

60111

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 23, 1965

No. 134

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, as we pause in this moment of supplication to lift our Te Deum for the emancipated realm in which our lot is cast, a land where the people rule, we would remember in our thought and prayer the fettered lands where freedom is but a haunting memory and an agonizing hope.

By our remembrance of them we would send our assurance through and across any curtain or wall that no threats of their present ruthless masters will make America break her vow to keep alive the remembrance of perpetrated atrocities until the enslaved peoples are free from the spoiler's clutch and their soil is no longer defiled by his abominations. Give us the solemn realization that to pray for our own progress and prosperity and at the same time to keep silent, to pass by unheeding on the other side, while the plots of a diabolical scourge cut the very roots of a dozen nations' future fate, is to forfeit all right to our own high privilege and heritage. Help us in these days of crisis and destiny to face the searching eyes of that One who took as His holy mission the proclamation of liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. And so this dedicated week in the name of the God of Justice we would make ourselves the captives of the captive nations and beseech Thee to use our lips and our breath to sound forth a trumpet that shall know no retreat until all men are free from the tyranny of despots.

In the Redeemer's name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 22, 1965, was dispensed with.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 481, S. 1588.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be temporarily postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PENALTIES FOR ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT OR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 482, H.R. 6097.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6097) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 3, line 22, after the word "shall", to strike out "preclude" and insert "suspend"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "to such extent as the Attorney General of the United States shall direct." and insert "until Federal action is terminated."; and at the top of page 4, to insert:

(1) Violations of this section shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Assistance may be requested from any Federal, State, or local agency, includ-

ing the Army, Navy, and Air Force, any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 498), explaining the purposes of the bill and the need for this much desired proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to rectify the omission in Federal law by making it a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President, the President-elect, the Vice President, or, if there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President of the United States, the Vice-President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President. In addition, it makes it a Federal crime to attempt, or to conspire, to kill, or kidnap any of the individuals designated.

STATEMENT

There was no Federal criminal jurisdiction with respect to the assassination of the President on November 22, 1963. It is anomalous that Congress has legislated in other ways to protect the safety of the Chief Executive and other Federal officers, but has never made the murder of or an attack on the President a Federal crime. Under existing Federal criminal law, title 18, United States Code, threatening harm to the President is a Federal offense (sec. 871), as is advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by assassination of any of its officers (sec. 2358). The murder of Federal judges, U.S. attorneys and marshals, and many other specifically designated Federal law enforcement officials is a Federal crime (sec. 1114); as is conspiracy to injure any Federal officer on account of, or while he is engaged in, the discharge of his official duty (sec. 372).

Notwithstanding these various criminal provisions covering other officials in Federal service, the Federal law today fails to assure full and complete Federal investigative and prosecutive jurisdiction over acts designed to harm the Chief Executive of the United States.

A primary advantage resulting from the enactment of this measure would be the assurance of clear Federal jurisdiction in the

July 23, 1965

investigation and prosecution of Presidential assassinations. Clear Federal jurisdiction in this area would minimize the conflict and confusion growing out of concurrent jurisdiction of Federal and State agencies. Enactment of this bill would mean that investigation of the acts covered and of any possibility of a future attempt would be conducted by Federal law enforcement officials. At present, Federal agencies participate only at the sufferance of local authorities. Enactment of the bill would also insure that the detention and protection of suspects accused of committing any of the acts against the President and Vice President would be under Federal control. A further value of such legislation would be that suspects would be protected by Federal practices and procedures in their trial and prosecution.

A Committee amendment provides that the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have jurisdiction over investigations of violations of this act and such investigations be the fixed responsibility of one agency. From the standpoint of investigative experience and expertise the Federal Bureau of Investigation has demonstrated that it has the know-how and the talent to conduct these investigations. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has demonstrated through its present close association with police departments throughout the country that it is able to work in concert with all law enforcement agencies.

It is self-evident that the murder of the President of the United States is a crime against the National Government. The committee restricted the coverage of the bill to the President and Vice President, and, in the absence of the Vice President, to the officer next in order of succession. (The bill also applies to any individual acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States and during the period between election and inauguration, to the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect.) The committee considers it unnecessary to require that the hostile act occur while the victim is engaged in (or because of) the performance of official duties. The injury suffered by the United States as a consequence of an assault on any of the officers specified in the bill does not bear any relationship to the activities of the victim at the time of the assault nor to the motives of the assailant. In this connection, the committee adopts the following statement made by Senator George F. Hoar in the 1902 debate on legislation seeking to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime:

"What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the Executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important to this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour."

This bill is designed to implement recommendations for a Federal criminal statute on the subject made in the "Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy." After a thorough and painstaking investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, the Commission urged that the Congress adopt legislation which would: "Punish the murder or manslaughter of, attempt or conspiracy to murder, kidnaping of and assault upon the President, Vice President, or other officer next in the order of succession to the Office of President, the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, whether or not the act is committed while the victim is in the performance of his official duties or on account of such performance" (at p. 455).

There have been a number of efforts in the past to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. All such efforts have failed. A number of bills were introduced

immediately following the assassination of President Kennedy. Approximately 50 measures on this subject have been introduced in the 89th Congress. A Judiciary subcommittee of the House of Representatives conducted 2 days of hearings on May 26 and 27, 1965 in which the Deputy Attorney General and the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the former counsel to the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, a representative of the American Bar Association, and congressional sponsors of this legislation appeared and testified.

The committee believes the need for this legislation is manifest and recommends the bill to pass.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senate will approve today H.R. 6097, "An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes."

This bill, which will become law when signed by the President, represents substantially one of the recommendations made by the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, on which I had the honor to serve. I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations made by the Commission, which will be found on pages 454, 455, and 456 of the Commission's report, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission's review of the provisions for Presidential protection at the time of President Kennedy's trip to Dallas demonstrates the need for substantial improvements. Since the assassination, the Secret Service and the Department of the Treasury have properly taken the initiative in reexamining major aspects of Presidential protection. Many changes have already been made and others are contemplated, some of them in response to the Commission's questions and informal suggestions.

ASSASSINATION A FEDERAL CRIME

There was no Federal criminal jurisdiction over the assassination of President Kennedy. Had there been reason to believe that the assassination was the result of a conspiracy, Federal jurisdiction could have been asserted; it has long been a Federal crime to conspire to injure any Federal officer, on account of, or while he is engaged in, the lawful discharge of the duties of his office. Murder of the President has never been covered by Federal law, however, so that once it became reasonably clear that the killing was the act of a single person, the State of Texas had exclusive jurisdiction.

It is anomalous that Congress has legislated in other ways touching upon the safety of the Chief Executive or other Federal officers, without making an attack on the President a crime. Threatening harm to the President is a Federal offense, as is advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by the assassination of any of its officers. The murder of Federal judges, U.S. attorneys and marshals, and a number of other specifically designated Federal law enforcement officers is a Federal crime. Equally anomalous are statutory provisions which specifically authorize the Secret Service to protect the President, without authorizing it to arrest anyone who harms him. The same provisions authorize the Service to arrest without warrant persons committing certain offenses, including counterfeiting and certain frauds involving Federal checks or securities. The Commission agrees with the Secret Service that it should be authorized

to make arrests without warrant for all offenses within its jurisdiction, as are FBI agents and Federal marshals.

There have been a number of efforts to make assassination a Federal crime, particularly after the assassination of President McKinley and the attempt on the life of President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1902 bills passed both Houses of Congress but failed of enactment when the Senate refused to accept the conference report. A number of bills were introduced immediately following the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Commission recommends to the Congress that it adopt legislation which would:

"Punish the murder or manslaughter of, attempt or conspiracy to murder, kidnaping of and assault upon the President, Vice President, or other officer next in the order of succession to the office of President, the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, whether or not the act is committed while the victim is in the performance of his official duties or on account of such performance."

Such a statute would cover the President and Vice President or, in the absence of a Vice President, the person next in order of succession. During the period between election and inauguration, the President-elect and Vice-President-elect would also be covered. Restricting the coverage in this way would avoid unnecessary controversy over the inclusion or exclusion of other officials who are in the order of succession or who hold important governmental posts. In addition, the restriction would probably eliminate a need for the requirement which has been urged as necessary for the exercise of Federal power, that the hostile act occur while the victim is engaged in or because of the performance of official duties. The governmental consequences of assassination of one of the specified officials give the United States ample power to act for its own protection. The activities of the victim at the time an assassination occurs and the motive for the assassination bear no relationship to the injury to the United States which follows from the act. This point was ably made in the 1902 debate by Senator George F. Hoar, the sponsor of the Senate bill:

"What this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important to this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour."

Enactment of this statute would mean that the investigation of any of the acts covered and of the possibility of a further attempt would be conducted by Federal law enforcement officials, in particular, the FBI with the assistance of the Secret Service. At present, Federal agencies participate only upon the sufferance of the local authorities. While the police work of the Dallas authorities in the early identification and apprehension of Oswald was both efficient and prompt, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who strongly supports such legislation, testified that the absence of clear Federal jurisdiction over the assassination of President Kennedy led to embarrassment and confusion in the subsequent investigation by Federal and local authorities. In addition, the proposed legislation will insure that any suspects who are arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

July 23, 1965

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator knows that this is one of the recommendations made by the President's Commission which investigated the assassination of the late President Kennedy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, and it is on the basis of those recommendations that the proposed legislation is now before the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. I know that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 483, H.R. 903.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 903) to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, H.R. 903, passed by the House and reported to this body by the Interior Committee with a recommendation to pass, authorizes the addition of approximately 5,500 acres of land to the Kings Canyon National Park in California. All of the acreage, with the exception of 80 acres which is private land, is already in the ownership of the Federal Government. The additional 80 acres would cost the Government only \$5,100.

The land was not originally included in Kings Canyon Park so that studies could be made to see if the area was suitable for water or power development. The studies have been completed and all are in agreement that it would not be feasible for water storage projects, and there is no local objection to including the area in the park system. As a matter of fact, over half of the property is already being administered by the National Park Service under an agreement with the Forest Service.

The area lies on the South Fork and Middle Fork of the Kings River, is an awe-inspiring vista similar to Yosemite Valley, and is a logical addition to a magnificent park.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 499), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 903 is to enlarge the boundaries of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., to include two areas, Cedar Grove (about 2,880 acres) and Tehipite Valley (about 2,740 acres), which are now excluded from it.

NEED

Kings Canyon National Park was established by the act of March 4, 1940 (54 Stat. 41). When its boundaries were fixed at that time, the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas, though recognized to be of national park stature, were omitted because of the possibility that they might be useful for water storage projects. Studies in the meantime have indicated that such developments shall not be undertaken, and the opposition to inclusion of these two areas in the national park has evaporated.

The inclusion of these two areas in the park will assist in protecting and preserving them and will, in addition, enhance the attractiveness of the park to the public. The Cedar Grove area, now a part of the Sequoia National Forest, provides an entrance to the park. It is already being administered by the National Park Service under a memorandum of understanding with the Forest Service and was visited by nearly 150,000 persons during 1964. The Tehipite Valley area, on the other hand, is a part of the Sierra National Forest. It has been described as "an unaltered wilderness gem, accessible only to hikers and horsemen." It is expected that it will continue to be administered without any development except, possibly, trails.

All but 80 acres of the land within the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas is already in the ownership of the Government. The estimated cost of acquiring the 80 acres of private land is about \$5,100. The committee recommends strongly that the National Park Service acquire these 80 acres and such other inholdings as exist within Kings Canyon National Park at as early a date as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

RURAL WATER FACILITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 484, S. 1766.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1766) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 3, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "40" and insert "50"; in line 5, after the word "area", to insert "or"; in line 10, after the word "living", to strike out the comma and

"or (iii) that part of the development cost of a facility constructed by a public body which is in excess of the costs which can be financed within the amount of obligations or levies permitted by law for which alternate revenue financing is not available" and insert "Provided, however, That in determining the ability of a public body to repay, consideration shall be given to any applicable legal debt ceiling or tax or assessment limits and to any other improvements contemplated to be financed within those limits."; on page 4, line 16, after the word "loan", to insert "or grant"; in line 23, after the word "to", where it appears the second time, to strike out "any public body or such other agency" and insert "public bodies or such other agencies"; on page 5, line 2, after the word "which", to strike out "does" and insert "do"; and in line 6, after the word "area", to strike out "not included within the boundaries of any incorporated or unincorporated city, village, or borough" and insert "primarily engaged in or associated with agriculture and not"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Secretary is also authorized to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies to provide for the application or establishment of soil conservation practices, shifts in land use, the conservation, development, use, and control of water, and the installation or improvement of drainage facilities, and recreational developments, all primarily serving farmers, ranchers, farm tenants, farm laborers, and other rural residents, and to furnish financial assistance or other aid in planning projects for such purposes.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants aggregating not to exceed \$25,000,000 in any fiscal year to such associations to finance specific projects for works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water in rural areas. The amount of any grant made under the authority of this paragraph shall not exceed the lesser of (i) 50 per centum of the development cost of that portion of the facility necessary to enable the project to serve the area which can be feasibly served by the facility and to adequately serve the reasonable foreseeable growth needs of the area, or (ii) that portion of the development costs which are above the probable ability of the association to repay a loan for such purposes from income or assessments levied at a rate or charge for service within the ability of a majority of the users to accept and pay for such service and maintain a reasonable standard of living: Provided, however, That in determining the ability of a public body to repay, consideration shall be given to any applicable legal debt ceiling or tax or assessment limits and to any other improvements contemplated to be financed within those limits.

"(3) No grant shall be made under paragraph 2 of this subsection in connection with any facility unless the Secretary determines that the project (i) will serve a rural area which is not likely to decline in population below that for which the facility was designed, (ii) is designed and constructed so that adequate capacity will be or can be made available to serve the present population of the area to the extent feasible and to serve the reasonable foreseeable growth needs of the area, or (iii) is necessary for orderly com-

community development consistent with a comprehensive community water development plan of the rural area and not inconsistent with any planned development under State, county or municipal plans approved as official plans by competent authority for the area in which the rural community is located. On October 1, 1968, the Secretary may make grants prior to the completion of the comprehensive plan, if the preparation of such plan has been undertaken for the area.

(4) The term 'development cost' means the cost of construction of a facility and the land, easements, and rights-of-way, and water rights necessary to the construction and operation of the facility.

(5) No loan or grant shall be made under this subsection which would cause the unpaid principal indebtedness of any association under this Act and under the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, together with the amount of any assistance in the form of a grant to exceed \$4,000,000 at any one time.

(6) The Secretary may make grants aggregating not to exceed \$5,000,000 in any fiscal year to public bodies or such other agencies as the Secretary may determine having authority to prepare official comprehensive plans for the development of water systems in rural areas which do not have funds available for immediate undertaking of the preparation of such plan.

(7) Rural areas, for the purpose of water systems, shall include any area primarily engaged in or associated with agriculture and not having a population in excess of five thousand inhabitants."

Sec. 2. Section 308 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) striking out "\$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$450,000,000";

(2) in clause (a) striking out "except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than three years from the date of the note"; and

(3) striking out clause (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(b) may retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate specified in the insurance agreement applicable to the loan";

(b) Section 309(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations and the remainder of such charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "all or a portion, not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the unpaid principal balance of the loan, of any charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans; and any remainder of any such charge";

(c) Section 309(f)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 506), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

In general, this bill would provide for grants and increased loans for water facilities in rural agricultural areas. It would also expand the Farmers Home Administration insured loan authority and provide

means of making such loans more attractive to investors through better yields and repurchase agreements.

With the committee amendments, it would—

1. Replace the present \$500,000 limit on direct loans, and \$1 million limit on insured loans, to any association under section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act with a \$4 million limit on loans and grants to any association under that section. Loans under that section are made for soil conservation, changes in land use, water use and control, drainage, and recreation, primarily serving farmers, ranchers, and other rural residents. Construction grants are not now authorized, but would be authorized by the bill for water systems;

2. Authorize grants of up to \$25 million per fiscal year to associations to finance water facilities serving rural areas. No grant could exceed either 50 percent of the development cost or that part which is in excess of the association's ability to finance. No grants could be made for facilities to serve areas with populations likely to decline below that for which the facility is designed, facilities with inadequate capacities, or facilities which are not needed or are inconsistent with State, county, or municipal development plans;

3. Authorize grants of up to \$5 million per fiscal year for assistance in preparation of comprehensive plans for development of water systems in rural areas;

4. Define "rural areas" for the purpose of water systems as areas primarily engaged in or associated with agriculture and not having a population in excess of 5,000;

5. Increase the limit on loans which may be insured under subtitle A of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act (real estate and similar loans) in any one year from \$200 million to \$450 million;

6. Repeal the provision prohibiting agreements by the Secretary to purchase such insured loans in less than 3 years from the date of the note;

7. Permit the Secretary to fix the insurance charge retained by him from borrowers' payments, and the portion of such charge deposited in the insurance fund (instead of at least one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding principal obligation in each case). The portion of the charge deposited in the fund could not exceed one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding principal balance; and

8. Increase the amount of loans made from the insurance fund which the Secretary can hold at any one time for future sale to \$50 million (from \$25 million).

NEED FOR THE BILL

All over the United States and particularly in the dairy areas farmers are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the high sanitary requirements for food production with old-fashioned supplies of water.

Not just any water will do these days—it must be clean and chemically acceptable.

Rural communities, some 30,000 of them, need new water systems for food processing, for preparing vegetables for market, for fire protection, for maintaining local industries, and for household uses.

Until this need is met, these communities cannot grow and make their proper contribution to the overall growth of the Nation.

Until this need is met, they cannot absorb their part of the increasing population of our country—estimated at 100 million gain within the next generation.

Many communities where a new water supply would result in increased population and an expanded economy are presently unable to meet the cost by themselves.

The Senate has already approved authority for grants to political bodies to assist in providing water facilities for urban people. Our citizens in rural areas have the same need and are entitled to the same degree of assistance. The Farmers Home Administration has the

experience and knowledge necessary to solve the special problems involved in providing water to rural areas.

In its implementation of this law, the committee understands that the Farmers Home Administration will establish guidelines or standards of economic feasibility which will assure the most economical use of the Federal funds available to carry out the purposes of this legislation; and will also establish technical and engineering standards to assure proper construction of the facilities being financed under this law.

The need for the expanded insured loan authority provided by section 2 of the bill is described fully in the report of the Department of Agriculture on S. 709. In addition, the Department has advised the committee that applications for \$64,034,395 in farmownership loans were held over from fiscal 1965 because of lack of funds, and that it estimates new applications in fiscal 1966 for farmownership loans which would be made but for lack of funds at \$345,975,605, or a total demand for farmownership loans for 1966 of \$430 million. It also estimates applications for association loans under section 306 in its present form during fiscal 1966 at \$361,071,850, making a total demand by qualified applicants of over \$791 million.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is gratifying to know that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported favorably S. 1766, the rural water facilities bill. The need for this legislation is known to all of us as evidenced by the number of Senators who have joined in sponsoring the measure. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the principal sponsor of S. 1766, for his active leadership and perseverance in moving this vital proposal to fruition. There are approximately 30,000 rural communities in the United States which require new water systems for industry, farming, fire protection, household purposes, and many other uses. This is a critical situation in West Virginia where over 60 percent of the people are rural residents. This is a matter which often receives little recognition due to the fantastic expansion of urban areas—a problem which has commanded considerable attention and effort from public and private agencies. But for continued social and economic progress and our national growth we cannot serve our cities to the exclusion of rural citizens. The requirement is for coordinated development of rural and urban areas. As the Senator from Vermont cogently pointed out when he introduced this legislation, "America must spread out. Instead of continuing the drain from rural America to the urban areas, we should make the conveniences of the cities, provided for with public funds, also available to the smaller cities, the town and rural communities." The unprecedented increase in population cannot be absorbed by our metropolitan areas alone; it will require large cities and rural communities. To meet the needs of an expanding America we must not fail to exploit the growth and development potential of our rural areas. I support S. 1766 and I am confident it will receive early Senate approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

of California for their wisdom and foresight in enacting this progressive legislation.

Recently I introduced S. 2155, the criminal injuries compensation bill. The bill would set up a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission to award compensation to persons who suffer losses as a result of their being a victim of a crime of violence. I hope that the Federal Government will not lag too far behind the State of California in enacting such meritorious legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Post of July 23, 1965, and the California statute be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1965]

CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATED IN CALIFORNIA

California has become the first State to provide financial compensation for victims of violent crimes and the families of murder victims.

A bill creating a compensation fund administered by the State department of social welfare was signed into law this week by Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

New Zealand has a compensation system and Great Britain is experimenting with a similar system. A bill creating a Federal compensation board has been introduced by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

The most prominent American supporter of the compensation idea is Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, who has been named Ambassador to the United Nations.

[A California Statute]

CHAPTER

(An act to add Section 1500.02 to the Welfare and Institutions Code and to add Section 11211 to Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code as proposed by Assembly Bill No. 1682, relating to aid to families with dependent children)

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 1500.02 is added to the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

1500.02. Aid shall be paid under this chapter, upon application, to the family of any person killed and to the victim and family, if any, of any person incapacitated as the result of a crime of violence, if there is need of such aid.

The department shall establish criteria for payment of aid under this chapter, which criteria shall be substantially the same as those provided for aid to families with dependent children, provided, however, that aid shall be paid regardless of whether or not the applicant meets the property qualifications prescribed for that program. In no event shall expenditures under this section for the 1965-1966 fiscal year exceed one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000).

Upon conviction of a person of a crime of violence resulting in the injury or death of another person, the court shall take into consideration the defendant's economic condition, and unless it finds such action will cause the family of the defendant to be dependent on public welfare, shall, in addition to any other penalty, order the defendant to pay a fine commensurate in amount with the offense committed. The fine shall be deposited in the Indemnity Fund in the State Treasury, which is hereby established, and the proceeds in such fund shall be used for the payment of aid under this section.

This section shall not constitute part of this state's plan for participation in any aid program under the federal Social Security

Act, and shall be financed entirely by state and county funds. In all other respects, it shall be administered in the same manner as any other provision of this chapter.

SEC. 2. Section 11211 is added to Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code as proposed by Assembly Bill No. 1682, to read:

11211. Aid shall be paid under this chapter, upon application, to the family of any person killed and to the victim and family, if any, of any person incapacitated as the result of a crime of violence, if there is need of such aid.

The department shall establish criteria for payment of aid under this chapter, which criteria shall be substantially the same as those provided for aid to families with dependent children, provided, however, that aid shall be paid regardless of whether or not the applicant meets the property qualifications prescribed for that program. In no event shall expenditures under this section for the 1965-1966 fiscal year exceed one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000).

Upon conviction of a person of a crime of violence resulting in the injury or death of another person, the court shall take into consideration the defendant's economic condition, and unless it finds that such action will cause the family of the defendant to be dependent on public welfare, shall, in addition to any other penalty, order the defendant to pay a fine commensurate in amount with the offense committed. The fine shall be deposited in the Indemnity Fund, in the State Treasury, which is hereby established, and the proceeds in such fund shall be used for the payment of aid under this section.

This section shall not constitute part of this state's plan for participation in any aid program under the federal Social Security Act, and shall be financed entirely by state and county funds. In all other respects, it shall be administered in the same manner as any other provision of this chapter.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of this act shall become operative only if Assembly Bill No. 1682 is enacted by the Legislature at its 1965 Regular Session, and in such case at the same time as Assembly Bill No. 1682 takes effect; at which time Section 1500.02 as added to the Welfare and Institutions Code by Section 1 of this act is repealed.

PIONEER DAY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, tomorrow the people of my State join with the people of our sister State, Utah, to pay tribute to the early pioneers on the 118th anniversary of the settlement in our region. These early settlers were members of a uniquely American religious group, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It was on July 24, 1847, after 102 days on the trail, that the first Mormons arrived in a canyon overlooking the Great Salt Lake Valley. Their leader, Brigham Young, surveyed the valley and said simply, "It is enough. This is the place."

In the era of manifest destiny, the Mormon pioneers were among the first to attack the hardships of the expanding western frontier. As Prof. William Mulder has said:

In their westward movement they were like the fine filament preceding the thread as it seeks the eye of the needle. They were part of the vanguard of settlement that was already making the Oregon and California Trail a dusty highway.

These early Mormons were also in the forefront of the American scene in other ways. Religiously, the Mormon faith expressed the new liberal optimism in the

ability of many to better himself, to attain greater perfection.

The LDS also possessed a deep commitment to social justice. In fact, some of the early Mormons, through the practice of consecrated property, sought economic equality by deeding all property to the church and then allotting the returns from this property to members according to their needs. While this is not practiced today, the Mormons still have a comprehensive welfare program that reaches all corners of the Mormon community, assuring that none shall want.

Shortly after arriving in Utah, the Mormons began to develop the land and attempt colonization of the surrounding territory. In 1855 they pushed northward and founded Fort Lemhi, the first major attempt at settlement in my own State of Idaho. Then, in 1860, the Mormons founded Franklin, the first permanent settlement in the State of Idaho.

Like Thomas Jefferson, the Mormon settlers had an enduring faith in the value of agricultural labor. As the first Anglo-Saxon people to practice extensive irrigation, the Mormons were able to transform a semiarid region into a land of green and productive valleys.

During the latter part of the 19th century, the Mormons were a persecuted people. But today they occupy a prestigious position in American life; one of their members is considered a possible candidate for the office of President of the United States. Others have played a prominent role in Congress and have held such important executive positions as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Treasurer of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Commissioner of Education, and Secretary of the Interior, under Democratic and Republican Presidents alike.

The Mormons have attained this position of prestige, I think, because of their strong commitment to the clean and wholesome life. They maintain one of the few organized religions without a paid clergy. Church activities permeate the social structure of the communities where the Mormons live, drawing people from all stations of life into shared experience. Programs for Mormon youngsters are well designed to help prepare young men and women for the responsibilities of adulthood.

The Mormon tabernacle choir, besides being a source of accomplishment for the Mormons, is certainly one of the finest choirs in the world. At the request of President Johnson, this choir sang at the 1965 Presidential inauguration.

Aside from the laudable social and religious activities of the Mormons, they have also gained respect for their endeavors in the field of education. They have established several outstanding institutions of higher learning, the largest being Brigham Young University. In my own State they operate a fine junior college at Rexburg, Ricks College. The Mormons are strongly committed to the enlightenment of the people through education, and they devote a large portion of their resources to it.

Today people throughout my State pause in their daily activities to pay tribute to the Mormon pioneers. Their

courage, their valor, their fidelity to a common cause has set a standard for all. For these qualities and for the contributions made by their descendants, they have my respect and admiration. I am proud to join with the people of my State and the people of Utah in paying tribute to these sturdy Americans.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, those of us who attended the final services for Adlai Stevenson last Monday in Bloomington, Ill., were privileged to hear a moving and appropriate tribute to him by Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president of the Unitarian Universalist Association of North America.

I ask unanimous consent that this tribute be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

(By Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, Unitarian Universalist Association (of North America))

The very presence of this company speaks more eloquently and more tenderly than anything that we can say or sing. But here in the community and the church of his childhood and of lifelong associations, we pay to Governor Stevenson our most intimate and final tribute, recognizing also the lasting bereavement of all mankind.

Many of those who have loved him the longest and most dearly are with us, and each in the privacy of his own thoughts offers his own prayer; yet the larger company at Washington's National Cathedral bowed as reverently in his honor; and statesmen and the common people alike, the world around, have taken him to their hearts, and will mold his memory into their own images of the best life and prophecy of America in the 20th century.

Adlai Stevenson was destined by his heritage and his own nature for public service. And although in moments he shrank from that role, he also thrived upon it. It was at once a bitter cup that he had to drink, and the elixir of life that lifted him to the fulfillment of his own powers. He may not have thought that he had accomplished enough, for there were bitter disappointments, public and private, and yet unmistakably he was called to greatness; and the God that shines in the firmament of the heavens was radiant in his person and resonant in his voice. Not either ancient Israel or modern New York could produce a more articulate spokesman for justice and the right. If Winston Churchill could turn a phrase as well, it was not to liquidate the empire, but to keep the past upon her throne, whereas Governor Stevenson undertook the tougher task primarily of persuading a nation to minimize its sovereignty and to merge its hopes and fears with those of other nations. In his own words his attempt was "to defrost a * * * segment of the opaque window through which we see others and others see us," and thereby to increase understanding and fraternity among men.

He added very recently that change is not the great enemy of men, but violence is that enemy. If political success is to raise the level of the national debate and of the world's dialog, to make truly qualified people feel more at home in public life, and to influence one's country and mankind for good, then he achieved success emphatically and dramatically. We shall remember his combination of greatness and goodness.

We salute him for his modesty and his ambition, for his ability and his affability.

for his wisdom and his wit, and for his failures and his successes. His mind was extraordinarily free from prejudice, and subservient to the truth. If at times he was deliberate in the making of decisions, it was because he sought the moral context for the workable answer.

He was a philosopher and a politician. All men counted with him, but none too much. He was an American, but he died in England. He was a Democrat, but his family newspaper, of which he was a principal owner, is Republican. He was a Unitarian but in our Nation's Capitol his flag-draped casket lay fittingly before an ecumenical Episcopal altar. In the climax of his career he was an Ambassador to the United Nations, with strong convictions of his own, and with an unflinching fidelity to his country and his President. If there ever seemed to be contradictions in his life, Emerson's explanation is applicable, "to be great is to be misunderstood." He was not just an American, or only a Democrat, or exclusively a Unitarian, or solely an Ambassador. He was also always the universal citizen. His patriotism was intense, but it had no bounds. His politics were both purposeful and personal. And the cardinal principles of his religion were freedom and human dignity.

My colleague, his cousin, Robert Richardson, reminds me that their great-grandfather, Jesse Bell, would be very proud to have us say that the Governor was truly Lincolnque in his idealism, his integrity, his compassion, and his humor, as well as in his love of the State of Illinois. He was a devoted son, and brother, and father, and grandfather. He was a loyal friend. And he was a servant to all the children of men. In that "distant day when nobody rattles a saber and nobody drags a chain," his name will shine with an ever-increasing luster.

He understood not only democracy and communism, but likewise the "moving forms and shadows of a world revolution." He was not cowed by complexity, but kept his eye on the goals that he knew to be worth every effort that could be bent in their direction. He believed in a better world that we ourselves can and must create here and now. Characteristically, a decade ago, with his friend Albert Schweitzer and Prime Minister Nehru, he was a prophetic advocate of a nuclear test ban treaty. "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that publishes peace." G. K. Chesterton once said that if we only had more visionaries among our statesmen, we might get something really practical done. Adlai Stevenson was that kind of a statesman.

Though there was a poignancy in his life that matched the hungers of his heart and the sensitiveness of his being, he had a faith that was greater than any problem or peril or defeat. And he was able to say with Esdras: "Great is the truth and mighty above all things."

"The memorial of virtue is immortal because it is know with God and with men. When it is present, men take example at it, and when it is gone, they desire it. It weareth a crown and triumpheth forever, having gotten the victory, striving for undefiled rewards."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this week we are observing Captive Nations Week. It is a week when all of those in the world fortunate enough to live in freedom should be reminded of those many millions for whom freedom is only an unreal dream or a word without meaning.

The Iron Curtain which descended over so many once free nations after World War II has not been raised. For more than 20 years tens of millions of

people have suffered the despotic rule of Soviet colonialism. Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Czechs, Ukrainians, Rumanians, Armenians, and others have all felt the iron heel of Soviet domination. Economic exploitation, religious persecution, expropriation of property, terror, purge and imprisonment have in varying degrees become part of their daily lives.

But seeds of unrest and change are present in Eastern Europe. Freedom's flame still burns brightly in many hearts. It is up to us to do everything that we can to keep that flame alive until all of these peoples, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, achieve freedom and the right to govern themselves.

McGee
PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION—REJECTION BY THE LEGISLATURE OF COLORADO

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, several States have already acted with dispatch and wisdom to ratify the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution pertaining to the continuation of the executive department of this Government in competent hands should disability strike our President at any time. But one State, Colorado, has acted with similar haste to reject the amendment on the specious grounds, as expressed by one member of its State senate, that the United States of America has done without this amendment for 175 years and can still do so.

In truth, Mr. President, I think virtually all of us are aware of the fact that the United States of America has been lucky in the past and cannot afford to flirt with the danger of political chaos which could arise out of a crisis over Presidential succession. As the Washington Post said editorially on Thursday:

On many occasions the country has been only one heartbeat away from potential chaos because of the absence of any mechanism for replacing the Vice President.

It is, indeed, rather shocking, as the Post has said, Mr. President, to note such complete unawareness of the problems of Presidential succession and disability as that manifested in Denver. But, in all fairness, Mr. President, I would add that I doubt in all seriousness if the action of the Colorado Senate, taken, apparently, in some haste, represents in fact the thinking of the people. I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial, "Reaction in Colorado," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REACTION IN COLORADO

Colorado's rejection of the proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution merits some kind of note in the annals of political stagnation. This projected reform, designed to make certain that the office of President of the United States will always be occupied by an able-bodied and competent person, had majority support in Denver as elsewhere. But a handful of Republican State senators denied it the necessary two-thirds vote on the ground that the United States had done

without it for more than 175 years and could still do so.

This argument advanced by L. T. Skiffington could be made with equal force against any governmental reform at any time. It could be made with equal force against the act giving statehood to Colorado. It is an essentially unenlightened plea for the status quo with no regard for the changed conditions which have made improvement of our machinery of government imperative. Indeed, the premise on which the argument is based is itself a betrayal of ignorance. The country passed through perilous times while President Garfield and later President Wilson were stricken and could not be temporarily relieved of their onerous duties because of the existing defect in the Constitution. On many occasions the country has been only one heartbeat away from potential chaos because of the absence of any mechanism for replacing the Vice President.

It is rather shocking to note such complete unawareness of the problems of Presidential succession and disability as that manifested in Denver. Fortunately, three other States—Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Oklahoma—hastened to ratify the proposed 25th amendment. We have no doubt that 35 additional States will complete the ratification process. In the end, Colorado may wish to erase the negative distinction it has acquired by a minority response to any argument based on blind reaction.

A CHALLENGE TO EXTREMISTS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Columnist Max Freedman has paid the State controller of California, Alan Cranston, a much deserved tribute in the Washington Evening Star for Thursday.

Mr. Cranston, Freedman notes, has spoken out importantly about extremists in his State, expressing the view which none can challenge that the extremist makes his greatest gains when moderate, responsible people remain silent or act timidly. And he makes the very valid point that extremists, whether of the left or right, are one of a kind, really. The point is well made by Cranston, and by Freedman in his column, that both types of extremists are fundamentally destructive of the democratic process, though the rightwing variety enjoys a fundamental advantage in that many Americans honestly believe they are defending American ideals and freedoms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's column, "Californian Challenges Extremists," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 22, 1965]

CALIFORNIAN CHALLENGES EXTREMISTS (By Max Freedman)

It could not have been easy for State Controller Alan Cranston to make his recent important speech on extremist groups in California. Had someone from outside California spoken in these harsh and challenging terms, he would have been charged with maligning the State as a paradise for extremists. Cranston accepted that risk because he believes that the extremists make their greatest gains when the moderate and responsible people are silent or timid.

What fails to emerge from Cranston's

analysis, otherwise so admirable, is an explanation of why California should be so open to the appeal of the extremists. Their supporters are found among young people as well as among the old and the retired taking counsel from their frightened prejudices. We must apparently reconcile ourselves to the curious fact that the liberal and progressive traditions of California are crossed by a more raucous and extreme strain.

Cranston begins by citing documentary proof that the Communists and the John Birchers often say the same thing. For example, the monthly magazine published by the leftwing Progressive Labor Party charges that President Kennedy was assassinated on orders from big business. The John Birch Society claims that Kennedy was killed because he was not a good enough Communist. Both denounce President Johnson and Walter Reuther as conspirators afraid to avow their real purposes or to disclose their real masters. Both denounce the American press as an organized conspiracy against the truth.

The major difference between the leftwingers and the John Birchers is that one group thinks the United States is headed toward fascism and the other claims the United States is moving toward communism. It is not much of a difference for people who believe in freedom.

Cranston cited evidence that 3,000 groups in the United States are now spending \$30 million a year promoting rightwing extremism. Last year the John Birch Society alone spent an estimated \$3 million and is now planning to add 38,000 new members in California. Robert Welch, the society's president, devotes about half his time to enlarging the California membership.

Another rightwing extremist, Carl McIntire, a deposed Presbyterian minister now conducting a disreputable anti-Catholic radio campaign, grossed an estimated \$1.5 million in 1964.

Welch has said, "Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud."

The one thing common to all extremist groups is their inflexible conviction that they are right and their opponents are evil. Acting on this principle, they are no longer open to reason, no longer willing to respect the wishes of the majority. What makes them dangerous is neither their ugly political technique nor their contempt for the facts. They are fundamentally destructive of the democratic process itself. They create a climate of fear so that their doctrines of hate may prevail. The vicious personal attack on the reputation of Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California, an attack to which he responded with rare courage, is only one example of the evil weapons they will use against a public man of whom they disapprove.

Yet the rightwing groups, as Cranston has shown, enjoy one vast advantage always denied to the Communists. Many Americans do honestly believe that these extreme rightwingers are defending American ideals and values. They see them owing no foreign allegiance and parading their claims as super-patriots. If the rightwingers are rough with their opponents, it is a roughness justified by the cause being served. That is the basic appeal of the extremists, in California as elsewhere. Yet the warning by the Los Angeles Times is profoundly true that subversion remain subversion whether it comes from the right or the left.

The extremists probably have made life a misery for Cranston since he denounced them. But other public officials will no doubt follow his courageous example. A concerted exposure of the false assumptions and dangerous methods of the extremist groups is the best way to discredit them utterly.

CHICAGO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA SUCCESS IN ALASKA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra enjoys an international reputation for excellence. I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the overwhelming success it enjoyed at Fairbanks, Alaska. This was the first event in which a major orchestra had appeared in the city, and I am glad to read that thunderous applause acclaimed the performance.

I ask that the articles from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner and New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, May 25, 1965]

FIRST MAJOR CONCERT THRILLS FAIRBANKS, SYMPHONY LAUDED

(By Prof. Charles Davis, head, music department, University of Alaska)

Last evening's capacity crowd accorded the Chicago Symphony a tremendous ovation as it concluded the first of two concerts in Hering Auditorium.

To residents of the Fairbanks area it was a truly memorable evening as one of the world's foremost symphonies conducted by the internationally known Jean Martinon became the first major orchestra ever to present a concert in the farthest North city.

With meticulous precision and ensemble the orchestra recreated the mood and contrasts of Beethoven's Symphony No. 6—the "Pastoral." At the outset, the vagaries of the acoustics of the Hering stage caused momentary uncertainties in the thinly scored section of the first movement. Quickly adjusting to the situation, the ensemble demonstrated its virtuosity in painting colors from the quiet pastels of countryside to the thunderous storm which interrupts the restful quiet of "the Brook."

DELICACY OF LINE

In opening an orchestral program with the "Pastoral" the first two movements in their predominantly restrained dynamics seem somewhat overlong. This reviewer might have preferred a degree of anticipation in the "Andante Molto Moto," as the tempo seemed to suggest too great a degree of repose. The serenity of this second movement was characterized by great delicacy of line and phrasing.

Certainly the third movement of the symphony is a welcome change of mood, with its Landler dance rhythm. From this movement the heightened tension builds to its ultimate climax in the "storm." Here the instruments combined with a sonority of tone that overwhelms, still maintaining an exactness and balance characteristic of great ensemble playing. The final Allegretto was a consummate portrayal of joy and peace.

Following the intermission, the orchestra turned to a composition in a contemporary idiom—"Orchestra Variation on a Theme of Paganini"—by Blacher. Announced by solo violin in its original form, the theme, disguised and altered, moves to various sections of the orchestra with accompaniments in widely contrasting rhythm and sonorities. The complexities of rhythm combined with a modern harmonic usage create highly entertaining program fare.

Concluding the program was the familiar tone poem "Don Juan" by Richard Strauss. This composition, typical of the early Strauss writing, exploits all sections of the orchestra in intricate melodic motifs and contrast-

ing stentorian harmonies. Once again the orchestra demonstrated great virtuosity with its precision of ensemble, its delicate maneuvering from one solo instrument to another or to the full complement of players as Conductor Martinon deftly recreated the score.

THUNDEROUS APPLAUSE

Accorded a thunderous, standing ovation by the audience, the orchestra responded with the bombastic "Rakoczy March" by Hector Berlioz. Still reluctant to accept the end of a thrilling evening, the audience kept Conductor Martinon returning for repeated acknowledgements.

Tonight, the symphony promises an equally exciting evening with Associate Conductor Irwin Hoffman conducting a program including Schubert's "Symphony No. 6," the "Harry Janos Suite" by the contemporary Composer Zoltan Kodaly, and the Brahms "Symphony No. 2." Hoffman, a protege of the late Serge Koussevitzky, was formerly conductor of the Vancouver, British Columbia Symphony and has appeared as guest conductor of leading orchestras throughout the United States, Mexico, and South America.

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1965]

CHICAGO SYMPHONY CHEERED IN ALASKA
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, May 26.—Monday evening's capacity crowd accorded the Chicago Symphony a tremendous ovation as it concluded the first of two concerts in Lathrop High School auditorium.

To residents of the Fairbanks area, it was a memorable evening as one of the world's foremost symphonies conducted by Jean Martinon became the first major orchestra to present a concert in the farthest north city.

With precision and ensemble the orchestra recreated the mood and contrasts of the chief work, Beethoven's Symphony No. 6—the "Pastoral." At the outset the acoustics of the Lathrop stage caused momentary uncertainties in the thinly scored section of the first movement. Quickly adjusting, the ensemble demonstrated its virtuosity in painting colors from the quiet pastels of countryside to the thunderous storm which interrupts the restful quiet of the brook.

Accorded a standing ovation, the orchestra responded with the "Rakoczy March" by Berlioz.

At the end of the concert the audience made Mr. Martinon return for repeated acknowledgements.

The symphony played again Tuesday night before going on to Winnipeg, Manitoba, for another concert.

THE 14(b) ISSUE—RIGHT-TO-WORK LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is before the Senate in S. 256 and action is imminent in the House on the companion bill, H.R. 77, which was reported favorably on June 22.

Over the years, the right-to-work question surrounding the issue has drawn forth literally millions of words, engendered bitter feelings, caused the expenditure of untold sums of money by those who contend for and against, and shaken the entire electorate in such States as Ohio and California when the issue appeared on the ballot there. Advocates and proponents are to be found in this body, and we can look forward to strong expressions of differing views before the roll is called on the repeal bill.

I support the bill for repeal. I have sought to look at the question rationally

rather than emotionally, and I have come to my conclusion as a result of the persuasiveness of the facts surrounding the situation.

On Monday of this week, Hobart Rowan, of the Washington Post, examined the question in his column appearing on the business page of that paper. His article is penetrating, and as a business editor his views are worthy of attention. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC IMPACT: SMOKESCREENS OBSCURE RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

(By Hobart Rowen)

The battle over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—those unfortunate few words that allow an individual State to ban the union shop—is about to be resumed, this time on the House floor. The public will thus be treated again to an appalling amount of hokum and buncombe on this issue.

Those individuals and organizations that want to preserve the right-to-work laws permitted by section 14(b) ought to quit shadowboxing, and say forthrightly that they're against the whole idea of labor unions.

Right or wrong, at least that position would end the pretense that they are losing valuable sleep over the question of individual liberty.

At the present time, 19 States have taken advantage of section 14(b) by prohibiting any agreement between an employer and a union specifying membership in a union as a condition of employment. Even if a company and a union should desire a union shop, it would be illegal in these 19 States.

But while the chamber of commerce and others weep crocodile tears about the loss of liberty in the other 31 States, the basic motive of the right-to-work crowd is to attract industry with the promise of cheap, nonunion labor.

And as the AFL-CIO has ably documented, the less respectable of the antiunion band have a close alliance with the ultraright-wing John Birch types, whose bias on this score is merely one aspect of a longer record of antiquated, antisocial, 19th century prejudices.

Organizations like the chamber, which are eminently respectable, if behind the times, fail to see the inconsistency between their avowed support of the principle of collective bargaining and their demand for continuance of section 14(b).

They are saying, in effect, that an employer should have to bargain with his workers (that's what collective bargaining means)—provided they haven't formed an effective union. If one can make sense out of the chamber position, it is that employers should strive to return to that nostalgic era when they could deal with their employees individually.

Well, maybe it would be nice—the way some people look at it—to do without unions. But the chamber better forget it, and take a look at the calendar. It is 1965.

Most of the really influential leaders of American industry have taken a more sophisticated approach. They know that the "individual freedom" propaganda is just that—a fine created by the same imaginative public relations men who thought up the misleading right-to-work phrase.

Actually, the real leaders of American industry couldn't care less about repeal of section 14(b). Some, it is true, wish that President Johnson had staved off AFL-CIO president George Meany's request. But policymakers in the U.S. business community deal regularly with unions and the union shop.

By and large, they'd be panicked if they

weren't assured of well-organized, responsible labor unions to provide a steady flow of manpower for them.

One of L.B.J.'s Texas aids confides: "When a big national company comes in down home, they generally ask: 'Where's the union?' If it's not there, they're disappointed. They want one right on tap."

But the local wheels are generally nervous. They are skeptical of union organizers, who are equated to invaders, men who want to upend precious States rights. Above all, the local men, often pillars of small-time chambers of commerce, feel they can keep wages low if the union is kept out. They freely advertise and solicit on that basis.

The unions have floated their share of baloney, too. Repeal of section 14(b) is not a do-or-die proposition for union organization, because they can and do survive in the right-to-work States.

And despite denials, it is true that the notion of a union shop involves a certain element of compulsion. This ought to be freely admitted, because the compulsion is justifiable. Where collective bargaining is the law of the land, a man who is deriving benefits from union representation ought to join the union. At least, he ought to pay dues, which is all the law requires.

The unions want to do away with section 14(b) because it is a bone in the throat. The Wagner Act established the principle of collective bargaining, and then the Taft-Hartley Act partially reneged. For 18 years this has invited antiunion harassment. Both management and labor could turn their attention to more useful and productive endeavors if section 14(b) were scrapped.

RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am glad to have been a cosponsor of the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, which Senator Ribicoff introduced last February and in which 67 Members joined him. That resolution expressed the sense of the Congress, in part, that "the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

The Senate passed that resolution by a unanimous rollcall vote on May 14, and it was passed by the House with amendment last week, on July 12.

The importance of this resolution, and the indisputable facts which called it forth, are underlined by an article appearing in the current issue of the noted nondenominational religious journal, the Christian Century. Under the title "Cultural Genocide in Russia," its former editor, Dr. Harold Fey, now a professor of social ethics at the Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis, discusses the extent of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. He warns that success of the efforts being made against the Jewish faith in "an officially atheistic state" "will have demonstrated that it has perfected a pattern of cultural genocide which can be used against other religions when their turn comes."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: