision to attack other military targets in North Vietnam and to establish a naval blockade around the North Vietnam ports. For these are the sort of tactics that, when used in support of our regular forces, can prevent this war from becoming an all-out ground war with its frighteningly heavy cost of American lives and material.

The President is today said to be reassessing his policies in light of the week-end events. Let us hope that he will call upon every means at our command—economic, military, and diplomatic—to defeat Communist aggression and thereby prevent this war from becoming an all-out land war.

RURAL YOUNG PEOPLE FROM 32 COUNTRIES TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE CONFERENCE AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS.

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my State of Kansas, and Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., in the Second Congressional District, are hosts this week to more than a hundred young men and women from 32 countries at the 12th annual midpoint conference of the International Farm Youth Exchange,

Court's ruling that all State legislators must be elected from districts roughly equal in population.

This did excite the Senate because the Dirksen proposal, if approved by two-thirds of the Senate and House, and three-quarters of the States, would tend to perpetuate a rotten-borough system that has weakened State government and had the effect of concentrating power in Federal Washington. DIRKSEN's amendment would exempt one branch of State legislatures from the Court's mandate, permitting their membership to be apportioned on factors other than population. Thus this branch would be in a position to veto the projects of the popularly elected branch.

No more vital issue has been raised at this session of Congress, notable as it has been for its handling of such complex problems as those posed by discrimination against potential Negro voters and the prohibitive cost of medical care for the unaffluent aged. The resolution DIRKSEN brought to the floor by his parliamentary maneuver was identical with the one he had been trying to pry out of the Senate Judiciary Committee with a favorable report. A few months ago it appeared that the task of persuading the committee would offer no challenge to the talents of the Republican leader. A majority of the 16-member committee was predisposed to give present State legislators some measure of protection in their jobs and, at the same time, to rebuke the Court for meddling.

COSTLY SHORTCUT?

But by the time the committee got around to voting DIRKSEN's majority had evaporated. Members were equally divided, eight to eight. So informed by the nose counters, DIRKSEN talked through the committee's session to prevent a showdown in which his motion to report the resolution would have failed. He threatened further attempts to "educate" the committee but decided instead to shortcut the committee process, a decision that may prove costly to him. It would be most unusual for Congress to sanction a constitutional amendment not previously cleared by a standing Senate committee.

The immediate cause of DIRKSEN's failure in committee was the defection of Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York. As a Republican, JAVITS had been under pressure from Albany to string along with DIRKSEN. Republicans in the legislature owe their strength to mal-apportionment favoring sparsely populated upstate counties. But JAVITS' own stronghold is New York City. When labor unions and civil-rights groups awakened to the damage the Dirksen amendment could do their interests, JAVITS felt the heat from their direction. He decided to abandon the Dirksen cause and to sponsor a compromise amendment of his own.

THE REAL CONTEST

Nevertheless, it is assumed that majorities both in the Senate and House remain more influenced by entrenched State politicians than by reformist constituents. The question is whether the majorities are two-thirds. Until debate has progressed to the point where this can be discovered, leaders of the opposition to DIRKSEN's resolution propose to keep the talk going in the Senate. Unless assured of the 34 votes necessary to beat it, they will try to filibuster it to death under the leadership of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, DIRKSEN's Democratic colleague from Illinois.

They will argue on the floor, as they have in committee, that the fight is not simply between urban and rural areas but rather between the new and old America. It is the now mushrooming suburban areas, not the cities themselves, that are worst victimized by old voting districts. It is the statehouse wingers, not the city bosses, who stand to lose most if the Court's one-man, one-vote deci-

sions are permitted to operate in the election of all State legislators to both branches. The contest is not really between Republicans and Democrats. Rather it is between stand-patters and progressives of both parties.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President,

some American military advisers in Saigon are distressed by the actions of Nguyen Cao Ky, presently Prime Minister or dictator of South Vietnam and formerly Air Vice Marshal of South Vietnam. It seems that the South Vietnamese have a proliferation of generals, air marshals, marshals and so forth, and very few privates to do the fighting. This dictator has been executing some Vietcong infiltrators as spies without trial—this in retaliation for Vietcong brutality to prisoners. Now he is threatening the execution of war profiteers in that unhappy jungle country. Drum-head trials and executions of prisoners of war should not be tolerated.

American officials in Washington and Saigon are even more distressed over a statement made by Ky shortly before he took over forcibly as Prime Minister. In an interview he was asked, "Who are your heroes, Marshal Ky?" Did he say George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, Gen. Robert E. Lee, General Patton or Rommel? He did not. His answer was:

I have only one—Hitler. I admire Hitler because he pulled his country together when it was in a terrible state in the early thirties. The situation here in South Vietnam is so desperate that one man would not be enough. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam.

This is the leader in South Vietnam that our military is now supporting and keeping in power.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am strongly of the opinion that an obligation rests upon Federal, State, and local governments to adopt measures which will secure needed hospital and medical service for our elderly citizens who are financially incapable of providing such service for themselves. As a consequence, I have supported the Kerr-Mills Act which, if properly implemented, would provide all needed hospital and medical service without limitation to all persons 65 years of age and upward who are unable to provide such care for themselves.

I was constrained, however, to vote against H.R. 6675, which is popularly known as the medicare bill. My reasons for so doing are set forth in the following statement which analyzes some of the salient provisions of the bill in the form in which it was approved by the Senate.

1

While the advocates of the bill profess the purpose of merely providing hospital and medical service for persons 65 years and upward in age who are unable to provide such service for themselves, the

bill undertakes to provide certain hospital and medical service for all persons of such ages, including well-to-do elderly persons able financially to provide such service for themselves.

The truth is that a substantial part of the 19 million Americans 65 and over are far better able to provide hospital and medical service for themselves than the overwhelming majority of the taxpayers who are to be taxed under the bill to provide such service for them.

A survey conducted during recent years shows these facts concerning the medical expenses of Americans aged 65 years and over: 47.6 percent of them paid for such service through Blue Cross insurance; 29.3 percent of them paid for such service through other private insurance or in cash possessed by them; 20.5 percent of them paid for such service under the provisions of the Kerr-Mills Act; and only 2.6 percent of them were unable to pay for such service in one of these ways. Accordingly, this survey indicates that only 23.1 percent of Americans of 65 years and upward need Government assistance in paying their hospital and medical expenses.

Despite this fact, this bill places upon the Federal Government responsibility for financing hospital and medical service for all the other 76.9 percent of Americans of 65 and upwards.

For this reason, one is justified in inferring that much of the support for this bill comes from those who are not primarily concerned with providing hospital and medical service for those elderly persons unable to provide such service for themselves; but, on the contrary, are primarily desirous of having the Federal Government assume bureaucratic control over the lives of the American people.

In my judgment, the proper approach to the problem of hospital and medical service to the elderly is that of the Kerr-Mills Act, which contains provisions sufficient to give unlimited service of this nature to those unable to provide such service for themselves while leaving to the well-to-do the responsibility for providing such service for themselves out of their own resources.

There is no solid basis for the proposition that the Federal Government must provide for the health needs of the well-to-do in order to avoid a so-called degrading means test for others. That is true because the law could simply provide that persons having an income below a certain amount or possessing property below a certain value would automatically be eligible for benefits under the Kerr-Mills Act.

2

The bill seriously impairs the entire social security system because of the social security taxes it requires to be levied upon the employed and self-employed throughout their entire working lives.

Existing social security taxes are imposed at the rate of 7.25 percent upon the first \$4,800 of the earnings of each employee and are payable one-half by the employer and one-half by the employee. This being true, the maximum

social security tax payable under existing law amounts of \$348 annually.

Under the new medicare bill and existing laws, the social security tax will ultimately rise to a total of 11.5 percent of the first \$3,600 of earnings of each American worker, if in some miraculous way there should be no further inflation and no increase in the cost of hospital and medical service, and no expansion of the benefits of the social security system. This means in plain English that each job in America paying gross earnings of \$6,600 a year will contribute to the Federal Government in social security taxes alone \$759 annually, half of such sum, or \$379.50, being paid by the employer, and the other half, or \$379.50 being paid by the employee.

The plight of the self-employed person who has no employer to assist him in paying social security taxes upon his earnings will be even worse. Under this bill and existing laws, the social security tax of the self-employed person earning the maximum taxable amount; that is, \$6,600, will eventually rise to \$518.10 annually.

The burden which these social security taxes will impose upon employees and self-employed persons can be appreciated more readily if one bears in mind that they are in essence income taxes upon gross earnings without the advantage of any exemptions or deductions.

When one meditates upon the burdens which Congress is placing upon earnings, he inevitably calls to mind Aesop's fable about the goose which laid the golden egg, and wonders whether its moral will ultimately apply to the entire social security system.

To all practical intents and purposes, the United States now has three separate Federal taxes upon the funds arising out of employment relationships. The first of these is the Federal income tax, which imposes a heavy burden upon the earnings of all employers, employees, and self-employed persons. The second is the unemployment compensation tax which is imposed upon payrolls, and is paid by employers. This third is the social security tax, which is imposed upon payrolls and is paid half by the employer and half by the employee.

Despite the heavy increases to be made in the social security taxes, the advocates of the medicare bill now admit what I have long contended and they have long denied; that is, that no adequate health program can be tied solely to the social security system. I say this because the bill provides that during the first full year of its operation more than \$1.2 billion must be taken from general taxes to make the bill workable. What sums will be taken from general taxes in the future for this purpose no one can now foretell. A prophet would not jeopardize his reputation in the least, however, if he should predict that withdrawals from general taxes for these purposes will amount to many billions of dollars annually in subsequent years.

The medicare bill illustrates the all too often repeated truth that advocates of new Federal programs minimize their costs and their impact upon the economy of the Nation.

The impact of the additional social security taxes imposed for carrying out the medicare program alone upon employment relationships is illustrated by the fact that such taxes will ultimately rise under the terms of this bill from \$2.4 billion annually to \$9.4 billion annually, even if the miraculous should happen and there should be no inflation and no increase in the cost of hospital and medical service and no expansion of the benefits of the social security system.

There is something essentially unfair in relying upon social security taxes to provide hospital and medical service for elderly persons financially incapable of providing such services for themselves. This is so for at least two reasons.

Social security taxes are imposed solely upon earnings in employment and not upon income derived from investments, property, or other sources. Consequently, an obligation, which in good conscience ought to rest upon all taxpayers, is imposed solely upon one group of taxpayers to the exclusion of all others.

Besides, the provisions of the bill tying the support of a medicare program for elderly persons financially incapable of defraying the cost of their own health needs to social security taxes is utterly repugnant to the principle that taxes should be imposed upon persons in accordance with their ability to pay. Under the bill, a self-employed person earning \$6,600 a year pays exactly the same social security tax as a self-employed person earning \$66,000, or \$660,000 or \$6,600,000 a year.

The medicare bill poses other serious problems which give me considerable pause.

It is difficult to believe that young people will be willing to continue in employment or self-employment for as much as 40 years and pay out of their earnings as much as \$379.50 each year, if they are employed by others, or as much as \$518.10 each year, if they are self-employed, for the support of a social security system and a medicare program when they are not to receive any benefits from either of them until they have spent their youth and their middle age and become elderly persons. As a consequence, it is altogether probable that the imposition of the heavy social security taxes will either lead to the destruction of the social security system in its entirety, or will result in pressures to broaden the social security system and medicare program into programs under which the United States will be converted into a virtual welfare state, and will undertake to manage the affairs of the people from the womb to the tomb.

What the establishment of such a welfare state will ultimately cost in dollars, in the character of our people, and in the nature of the United States as a country nobody knows.

We do recognize, however, as one of the fundamental laws of life that when government undertakes to do for people what people can do for themselves, the people not only lose their liberty, but they lose their incentive to strive to better their lot—the incentive which makes the free enterprise system work and life satisfying. Moreover, we can look with

misgivings to Britain which was once a great empire upon whose flag the sun never set. Her politicians promised her people that the Government would relieve them of the responsibility for their own lives, and manage their affairs from the cradle to the grave. Her people relied upon these promises, and Britain became a second-rate nation scarcely able to defray the cost of her welfare programs.

The Kerr-Mills Act is vastly superior to the medicare bill in respect to procedures for administration. This is true because the Kerr-Mills Act is based upon the theory that it is highly desirable to keep as much government as near home as possible. It places the administration of the medical program authorized by it in State and local governments, and restricts the Federal Government to the task of supplying most of the funds needed for its maintenance.

The medicare bill provides, however, that the medicare program established by it is to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a Federal Department notoriously given to the practice of taking a mile for every inch of authority extended to it by Congress. This propensity on its part is well illustrated by its current demands upon school districts throughout the country in general and throughout the South in particular—demands which go far beyond title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and far beyond the Constitution as interpreted by the Federal courts.

We can readily surmise that in its administration of the provisions of the medicare program, the hand of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will reach further and further into the field of medical practice.

I wish to indulge one more observation. As the inevitable consequence of including within the medicare program the millions of elderly persons financially capable of providing for their own health needs, the medicare program is grossly inadequate in its provisions for the hospitalization of persons suffering from chronic and protracted diseases. As it was reported to the Senate by the Senate Finance Committee, it made provision for such persons to remain in hospitals for only 60 days, and required as a condition precedent for their so doing that they should pay \$40 of the cost of their hospitalization. As amended in the Senate, the medicare bill provides that persons suffering from chronic and protracted illnesses may be hospitalized subsequent to the expiration of the 60-day period only in case they are able to pay and do pay \$10 per day for such hospitalization. The result of the effort to establish a medicare program covering all the elderly people, regardless of their financial ability, is that the elderly people who ought to have Government assistance are denied such assistance in the hour of their greatest need.

Congress would have been wiser and more just if it had adhered to the approach of the Kerr-Mills Act, and provided governmental assistance to elderly people financially incapable of obtaining such assistance for themselves, and left all other elderly Americans with the re-

Congress Giving Up Control of Purse**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body knows that one of the principal powers of the legislative branch under our form of Government is control of the purse strings. Every Member also knows that this power has been steadily eroding away in recent years.

In an illuminating article which should interest every Member of this body, one aspect of this steady loss of power was discussed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Under unanimous consent, the article by the gentleman from Wisconsin, entitled "Congress Giving Up Control of Purse," which appeared in the July 24 issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel, follows:

CONGRESS GIVING UP CONTROL OF PURSE

(By GLENN R. DAVIS, U.S. Representative, Ninth District, Wisconsin)

Acting in the light of their British colonial experiences, our Founding Fathers sought to make certain that their elected legislative representatives—their Congressmen—controlled the Federal purse strings.

Hence, section 9 of our Federal Constitution provided: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Sadly, and ominously, Congress has slipped into the slovenly habit of appropriating large sums of money, mostly in accordance with the patterns and amounts set in the executive budget, without proper concern for when the money will be spent, and without adequate post appropriation surveillance of the expenditure of the money.

In short, Congress is turning over too many signed checks to the President and his appointees.

In the fiscal year just begun, July 1, the President has said he will spend, that is, withdraw from the Treasury, \$99.7 billion during this and the succeeding 11 months. As you will note from the upper chart, he has asked Congress to authorize the spending of \$106.4 billion in this and subsequent fiscal years. Thus nearly one-third (\$34.4 billion) of this year's appropriated funds would be spent at the discretion of the President in future years.

At the same time, the President will drain off \$27.6 billion of prior years' appropriations.

At the end of this fiscal year—June 30, 1966—there will be \$101.5 billion available for expenditure by the executive departments of the Government. What a bundle of blank checks. And the signer of the checks, the Congress, has relinquished possession and control of them.

And this is only part of the true spending picture. Through Government trust funds, another \$28 billion will be taken out of the Treasury in this 12-month period. Such trust funds include social security, medicare (when authorized), and the interstate highway fund, to name a few.

As an instrument of further executive control of spending, the President has recommended several new user taxes, the proceeds of which would likewise go into trust funds to be disbursed by executive appointees without congressional appropriations.

Examples of such new sources of revenue, spendable without appropriation by Con-

gress, are the proposed doubling of the aviation gasoline tax, the establishment of a new soil conservation revolving fund, and the enhancement of transportation taxes payable into the interstate highway trust fund.

It is obvious that a supine Congress—and the 89th Congress seems to be even more supine than its predecessors—is rapidly relinquishing control of the public purse.

Unless that control is reasserted, and soon, the Members of Congress will be reduced, along with their constituents, to begging for political and economic crumbs at the back door of the White House.

Representative James Roosevelt Calls for Research Into New Mass Transit Systems**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 22, Station KFI of Los Angeles broadcast a news brief on the introduction of legislation (H.R. 10004) by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] to set up a 2-year, \$20 million federally sponsored research program to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new systems of urban transportation.

The legislation is identical to a bill I introduced (H.R. 9200) on June 17. Identical bills have also been introduced by 19 other Members: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN], H.R. 9763; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. KALPERN], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINNISH], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RONAN], H.R. 10003; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], H.R. 9207; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], H.R. 9208.

Following is the text of the broadcast: NEWS BROADCAST OVER STATION KFI, LOS ANGELES

California Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of Los Angeles, today trumpeted a call for the Federal Government to initiate research in determining what type of potential transit systems would get people within a city moving around in a faster, cheaper, and more efficient way.

Congressman ROOSEVELT, simultaneously with today's statement before the House of Representatives, introduced legislation which would provide the Housing and Home Fi-

nance Agency with an additional \$10 million to undertake such a research program. The bill amends the Mass Rapid Transit Act which Congress passed last year.

"Unfortunately," he said "the present Mass Rapid Transit Act can only help cities purchase buses and replace obsolete subway cars * * *. No substantial research is being sponsored by the Federal Government in an attempt to provide urban commuters with a technological breakthrough in intracity transportation.

"We should," Congressman ROOSEVELT explained, "be spending at least as much money on research to provide whole new systems which would move people about within cities rapidly, faithfully, economically, and efficiently, as we are in research on other modes of transportation."

"People need quick and safe ways to get about a city," he continued, "and new systems based on modern technology would help alleviate smog and contribute to the economic growth of cities and communities which they support."

Congressman ROOSEVELT pointed out that it was the responsibility of the Federal Government to initiate such research, but cities themselves should supplement the effort.

"A primary concern of mine, as a Los Angeles Congressman," ROOSEVELT said, "is to insure that there is an adequate intracity transportation system to relieve traffic and parking congestion and offset the inability of freeway systems to meet the onslaught of more automobiles."

For KFI news, this is Richard Barton from the Washington office of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Fe (M) Brown
Draft Dodging in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's issue of the Washington Post July 26, 1965, contained a number of significant reports concerning the situation in South Vietnam. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the Reuter dispatch concerning efforts to draft more Vietnamese youth into the Saigon Army. Apparently a substantial number of the young men prefer death to fighting against the Vietcong. The story also includes this statement:

Military sources said dodging the draft has turned into open rebellion.

This type of information, coupled with the statistics on the current desertion rate in the Saigon Army, may offer some clues as to the possibility of a military victory by the Saigon Government.

The pertinent portion of the article follows:

Meanwhile the death of 39 young Vietnamese who drowned when they jumped from a boat taking them to do compulsory military service focused attention on the government's growing recruitment problem.

The dead youths were among 50 who leaped from the naval vessel bound for a training school east of Saigon with more than 300 draftees aboard, Reuter reported.

Military sources said dodging the draft has turned into open rebellion. While the government is trying to build its forces from half

a million to 660,000 by the end of this year, an entire new class of draft-evading, cafe-lounging "cowboys" has emerged in Saigon.

To escape the regular police roundups they hide, dress up as girls, or even mutilate themselves.

Ripon Society—Fracturer of GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the Ripon Society continues as it has been acting recently, it will not need a very large mold in order to contain the surviving remnants of the Republican Party.

I fail to perceive that divine right or knowledge which gives to this rump group, with headquarters somewhere in an obscure college in an obscure State, the privilege of its constant carping of the leadership of House Republicans.

If they in good faith seek Republican unity, they might try, for a change, to attempt to unify with the responsible, frontline leadership of the Republican Party—the leadership which is operating in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

A recent editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel is in line with the above comments and has prompted these frankly disgusted remarks:

SPLINTERS HURT

The Ripon Society, a splinter group in the leftwing of the Republican party, is hard at work seeing to it that the GOP stays hopelessly fractured.

Latest divisive effort by this group of self-styled liberal Republican intellectuals is a newsletter taking to task Representatives LAIRD, of Wisconsin, and FORD of Michigan, House GOP leaders, for playing politics with Vietnam.

LESSON OF 1964 IS IGNORED

The only hope for a Republican comeback rests in coalescing the right and left wings of the party into a united force capable of offering at least a little challenge to the common enemy, the Democrats. That was the lesson of 1964, but the Ripon Society shows no sign of having learned it. So detrimental to coalition is the Ripon Society's efforts that one is led to suspect that it is a Democratic front designed to keep the Republican party deeply divided. If that is so, it is probably unnecessary, for the Goldwater wing remains as opposed as ever to yielding in order to achieve the essential GOP coalition.

It is somewhat ironic that the Ripon Society should be criticizing LAIRD for what it calls following the Goldwater line. Only a few days ago, LAIRD was, in effect, criticizing Goldwater for splintering the GOP with the Free Society association.

All of this public Republican political quarreling must comfort Lyndon Johnson. He's got his hands full with dissension and power struggles in the Democratic ranks, but he enjoys the advantage of heading a party that knows the importance of coalition and how to achieve it on the surface, however turbulent things may be underneath.

Meanwhile, the Republicans go on killing each other off.

War Criminals in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Members of this House share in the widespread admiration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for its alert and continuing interest in matters pertaining to our national security.

In accordance with such a policy, the VFW has become an effective spokesman for the men in our Armed Forces.

Recently our Nation, and the free world, were shocked by news of the murder of Sgt. Harold G. Bennett, who was a prisoner of the Communists in South Vietnam. Since then other stories of atrocities against U.S. servicemen captured by the Communists have come to our attention.

The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. John A. Jenkins, immediately issued a public statement calling on the U.S. Government to notify all concerned, including the Communists, that they would be held strictly accountable for killing and torturing any of our servicemen.

It was a powerful statement made on behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who comprise the membership of the VFW and under unanimous consent I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks:

WAR CRIMINALS IN VIETNAM

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 8.—The national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala., today urged that Communists in South Vietnam be held "strictly accountable for murders and torturing of U.S. prisoners." The VFW commander, who recently returned from an extensive trip through southeast Asia, including the combat areas of South Vietnam, said, "the U.S. Government should serve formal notice on the Communists in South Vietnam—and all those backing them, including Hanoi, Red China, and the Soviet Union—that before this war is finished, we will insist upon prompt and full punishment of those responsible for killing U.S. military and civilian prisoners."

Explaining the VFW position, Commander Jenkins continued, "the execution, for instance, of Army Sgt. Harold G. Bennett was nothing but cold-blooded murder. The U.S. Government has an obligation to the memory of Sergeant Bennett and every other one of our citizens killed or tortured by the Communist bandits and terrorists in South Vietnam. This obligation requires us, as a nation, to bring to justice and punish all those who help commit these evil deeds."

Commander Jenkins further stated that the VFW believes that our Government should keep an accurate record, available to the public, of all such atrocities against our citizens in South Vietnam. "We cannot," the VFW commander said, "let this war end without settling the account with the murderers of our patriots like Sergeant Bennett."

"Those terrorists are war criminals and they must realize that the United States

will make it certain they suffer the punishment of war criminals."

Concluding, Commander Jenkins said "The murder of Sergeant Bennett is another reason why President Johnson is absolutely correct in refusing to negotiate with the Vietcong. The VFW unwaveringly supports President Johnson in his position. We of the VFW realize that to negotiate with the Vietcong would mean doing business with those whose hands are dripping with the blood of American patriots."

Wisconsin Legislature Joint Resolution Memorializes Congress on Firearms Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin State Legislature in Senate Joint Resolution 75 memorialized the U.S. Congress to reject the pending amendments to the Federal Firearms Act—S. 1592. Under unanimous consent, the Wisconsin State Legislature's Senate Joint Resolution 75, which was passed by both houses of the Wisconsin State Legislature, follows:

S.J. RES. 75

A joint resolution to memorialize the U.S. Congress to reject the pending amendments to the Federal Firearms Act (bill S. 1592—89th Cong.)

Whereas said proposal, while attempting United States is bill S. 1592—89th Congress, to amend the Federal Firearms Act; and

Whereas said proposal, while attempting to prevent recurrence of the unfortunate events which tragically climaxed in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, would have the effect of drastically limiting the privilege of every responsible American citizen to purchase hunting and sporting small arms, which privilege is inherent in the constitutionally guaranteed "right of the people to keep and bear arms"; and

Whereas the sportsmen of Wisconsin have been traditionally opposed to registration of small arms now proposed by S. 1592—89th Congress; and

Whereas said proposal, by requiring license fees of \$500, not only would force many small, independent businesses out of existence, but would also make it impractical for the sportsman to reload cartridges for his own use and that of his friends; and

Whereas said proposal extends Federal regulation into an area in which the States themselves have already taken the initiative of most careful regulation, as witnessed by the provisions in the statutes of this State pertaining to reckless use of weapons under sections 941.20 to 941.24, and pertaining to machineguns under chapter 164: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to reject bill S. 1592—89th Congress in its present form, because said proposal places the enforcement emphasis on availability and possession of arms rather than on the reckless or criminal use of arms; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary