

VETERANS

Veterans Administration:
Proposed closing of 32
installations - March 8

Court of Veterans Appeals:
establish - March 25

Cold War Veterans' Readjust-
ment Assistance Act - July 19

Payment of certain benefits to
widows of veterans - July 7



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965

No. 43

THE PROPOSED CLOSING BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OF 32 INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the past month, I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from officers and members of veterans' organizations in my State, as well as from countless numbers of persons in our veterans hospitals or from those with friends or relatives in those hospitals. As you know, the State of Minnesota is not directly affected by the proposed closing of these facilities; but as a representative of my people, I want to state that I fully support those who are asking for further consideration of these measures. We already have the facts and figures relating to costs and economy. But I think we have a legitimate concern in determining the cost in terms of human lives, human relationships, and human needs. I submit for the Record, as an indication of the conviction of my people in the State of Minnesota, a copy of an editorial which was published in the Gopher Overseer of this month. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

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

[From the Gopher Overseer]
VA ECONOMY MEASURES

The Veterans' Administration order closing 32 VA facilities came as a sudden shock to the Nation's veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars had been aware that a study of the Veterans' Administration by the Bureau of the Budget had been going on for more than a year. It was no secret that a few very old, obsolete VA hospitals might be closed down and their patients transferred to more modern facilities, and that some regional offices in areas already served by another office might be discontinued.

Nowhere was there any indication of the change in policy which resulted in the wholesale downward revision of the entire Veterans' Administration structure.

Present law authorizes the establishment and operation of 126,000 hospital beds in the VA system. In addition to this, President Kennedy authorized 2,000 beds within the hospital system to provide nursing care for invalid veterans. The 88th Congress last fall

passed H.R. 8009 authorizing the Veterans' Administration to establish still another 4,000 nursing care beds in VA facilities and other beds in State and private homes.

Despite these mandates, the VA at last count had only 46 nursing beds in operation with only 1,000 scheduled for operation this next fiscal year. Likewise, the authorized 125,000 VA beds are not being full utilized as indicated by the 1965 VA budget request which anticipates an average daily patient load of 110,268.

The announced closing of 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries involves more than 6,000 beds. Some 3,000 of these are classified as domiciliary and serve to care for a class of citizen for whom there is no other provision.

The closing of regional offices will leave eight States without the personal service accorded to more fortunate veterans living in other communities. The difficulties of travel, additional expense, and lost time from work for veterans living in those States, which include our neighbors of North Dakota and South Dakota, will undoubtedly result in many of them passing up the rights to which their service has entitled them.

The entire reason given for the sweeping VA order is economy. Economy of operation, economy of maintenance, and, undoubtedly, economy because less veterans will be cared for.

The Veterans' Administration and its newly appointed Director, Mr. William Driver, is taking the brunt of the blame for this situation. Actually, the "bogeyman" in this case is a shadowy Federal agency known as the Bureau of the Budget. It is from this executive group that the order has come and it is the job of the Veterans' Administration to carry out this order.

We are fortunate that influential Members of Congress have also been shocked at this arbitrary action and that they have added their voices of protest to those of the veterans organizations. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senator majority leader, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Senate minority leader, have joined to denounce the arbitrary nature of the action. Both Senate and House committees have scheduled hearings and the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been given its opportunity to express its feelings, as have other veteran groups.

Whether the closing of the VA facilities actually goes through will probably depend upon the feeling of the people themselves. If they oppose it, and indicate so to their Congressmen, the VA hospital system can be saved. If they are apathetic, this cut will be followed by others.

Some of us are not going to enjoy being part of the Great Society very much if we have to watch our less fortunate comrades wistfully peering in at us from the cold outdoors.

some responsibility, that it's not all just other people and fate."

"I'll think about it," she said. "After a while I might get to think it's partly my fault—maybe."

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today also marks the 144th anniversary of the Greek Independence Day, which should have special significance to the United States and to the entire world, because throughout history the Greek people have been in the forefront in the struggle for the liberty of the individual.

Today, Greece, a member of the NATO alliance, is one of our staunchest allies. She has successfully resisted and repulsed the Communists who attempted to infiltrate her after World War II. To the peoples of the captive nations, Greece is, indeed, a symbol of hope for their future independence and freedom. I am, indeed, proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend and ally on the 144th anniversary of her independence.

A COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it was my great pleasure to join in the sponsorship of S. 1200, a bill to establish a Court of Veterans Appeals.

Congress has provided a comprehensive system of benefits for veterans, their surviving widows, children, and dependent parents. The extent of this program is shown by the fact that the budget for fiscal year 1966 contains more than \$4 billion for the payment of compensation and pensions. Unfortunately, the law provides that decisions of the Veterans' Administration on all claims for compensation and pension benefits shall be final and conclusive, and cannot be reviewed by any officer of the United States or any court thereof.

Over the years, Representatives and Senators have been approached by veterans seeking their assistance in furthering their attempts to establish service connection for their disabilities. In studying the results of these efforts, I find that the percentage of "wins" has been rather small. Quite possibly those who lost did not have real claims. Nevertheless, I have been impressed by the sincerity and honesty of veteran claimants. In some instances they have convinced me that they have had valid claims to the extent that, upon reading Board of Veteran Appeals decisions in denial, my original views have remained unchanged.

It has been my observation that these cases usually have fallen in the area where the doctrine of reasonable doubt was the determining factor and it was not resolved in the veteran's favor.

This is the type of case I believe would benefit the most by a Court of Veterans Appeals; and I am sure that a considerable number would fall in this category. A veteran who has a case of this sort, and is denied the benefit he is seeking, cannot avoid feeling that he has not received justice. Further recourse to a court would help to dispel this feeling, regardless of the outcome, and, in my

opinion, provides sufficient reason for establishing a court.

It has been said before, and I think it bears repeating when considering matters of this sort, that many times the appearance of justice is almost as important as justice itself. If a court can accomplish this—and I believe it can—then certainly it should be established.

There is further justification for it: Military retirement cases can be taken to the U.S. Court of Claims; but, through some strange quirk, benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration are considered gratuities, and are not subject to review by a court, despite the fact that in each instance the basic issue is the establishment of a disability which arose in service.

The Government life insurance program administered by the Veterans' Administration is an exception. Insurance cases can be taken into court, because they are considered contract cases. It is my feeling—and I know it is shared by others—that when a man enters the Armed Forces, he does so with the assurance that should he incur a disability while serving, he will be compensated for it. This is an implied contract; and when a controversy arises, a court should be available to settle it.

The Veterans' Administration over the years has done an admirable job; but it is an inescapable fact that the Board of Veterans Appeals is in the unenviable position of making determinations in claims against the very organization of which it is an integral part. Justice can never be fully served under these conditions.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to several editorials and an article commenting on the President's address to Congress on March 15 and the proposed legislation on the so-called voting rights. These editorials merit the attention of all Members of the Congress who wish to consider objectively this proposed legislation, which the President is demanding be passed with limited consideration and study. These editorials and the article are as follow:

"This State and Voting," from the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 3, 1965.

"The President's Speech," from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"Asking Too Much for Too Little," from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"Has This Nation Truly Come to Such a Pass?" from the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"More Vicious Than Anticipated," from the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., dated March 18, 1965.

"Innocent Till Proved Guilty?" from the Augusta Herald, of Augusta, Ga., dated March 20, 1965.

"Johnson, the Omnipotent," from the Savannah Evening Press, of Savannah, Ga., dated March 16, 1965.

"L.B.J.'s Voting Rights Speech," from Human Events, of Washington, D.C., dated March 27, 1965.

"Sixteen Laws Already Available," from the Chattanooga News-Free Press, of Chattanooga, Tenn., dated March 15, 1965.

"An Offense to South Carolina," from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 22, 1965.

"Question Lingers on Voting Bill," an article by Mr. Richard Wilson which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on March 24, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these editorials and the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, together with my newsletter, dated March 22, 1965, entitled "The Art of Omission."

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

[From the State, Mar. 20, 1965]

THIS STATE AND VOTING

Under one provision of President Johnson's proposed Voting Rights Act, it looks as if South Carolinians are going to have to register and vote whether they have an interest in doing so or not—if they want to exercise the last chance to manage their own voter registration.

The device which would bring Federal voting registrars to South Carolina is the provision which would come into play if less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age are registered or if less than 50 percent vote in an election.

Negro leaders openly say that Negroes in South Carolina generally face no obstacles whatsoever in registering to vote. In fact, it was recently discovered that one person with a whole string of disqualifying convictions had been registered.

It may come as a shock to the people in Washington, but obviously less than 50 percent of the voting age whites and Negroes participated in the last election, for which there was nevertheless a record turnout.

Some simple calculations are revealing. The State has a population of about 2,300,000 according to the last census. About 35 percent are Negroes.

Assuming that 50 percent of this group of voting age (the actual percentage is higher), this would leave more than a million white persons of voting age, and about 400,000 Negroes. Last fall 524,578 voted out of 772,748 persons who had registered.

This leaves us with less than half the eligibles registered—probably for both white and Negro. Estimates are that about 400,000 white persons voted last fall—certainly less than 40 percent of those of voting age.

According to Justice Department figures, incidentally, approximately 34 percent of eligible (according to age) Negroes are registered in the State. The percentage of white and Negro registrants seems fairly close.

Thus would come the Federal registrars—even though on one can cite any reason other than citizen apathy for their having to come.

South Carolina, it seems might have to engage a little compulsory registration, and voting, if it wishes to keep control of its election machinery.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Mar. 17, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson responded to the pressures of Selma with an ultimatum to Congress.

The Federal Government, he declared, will usurp State and local authority for the registration of voters.

EXHIBIT 1

HOSPITAL FIGHTS A FRUSTRATING BATTLE

The world's largest, oldest, most prestigious center for treating drug addicts sits atop a hill near Lexington on a thousand acres of Kentucky's finest bluegrass meadowland. It opened 30 years ago as the U.S. Narcotics Farm, but when addicts started writing in to order narcotics, the name was hastily changed to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital. It has been an off-and-on home for countless addicts, who refer to it simply as "K.Y." Until recently, when a few big cities started putting aside hospital beds for addicts, Lexington and a smaller Public Health Service hospital in Fort Worth, Tex., were just about the only spots in the United States where a junkie could hole up, get off heroin, catch his breath and have a crack at permanently overcoming his addiction.

The scores of addict treatment centers that spread across the country—there are 40 in New York City alone—range from the well-known, multichaptered Synanon (Life, Mar. 9, 1962) to the offices of a few individual physicians with an honest sympathy for addicts. But Lexington still bears the brunt of addiction treatment, taking in 1,900 voluntary patients and 432 Federal prisoners last year (at any one time prisoners, who stay longer, outnumber volunteers).

Anyone who has never been a voluntary patient before and uses any drug included in a long—but outdated—list set by Federal law may get in simply by showing up at the main gate. Former voluntary patients who seek readmittance must file an application. Unfortunately, some of the more hazardous addicting drugs, like barbiturates and amphetamines, are excluded from the list, and users of them are admitted only if they also use a listed drug. While a once-in-a-while marihuana smoker can get in, a dangerously addicted barbiturate user is turned away.

Checking into Lexington, an addict finds himself swept up by a system designed to take him off drugs and keep him off. Getting him off is not much of a problem. Because of the high price of heroin on the street, few addicts today can afford enough to give them a severe habit. When they kick the habit, even without assisting medication, they ordinarily experience intense nervousness, runny nose, goose flesh, diarrhea, mild stomach cramps—symptoms familiar to anyone who has fought off a bad case of flu. To relieve discomfort during the first few days of withdrawal, heroin addicts get a periodic swallow of methadone, a synthetic narcotic. Barbiturate addicts get pentobarbital. After a few days, the addict's body has lost its dependence on heroin and needs no drugs but rest and food.

The real battle at K.Y. is not with the addict's body but with his mind. He must be weaned from his emotional craving for drugs. Once off drugs, he is moved to "orientation," where for 3 weeks he is tested and talked to by psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and job trainers. Finally assigned a room in "population," he finds himself with a 30-hour-a-week job or a school program teaching him to be almost anything from a printer or pants presser to a dental assistant.

From here on in, Lexington stops looking like a hospital. The staple medicine is other people. The addict is forced to cope with the staff and other patients, and now he has no drugs to help him escape—as he always has before—the problem of dealing with other people and with himself. Group therapy sessions help him along and, if he needs it, he may get individual therapy from 1 of the hospital's 14 staff psychiatrists.

Treatment does not always go so smoothly. Most patients are big city heroin addicts who, though they come voluntarily to the hospital, may not be really sure they want to make the break. Sometimes they try to smuggle

drugs in with them. They show a resourcefulness and ingenuity picked up in years of street living. Addicts have hidden heroin under their toenails, taped to the bottom of their feet, stuffed behind dental plates, sprinkled through their hair. To inject drugs smuggled into the hospital, patients have fashioned syringes from plastic bottles and needles from ballpoint pens. Some years ago, the entire hospital system appeared outsmarted when patients suddenly started showing up high on heroin. Security men sitting in the admitting rooms could not detect the flaw, and the heroin kept coming in. Finally a helpful addict sent a hospital official a copy of a leaflet he had bought on a Harlem street corner for \$1. It was titled "How To Smuggle Drugs Into Lexington": simply, go in with a couple of bags of heroin in your hand, ask for a paper towel to wipe your nose, crumple the bags into the towel and hold on to it—nobody will suspect the towel because a hospital official gave it to you in the first place. And it worked.

Dr. Frederick B. Glaser, the psychiatrist who appears on the preceding pages, considered the two young sisters to be among his most hopeful patients. "You talk to those girls," he said before they had returned to New York, "and your heart goes out to them. They're ingenuous, not at all hardened. Both girls break a lot of rules, but you hate to punish them because they're so childish and they break them so innocently. One day they don't go to work and you tell them they have to, and they ask innocently, 'Why?' They're so childish that someone suggested that when they do something wrong, we ought to just spank them. If I were in New York and could see these girls as outpatients I think I could help them."

When they did get back to New York, the younger sister moved in with her mother and the older one went back with a 60-year-old bookie who had kept her before she went to Lexington. They live only a few blocks from a corner—96th Street and Broadway—popular with junkies and pushers. "I try to stay out of the neighborhood," the older sister said, looking up toward the drug-infested corner, "but it's tough. The other junkies ride you when you're off stuff. I guess they want to get you back on so they won't feel put down by you. I really want to stop drugs. At K.Y. I saw these junkies with scars and abscesses and all that. That's not for me. I want to stop." But a week after leaving Lexington, she was back on drugs—and so was her sister.

Doctors at Lexington, though disappointed, were hardly surprised. Very few Lexington patients—probably less than 10 percent—stay off drugs when they get home. Dr. Glaser and the other doctors would seem to have ample reason for feeling that they are fighting a losing battle. But they do not. They are bolstered by one intriguing and extraordinary fact: nearly half the country's addicts are in their twenties, and only 11 percent are over 40. What happens to an addict when he begins to age? Evidently, as he grows older, he also grows up. He matures. His compulsion to avoid the desperate, degraded life of addiction overpowers his compulsion to use drugs.

Many psychiatrists believe that the maturing process can be hastened by hospital therapy, that as the addict experiences drug-free life in a hospital—or perhaps even in a jail—a layer of maturity is laid down within him. Each time his addiction is arrested for a few more weeks or months, the layer thickens. Finally, he outgrows his infantile need for the solace of drugs and gives them up. This theory, combined with the obvious humanitarian necessity of providing some kind of hospital treatment to addicts, is what refutes Lexington's high relapse rate—and keeps its doctors plugging.

Dr. Glaser scratches his head and listens to suggestions and gripes from some addicts in one of the female dormitories (their faces have been retouched). His toughest job in treating patients is getting them to recognize their problems and to attack them without the help of drugs. Many addicts have for so long used drugs to insulate themselves from the world and its anxieties that they cannot recognize a problem when they see it. They reject responsibility for their own lives. Some prisoner patients, upset by the relative freedom and the responsibility it implies, ask to be transferred to conventional prisons where every door is locked and every movement regimented. Teaching all patients to accept responsibility, to recognize their faults and to move ahead into the complicated business of living a drug-free life can take months and years of steady, perceptive, inspired labor.

Almost all the patients' problems have something to do with their families. A young girl received a telegram from her husband telling her that her father had been fighting with him, trying to break up the marriage. He said that if she wasn't home in a week he was going to kill her father or be killed by him. The girl read the telegram and burst into tears.

"Why can't I kick my habit and be happy one time in my life, when I love this man so much. All my father ever did all my life was drink and chase me and make trouble for me. And now I finally find one man worth giving up drugs for and why won't he leave me alone?" Glaser said softly, "I'll arrange for you to make a phone call home. See what you can do to keep from leaving. Maybe your husband sent the telegram in a fit of anger or desperation and things aren't really that bad. Try to stay as long as possible and let us help you."

Another voluntary patient complained that because she had bad teeth no one in her "alley" (dormitory corridor) liked her. She demanded a room in another alley. Glaser explained that rules forbade such a move until she had been in the room for a certain number of weeks.

"Well, I can't stand it there," she cried. "I don't like anyone. They don't like me. I'd rather be on the street than living there. If I stay there, I'll have to have something to calm me down. Else I'll have to go back to the street."

"You'll have to decide what you think is best," Glaser said, and left her to think it over. "Sometimes," he explains, "you have to force patients to take their problems. They'll try anything to make you bend and solve their problems for them. But that's what's been happening all their lives. That's why they're sick and on drugs. You can't let yourself do it."

Another patient told Glaser she went on drugs because she felt guilty about having stolen a wallet from her grandfather when she was 14. She stays on drugs, she said, because her husband has just been transferred to Mexico and won't give her air fare to get there.

"But he says he'll give you the fare. He just won't give you round trip fare," Glaser points out.

"If he wanted me, he'd give me a ticket to there and back home."

"Then it's not really your fault you're on drugs, is it? It's your grandfather's and your husband's fault."

"Yes."

"Well, then, if you're just a victim and it's not really your fault at all, why are you here for therapy? Maybe you should send your grandfather and husband here for therapy. It's their problem."

"Well, if it's anything I've done, I don't know what it could be."

"Then I don't think we can help you until you realize that you have something to do with what happens to you, that you have

Let there be no mistake. The latest draft of the Dirksen amendment bears little relation to the amendment reported by the subcommittee and even less resemblance to Senate Joint Resolution 2, upon which the hearings were held.

The subcommittee made two significant changes in the original text of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

First, it eliminated the opening sentence, which was widely interpreted as denying judicial review.

Second, it included a complex provision for periodic resubmission of any plan previously adopted by referendum.

Senator DIRKSEN has now proposed, without further hearings or subcommittee consideration, additional and substantial changes. These include:

First. The factors other than population that can be considered are now limited to geography and political subdivisions.

Second. These two factors can be accorded such weight as (the people) deem appropriate in both a bicameral and unicameral legislature. The earlier texts both limited the use of nonpopulation factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature to reasonable weight.

Third. The provision for periodic resubmission has been wholly rewritten.

Fourth. The new draft requires that the first malapportionment plan shall be submitted to the people, along with an alternative plan based upon substantial equality of population.

My point is that this is virtually a new amendment. It bears only faint resemblance to Senate Joint Resolution 2, on which hearings were held in the Senate. I submit that, before this new language is considered on the floor of the Senate, further hearings should be held. We need to know what the lawyers, the scholars, the political scientists of this country think about this new language. We need to hear from mayors, Governors, and local political leaders as to what effects the new language can be expected to have.

There are many serious questions to be considered and answered. A few come very quickly to mind.

First. What is "geography" as a factor in apportioning a State legislature? Can a State give greater weight to mountaineers than fishermen? Can it give more seats to deserts than to areas of greater population? Can it give one mountainous area more representation than another mountainous area? Or must it be consistent in applying a geographic factor?

Second. What are "political subdivisions"?

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I read recently that the State of Hawaii is interested in acquiring Samoa and Guam as a part of that State. What would be the point of geography in that case?

Mr. TYDINGS. The point made by the Senator from Tennessee is well taken. Can a State legislature make a new town, draw new lines for its sewerage or sanitation districts and then claim to have

changed "geography" or to have created a "political subdivision"?

What, I repeat, is a "political subdivision"? Is an unincorporated town or a school district or a sewerage district a "political subdivision"? Is there anything to prevent a State from changing its subdivision boundaries to effect unequal representation?

If, as the Senator from Tennessee suggests, Hawaii annexed Guam, would Guam be a "political subdivision"?

Does this amendment, as now written, overrule the Supreme Court's decision in *Gomillion* against Lightfoot? Can a State of county gerrymander to exclude from a "political subdivision" Negroes, Jews, migratory workers, or any other group?

Third. Why did the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 remove the "reasonable weight" limit as applied to unicameral State legislatures? Under the new, proposed Dirksen amendment, the third draft we have seen, can a State with a single house, a unicameral system, completely ignore population? Is this not an open invitation in some States to change from a bicameral to a unicameral system, in order to be able to malapportion the State legislature?

Fourth. If it makes sense to submit, along with a malapportionment plan, an alternative plan based upon substantial equality of population, why is this requirement limited to the first time a plan is presented? If that is fair one time, it should be fair every time.

Such questions were never discussed in our hearings, but now the distinguished Senator's greatly changed amendment is being circulated to members of the Judiciary Committee. Committee members are expected to vote on the first amendment to limit the franchise since the signing of the Declaration of Independence without benefit of mature deliberation on its current provisions.

My point is that we should not amend the Constitution of the United States in panic or in haste. If the distinguished minority leader has new and better language to propose, it should be taken back to the subcommittee, and hearings should be held on the language. These hearings could be limited in scope to the changes which the Senator has proposed.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. This Congress has already submitted to the States one ambiguously drafted constitutional amendment. I hope it will not hastily submit another questionable provision.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I would dislike for the *Record* to go unchallenged by not inserting the opinion that, though the Senator from Indiana has the greatest respect for his colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, he is still resolute in his disagreement with the Senator from Tennessee regarding the interpretation to be placed on the constitutional amendment which I hope soon will be the 25th

amendment, and which has already been ratified by three States, that of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Nebraska, and the Senator from Wisconsin. It is only the beginning of what we hope will be a long list of State legislatures that do not share the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee. I know reasonable men can disagree, but I feel sure in this instance I am correct.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In line with the difference as between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Indiana on the amendment which was adopted a few days ago, I am sure there is no disagreement in this particular matter between the two Senators on this point, and that is on the position of the Senator from Maryland when he urges that the language which has never been considered by committee, offered as a substitute, I am sure in the best of faith, should nevertheless be given the same scrutiny as the original resolution, because nobody is good enough to make language, and no combination of people is good enough to present language, which has not been scrutinized in the committee, and this applies most particularly to an amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator makes the very point I was trying to make. There is no question of the good faith of the distinguished minority leader. Of course not. The point is that in the final draft which he has circulated to members of the Judiciary Committee, he has come up with substitute language for the original Senate Joint Resolution 2, on which hearings were held. He has drafted new language which would permit the legislatures to apportion on factors other than population, but permitting consideration only of geography and political subdivisions. These are extremely broad areas. Their definition requires further study and consideration. It was not before the subcommittee. Occasionally, a question may have been asked in the general area, but the subject was not adequately covered. It was not adequately covered because it is contained in a draft which is entirely different from the resolution on which the subcommittee worked for months, a draft which incorporates basic changes never considered by the subcommittee. I submit that we should not adopt a constitutional amendment, nor ask the people to ratify it, when it is presented in a changed form which has never been adequately considered.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. With further reference to the proposed constitutional amendment previously referred to, let the *Record* show that a goodly number of questions have now been asked about it, and some persons are having second thoughts about it. But it is too late. It has been submitted to the States. From the volumes of editorials written across the country, one would gather that seri-

ous questions are being entertained about the meaning of the proposed amendment and the advisability of its being ratified.

Let the RECORD show that while three States have ratified, one has declined to ratify. Apart from that fact, it is a mistake we have already made. There was a time when we could have corrected it. The purpose of the Senator from Tennessee was to have the proposal returned to the committee for some study and drafting because the Senate had adopted language to be submitted to the States as a constitutional amendment which had not been considered carefully—indeed, language on which members of the conferees differed in their interpretations as to meaning.

I plead with the Senate Judiciary Committee not to repeat this kind of mistake. This is a precious document with which we are dealing. If we make a mistake and enact a statute, it can be repealed, but stripping something from the Constitution of the United States is quite a different thing. It is a more serious matter with which we deal. I hope that before the Senate Judiciary Committee reports another amendment to the Constitution, it will hold hearings on the exact text upon which the Senate is expected to act.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I dislike to shoot dead soldiers and debate an issue which has already been decided on the floor of the Senate. We are doing a disservice to the decision which has already been made by both Houses of Congress—by the votes which have already been cast by an overwhelming majority of the Senate—to cast reflections now upon the decision which was made.

The Senator from Tennessee is rendering a creditable service to the overall discussion of this matter by clarifying—if, indeed, clarification was necessary—what the legislative intent would be.

I do not like to see an issue discussed again which has already been decided by the Senate.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Tennessee that the Judiciary Committee and all other committees of Congress should give the closest consideration to a matter as important as a constitutional amendment.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I intend to follow this pattern to the last degree.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Maryland in yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Barlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr.

FINO, and Mrs. DWYER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 24) to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. REINECKE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 36, inclusive, and in amendments numbered 42 and 43 to the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 37 through 41, inclusive, and 44 through 49, inclusive, to the bill; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Mr. STEED, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. SLACK, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. REIFEL, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTROYA in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise today to address the Senate in support of Senate bill 9, the cold war GI bill. I was privileged to have sponsored this very necessary and worthwhile legislation on the day it was first introduced in the 89th Congress, January 6, 1965. Not only did I enthusiastically support Senator YARBOROUGH, the distinguished author of this bill, but I also appeared in support of it before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on February 19, 1965.

I feel especially qualified to sponsor the proposed legislation and vote for its passage today, for I was a beneficiary of one of the previous GI bills. It gave me an opportunity to continue my education following my term of service during the Korean conflict, and enabled me to avoid the unhappy choice between foregoing further education or delaying it still longer in an effort to acquire the resources to gain it.

The same problems of readjustment and economic dislocation that we knew 10 years ago are faced today by thousands of young men returning from service in the Armed Forces. These young Americans have been forced to disrupt their lives and careers to serve in the

Armed Forces throughout the world. Then, after completion of their term of service, these men face not only the serious problems of adapting back to civilian life, but also find themselves far behind those in their age group who were allowed to continue their schooling and their careers.

Thus, the cold war GI bill has been proposed to balance this situation and to give the veteran who has sacrificed 2, 3, or 4 years of his life an opportunity to catch up with his nonveteran companions whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

One of the main arguments against the bill has been that since the United States is officially at peace, it would be unprecedented and unwarranted to give peacetime servicemen benefits previously extended only to those who faced the hazards of war. However, the distinction as to whether the United States is officially at peace is a meaningless technicality when American servicemen are being killed and wounded in Vietnam and elsewhere. In addition, neither the World War II nor the Korean GI bills made any distinction between those who served in the front lines and those who served in a safe stateside job. The two previous GI bills were not intended as reward for combat duty, and applied to all veterans. Their main purpose was to help veterans readjust to civilian life and catch up to those whose lives were not disrupted by military service. This is also the purpose of the cold war GI bill.

In addition to the matter of fairness to cold war servicemen, the cold war GI bill would also serve the national interest as did the World War II and Korean GI bills.

It has been well established that the Nation reaped tremendous social and economic values from the two previous GI bills, mainly as a result of the educational assistance they provided.

More than 7,800,000 World War II veterans—nearly half of the 16,500,000 U.S. participants—took some form of training under the GI bill.

Of the total enrolled 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below college level; 1,400,000 underwent on-the-job training; and 700,000 underwent on-the-farm training.

Today we are a far stronger Nation because of the infusion of skilled and professional manpower gained through the GI bill; 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, nurses, 360,000 schoolteachers, 150,000 scientists, 107,000 lawyers, 243,000 accountants, 36,000 clergymen of all faiths, 17,000 writers and journalists, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 61,000 printers and typesetters, and 70,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

The total cost of the program was \$14.5 billion. Eighty percent of this went directly to the veterans in the form of subsistence allowances. Nearly all the rest was spent on tuition and other training costs and only a cents

out of every dollar went for administration.

Experts have stated that our present shortcomings in these and other essential operations would have been even more catastrophic—had it not been for the GI bills.

In Minnesota, nearly 200,000 veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict were able to upgrade their education and training as a result of the GI bills. The cold war GI bill would provide the same educational opportunities to about 34,000 more Minnesota veterans during the first 5 years of its operation.

Finally, it has been shown that GI bills are really an investment which eventually pay for themselves. U.S. Census Bureau figures show that World War II veterans alone now pay the Federal Government \$1 billion a year in additional taxes because of the increased earning power they attained from their GI schooling.

Altogether, it was the largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at bargain rates. The \$14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.

The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to \$1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans. I am pleased to add my support to the proposed legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. More than that, I am grateful for his support to the 5 million cold war GI veterans.

What is important is the right of the young men to go to school, and not be cast among the unemployed. As the report from the Department of Education of California indicates, 5 percent of the young men in this age bracket are unemployed. Unemployment among veterans in this age bracket, however, is 10 percent. Since the veterans are also included in the 5 percent, it can be readily seen that the percentage of the unemployed among the veterans is well over two times that of nonveterans. The nonveterans have been able to remain at home and go to school, while the veterans, after serving an average of 28 months, come back unprepared for civilian life and walk the streets and remain unemployed. It is a great injustice, and it is a situation which has been created by our Government.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for recognizing the situation and speaking out in an effort to correct it.

PROPOSED ANNEXATION BY U.S. OF PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in behalf of the cold war GI bill. Before doing so, I should like to refer briefly to the topic which was touched upon by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, when he asked the Senator from Maryland what would happen if Hawaii were to annex Saipan and Guam, for example.

I refer to the Senator from Tennessee that at the present time a discussion is underway in the Pacific on the possi-

bility or feasibility of Hawaii annexing the trust territory islands.

At the present time the first congress of Micronesia is being held at Saipan. Thirty-three delegates from the trust territory are taking part in the first meeting, and they are exploring the feasibility of setting up self-government for those islands in the Pacific.

There are a number of islands in this area which extend a distance almost equal to the distance across continental United States. The area has a population of approximately 87,000. It covers a vast territory in the Pacific.

These islands are under a United Nations trusteeship, and the United States is administering the islands.

Great concern has been expressed as to what will happen in the future to those islands. It has been suggested that they be annexed by the State of Hawaii. If that should happen, with apologies to the junior Senator from Alaska, it would make Hawaii the largest State in the Union, even larger than Alaska.

About 3 years ago the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] talked with me about the possibility of Hawaii annexing those islands, so that they could become a part of the United States. The islands are now under United Nations trusteeship. Before they could be annexed by the United States and added to the State of Hawaii, we would naturally have to obtain the consent of the United Nations and also the consent of the people who live on the islands.

This topic is being discussed in the Pacific. It is a live topic. There are many pros and cons on the subject. I believe we should give serious thought to the future of those islands.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am very happy that this extremely important subject has come up in the Senate. It is true, as the senior Senator from Hawaii has pointed out, that this idea came to me some years ago. I proposed and discussed the idea with the late Oren Long, of Hawaii 4 years ago and with Senator FONG and Senator INOUYE and with Governor Burns of Hawaii. It seems to me that one of the problems that we as a democracy face is the desire not to have colonies and to act in accordance with such purpose. Colonies are not appropriate to our system of government. Yet with respect to certain areas under our flag, if we could achieve that ideal objective, it would be to give them all the full equality of statehood, just as has now been achieved by the State so ably represented by the Senator from Hawaii and also by my own State. That was the latest action in the validation of our basic principles, by establishing full equality for the Americans of Alaska and of Hawaii. By that action in the 85th and 86th Congresses, we extended the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest north, farthest south, farthest west, and farthest east. It is not generally known that Alaska is not only the farthest north and the farthest west, but also the farthest east extension of the United States, for Alaska extends into the Eastern Hemisphere.

The question naturally comes up with respect to the smaller entities in the Pacific, whose economy and small population would not justify statehood, such as Samoa, Guam, Wake and the multiple islands of the Trust Territories. Yet we must find a practical way of ending their colonial status. Any changes, however, should of course take into consideration the best interests of all the parties concerned. It would seem not impossible to conceive that in the years to come we would ultimately create a great Pacific State, always assuming that the various components themselves desired it as well as the great State of Hawaii, to which the proposal is to annex them at the appropriate time and after full understanding and consent will have been obtained. I remember when we discussed the admission of the State of Hawaii to the Union in the Senate, those who opposed such action raised the objection that the proposed State was separated from the continent of the United States by vast international waters, that it was way out in the Pacific, and that international waters separated Hawaii's various islands. That was raised as an insuperable objection to the admission of Hawaii to statehood. Yet that was not found to be a valid objection. It is no more valid in connection with the whole Pacific area, and the proposed Pacific State, in these days of radio communication, jet transportation and what will, before long, be transportation at supersonic speeds. It is just as conceivable as it now has become in the case of Hawaii, that this vast area will one day be one State with persons living in it sharing equal citizenship with the citizens of our country. What could be a more desirable or more glorious destiny for them?

Therefore, I believe it is very fortunate indeed that this subject has come up for discussion. This proposal will not happen immediately, if it happens at all. Certainly it is a subject that requires discussion, study, and a good deal of thought.

This objective should, of course, not be attempted or achieved without the consent of the various component parts, first the State of Hawaii and the people of Hawaii, and also the people of these various other Pacific areas.

Some of them may not wish to join; some may. It is an extremely important subject. The future of these areas is a matter of our concern and of our responsibility. I am very much gratified the distinguished Senator from Hawaii has brought this up. It is something that we may look forward to. I know from personal contact that the people in these various areas would not desire to achieve anything other than American citizenship. At the present time they have a second-class affiliation and political status. Their hope, I am confident, would be for achieving first-class American citizenship, but that would have to be officially ascertained.

I know of no better way than by this proposal.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. This

is a very exciting idea. It first came from the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I compliment him for bringing forth this great idea.

As a Senator from the State of Hawaii I welcome the idea. I have been working toward the idea of having Hawaii annex those territories which would like to join us, with the consent of the United Nations.

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

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last December to be in the western Pacific. Members of Congress were in the party, including Representative MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii. We were astonished by the number of Hawaiians among those who came out to see the delegation for the Congress.

In Kwajalein, among the American civilian employees there we found many Hawaiians.

I pay tribute to the people of the State of Hawaii, the State so ably represented by Senator Fong, for their western movement.

Our history is characterized by the western movement of our people. In Alaska, for example, we are referred to as the "South 48."

We were amazed when we from the so-called South 48, reached the western Pacific, to find a large number of Hawaiians who had gone to the smaller islands.

A great number of American citizens from Hawaii have gone to the smaller island in the trust territories. They have created a great deal of good will for all the people of the United States, and they have rendered a unique service for the people of this country.

What we are discussing today is a fine idea: and I pay tribute to all the people of Hawaii for having pioneered as teachers, as farmworkers, and as helpers. Hawaiians are making a unique contribution as Americans to the democratic idea and American liberties. They are carrying democratic principles and ideals of liberty and of freedom forward throughout that vast area.

In another territory, which is recognized as being a part of Japan, Okinawa, there are many Americans from Hawaii.

It will be remembered that when Okinawa was a part of Japan it was considered the poorest prefecture of Japan. Now it has an average standard of living comparing favorably with that of the other prefectures in Japan.

American citizens have done much toward bringing this about, and many of such American citizens come from Hawaii.

I congratulate the Senator and his State and the people of his State on their pioneering spirit.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Texas for his laudatory and commendatory remarks concerning the contribution of the people of Hawaii in the Pacific Basin.

Just prior to the convening of the Congress of Micronesia, Hawaii sent a delegation to advise, counsel, and help the delegates on how to draft a bill, for example, to hold committee meetings, and other procedures related to our demo-

cratic form of government. Many of our people have gone to various parts of the trust territory and to the Orient, especially those who have been connected with the East-West Center.

We have sent quite a number of teams to the various countries in the South Pacific and to Asia. They have done and are doing fine work. The people of Hawaii and the United States should promote this idea and should not be afraid to expand their assistance. They should not be afraid to meet new problems. They should not be afraid to accept new people. That is the way we grow and prosper and that is the way we help others to grow and prosper.

I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a postscript?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of no more ideal circumstances, apart from the compelling geographical aspects, than to have the State of Hawaii father and guide the exploration of this far-reaching project, because Hawaii has presented to the United States long before its admission to statehood, a shining example of ethnic democracy. Indeed the finest under our flag. In my judgment, one of the strongest reasons why Hawaii should have been admitted to statehood long before it was is not merely because of its right to the full equality of statehood and all the other reasons for ending its territorial status, but because it shows the United States, as I have said, an exemplification of racial democracy of the meeting and mingling of the races of East and West, an entity in which there was less racial prejudice and less discrimination than anywhere else in America, setting the finest example to the rest of the Nation and to the world. For that reason, with the diversity of races in the Pacific, Hawaii offers the ideal location and the most qualified people to father the project, explore it, and see whether or not it may be feasible. The State of Hawaii has already rendered a great contribution to the United States. It has set an example of tolerance for the rest of the States to emulate.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I am contemplating offering a resolution in the Senate to obtain the consensus of the Congress in order to determine whether the idea is feasible. If the Congress looks favorably on the idea, I should like then to have the people of Hawaii and the people of the Trust Territory vote on it and see whether they are favorable to the idea. If they are, we should then present a petition to the United Nations to see whether the United Nations would allow the people of the South Pacific to join the people of Hawaii and this great Nation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The project need not be consummated in toto all at once. It might be that some islands out there would like to join, and the State of Hawaii would like to have them join. It would not be necessary to consummate

the entire project at one time. In all likelihood, if the idea is deemed feasible, it is something that may be achieved step by step. Certain areas will be ready for it as soon as others, assuming we could get the consent of the United Nations. There are five or six ethnic groups in the Trust Territories. They represent different stages of development. I believe that we need not feel that the idea must be accepted in toto immediately, or indeed at any one time. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii on his proposal to submit a resolution which would enable us to explore the subject much more fully.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the distinguished Senator from Alaska that the idea may not be consummated quickly, but we should be working at it promptly, because it is a great idea. It will take time, and I know it will require a great deal of effort. I hope that when I submit the resolution, I shall have the cooperation and support of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. When that takes place, Alaska might be willing to yield its title as the largest State remembering that even with the proposed Pacific State extending over a larger area, Alaska will still have a larger land mass, because a great deal of the area within the Pacific State would be Pacific Ocean and international domain.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator for his generosity.

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

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have found the discussion most interesting and enlightening. I introduced the subject in debate today, not to express approval or disapproval of the suggestion, for I have not studied it sufficiently to reach such a conclusion. My first impression is that the State of Hawaii might very well offer administrative and other advantages to the people of Samoa and Guam, islands of considerable population, which those people do not now enjoy. I am not sure that the same would hold true of the smaller islands of Micronesia, but I shall await the Senator's resolution and am prepared to consider that on its merits.

I raised the point neither to criticize nor to commend. I would be inclined to commend all those who advocate consideration of the question, as I now commend the senior Senator from Hawaii. I raised the question because it has a pertinent bearing on a proposed constitutional amendment on which the Judiciary Committee of this body is about to act. The new version of the Dirksen amendment refers to geography as a means of determining representation. Should Hawaii adopt Kwajalein as a part of her State, would a person living on Kwajalein have more proportionate representation than a citizen living in Honolulu? Would it mean that an Aleut on the extremity of the Aleutians would, under the U.S. Constitution or under the proposed amendment to it, have representation disproportionate to citizens living in Nome, Alaska?

under existing law, these claims must still be treated as valid claims and their interest in them must be settled by means of contest. I am certain you will appreciate the enormous amount of detail work possibly involved in clearing out any large number of claims.

As stated above, our problem is not with existing, active, and valid unpatented mining claims that can be located and the owners dealt with. The problem we face is the invalidation, proof of abandonment, and contest of all those underlying, dormant, inactive and abandoned claims which, under existing law, still hold claim to validity—and a lien on Government land—until such time as they are declared invalid or made a matter of contest.

Through necessity we feel that we must proceed with the basic functions of checking and abstracting to the best of our ability all those unpatented claims which we assume to be in our project area. We realize that even under the most diligent search—because of the vagueness prevalent in locating said claims—we will miss some and check out in great detail many others which, in all probability, would not be in our project area if the fact could be established.

We would be extremely interested in the probability of the passage of legislation which would tend to modernize the mining laws and perhaps present a method for the automatic invalidation of all such abandoned claims.

We note that H.R. 894, introduced in the House of Representatives on January 4, 1965, by Mr. JOHN SAYLOR and then referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs carries just such a provision in section 7(a) of the proposed legislation.

Is there much possibility that this bill, or legislation of a similar nature which might cover this type of situation, could pass within the next 2 years?

Yours very truly,

JOHN M. NELSON,
Superintendent of Lighting.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO THE WIDOW OF A VETERAN EVEN THOUGH SHE HAS BEEN REMARIED

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the present law on Federal benefits, compensating survivors of veterans dying in action or because of disabilities incurred or aggravated in active military duty, precludes forever the payment of such benefits to their widows upon remarriage. In many cases this works an extreme hardship when the second marriage is terminated by death of the war widow's second spouse.

Since widow's benefits are foregone during the period of remarriage, it seems only equitable to restore her standing as the widow of the veteran, when she is deprived of support by a second death. There would be no question of double compensation from the Veterans' Administration, but only the opportunity to elect to receive benefits as the widow of the former veteran-spouse, if not the latter.

To alleviate some of the financial hardship in these circumstances, I am now proposing a bill to reinstate recognition of the state of widowhood first created for the beneficiary by the death of her first spouse, at such time as she is again widowed.

By such amendment the law would manifest appropriate concern for the widows of our silent heroes when for-

tune and life abuse them. In this spirit I propose the following bill: To amend title 38, United States Code, in order to permit, under certain circumstances, the payment of death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation to the widow of a veteran even though such widow has been remarried.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2250) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to permit, under certain circumstances, the payment of death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation to the widow of a veteran even though such widow has been remarried, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MARINE AND ATMOSPHERIC AFFAIRS COORDINATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference the Marine and Atmospheric Affairs Coordination Act of 1965 and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks and that it remain at the desk through July 9 in order that Senators who wish to might join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 2251) to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine and atmospheric functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs, to enunciate national policies pertinent to the marine and atmospheric interests of the United States, to further the expanded exploration of marine environs and the use of marine resources, to encourage research and development in the marine and atmospheric sciences and technologies and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, there is a variety of bills before both Houses of the Congress to enhance and encourage the Federal role in the management of our marine affairs. These bills encompass ideas for the improvement of our merchant marine fleet, review of our interests in the law of the sea, exploration of the Continental Shelf, enhancement of our anadromous fisheries management efforts, import restrictions on fisheries products from those nations practicing poor conservation techniques in our adjacent waters, advisory council proposals for the coordination of our oceanographic effort, the establishment of a massive NASA-like organization for the conquest of the oceans—our "inner space"—and many others.

In addition, President Johnson has now proposed reorganization plan No. 2,

consolidating the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Weather Bureau and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory to form a new agency in the Department of Commerce to be known as the Environmental Science Services Administration.

All of these ideas have merit and are rooted in the national concern over the conduct and future direction of our marine and atmospheric activities. In my opinion, they are symptomatic of: First, the recognition of the tremendous importance of the oceanic and atmospheric environs to our daily lives and economy; and, second, the fragmentary attention we give these matters in Government policymaking and administration.

The legislation which I introduce today is designed to crystallize our attention on the need to coordinate our work in the interrelated areas of marine and atmospheric environments which so vitally affect our economy, trade, our international relations, strategic posture, natural resource programs and our basic continental climate and weather patterns.

It is my hope that this legislation and my remarks may serve as a catalyst for the Congress in considering the far-reaching implications of our activities—or lack of them—in exploring, understanding, and using the resources of the atmosphere and the ocean.

It is essential for those of us who have been primarily concerned with our interior natural resource programs to turn our eyes to the sea around us. In so doing, we will join the efforts of our distinguished colleagues, Senators MAGNUSON, BARTLETT, and others, who have continued to direct our attention to the implications of an inadequate "national will" concerned with marine and related affairs. It is my hope that the discussion engendered may contribute to the development of a "national will" to move forward in a strong, coordinated marine and atmospheric program.

In reviewing the problems and potentials inherent in our status and purposes in marine and atmospheric use and technology, my thoughts focus on several matters.

First, let me put into perspective the status and present direction of our efforts to conquer the mysteries of the marine environment. The words of Mr. James H. Wakeline, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development are appropriate:

For centuries man has looked to the sea as a surface on which to sail to distant lands for exploration and trade, as an arena for naval battles, as a supplementary source of food—but always as a region of mystery with unpredictable and awesome displays of strength. While the world's oceans do, in fact, cover almost three-quarters of the surface of the earth, our real interest lies as much in the volume beneath the surface as in the surface itself. The extent to which we can use this deep domain depends critically upon our knowledge of its boundaries, its properties, and its contents. To obtain this knowledge, we have been working—on a concentrated program in oceanography to study the dynamics of ocean behavior on and beneath the surface, to map the depths and shorelines with much greater accuracy and to access the vast storehouse of food, minerals, and chemicals for future exploitation by mankind. From this program, and others

related to it, we will learn much about how to alter and control the tremendous energy developed through the interaction of the air and the sea and released as hurricanes, typhoons, and other storms of great destructiveness. It remains for us now to put this knowledge to work and to find out how we can economically extract the resources from the sea for our use. Before we can fully apply this knowledge, however, we must learn how to live, work, and operate in the ocean depths. Without this capability we cannot effectively use the ocean space for our country's defense or make available its vital materials that we will require for future generations on the earth."

In our national assault upon the marine environment, I see a tremendous historic parallel with that of our country a century and a half ago as we began to unlock the frontiers and rich resources of the western North American continent.

In this earlier day Jefferson and a few others who advocated the opening of our West stood virtually alone. Powerful political and industrial forces sought to divert our energies from westward expansion toward Europe and seagoing trade. John Adams, then Senator from Massachusetts, sided with Jefferson in a display of political courage and vision which brought about his ouster from the Senate and what he then believed to be his political demise.

A few years later another New Englander, Daniel Webster, spoke in questioning terms of our great West saying, "What do we want with this vast worthless area? What use have we for this country?" Although I do not hear specific voices in this day against our national marine program effort, there is a counterpart reflected in apathy, lack of concern and absence of a "national will" to forge ahead.

The role of the Federal Government in opening our West was to explore, to map, and to provide capital and land incentive for the private development of the area. This role was a unique experiment a century and a half ago which staggered the European mind with its audacity.

Are we any less audacious today? I think not. The frontiers of the sea, great lakes, and the atmosphere between earth and space are before us. We need to use their resources and powers. Government can again lead the way through exploration, scientific inquiry, and capital incentive for business and private capital to follow. We need only to channel our energies and coordinate our efforts to lift the curtain of uncertainty over the realm of the little known.

The lifting of this curtain requires recognition of a little realized fact. This fact is that we now possess the technical knowledge and industrial capacity to live, work, explore, and exploit the resources of the marine world. Heretofore, the main thrust of governmental concern with marine and atmospheric affairs has been in the realm of basic scientific inquiry. For a long time scientific knowledge has been ahead of the engineering technology required to accelerate exploration and resource utilization in marine environments. This is no longer the case. We now realize that technology has caught up and even surpassed basic science. We are now ready to pursue a vigorous course of marine resource

utilization which will enhance our economy and contribute greatly to our general welfare.

Apparently, this basic fact did not influence the administration in its preparation of the Reorganization Plan No. 2 proposal. This plan is directed essentially toward the coordination of basic scientific inquiry within the interrelated fields of marine and atmospheric affairs. This is a sound proposal as far as it goes—but now is the time for governmental action to go further. Our programs must continue scientific research and inquiry—but this must be in partnership with the technologies of use and development. Our aim must be to encourage the mastery and use of these environs for the benefit of man.

Like the conquest of space, the conquest of the Marine environs requires the development of complicated equipment and specialized systems. These include: Vehicles to come and go from worksites and in which to explore and map, together with the navigational and propulsion systems for these vehicles, underwater construction techniques, unique construction materials, communication systems, power and distribution systems and a wide variety of new techniques for working in an aquatic environment. We have the technical knowledge to develop these systems. In fact, many now exist. We need only to define and coordinate our national efforts and to provide the incentive to attract the interest of those technological industries with the capacity to do the job.

So much for perspective. I would like to draw attention now to some of the effects and problems evident in our present national effort.

First, despite unused fisheries resources in our own waters, we do not catch the fish we eat, expending about \$600 million annually abroad for the importation of fisheries products. This represents a substantial part of our dollar drain.

Because our resources are unused, an increasing volume of Asiatic and European fishermen are attracted by our default to use our waters and catch our resources. All too frequently these foreign fishermen utilize exploitive practices in our waters, seriously undermining our resource conservation efforts. All this evades the law of the sea and the Continental Shelf doctrine and causes extreme embarrassment to the State Department.

Accenting this international problem is the relatively low status of our representatives in the departments of State, Interior, or Commerce who meet with the ministerial level representatives of other nations relative to U.S. interests in international marine affairs. Other nations, very logically, I think, believe that our Government doesn't care enough about these matters to give them high official attention.

Second, much of our international commitment is concerned with underdeveloped countries and the dietary lack of protein in 60 percent of the world's population. We ship our surplus grain to these nations but do little to attack the basic problem. We know that sustained fisheries resources exceed the world's

protein requirements—and further, that great unused resources are available just off the shores of many an underdeveloped country.

Other countries, particularly Russia, capitalize on this knowledge by building up the fisheries capacities of underdeveloped nations and by direct landings of fisheries products by their home fleets. In this way the Russian fisheries and merchant marine make a profit of their activities, and at the same time use their vessels as an adjunct of their defense posture throughout the world in recognition of the strategic importance of the world ocean areas—70 percent of the earth's surface.

Our sick fisheries industry and declining merchant marine do not compete—nor do they add the important strategic element of U.S. occupation throughout the world ocean area.

Third, we are constantly reminded that our continental reserves of strategic fossil fuels and minerals are dwindling—that indeed we are living today on the "savings" required for future generations. Were we to mine more from the sea and the continental shelf we would be, in effect, living on our "income" rather than exclusively on our savings, for every river, every stream, every rain brings dissolved minerals and chemicals from the land to the sea—enriching and replenishing the sea.

By this I do not suggest any abandonment of our interior resources or that we need depend upon the minerals, oil, and gas resources of the sea today, or even tomorrow. I do maintain, however, that we must accelerate our effort, now, to explore, to chart and locate and to use the resources of the marine environment. If we do not, others will. Through use and industrial incentive our technology will rapidly improve.

Fourth, the hearings of the subcommittee on air and water pollution have brought to light some serious problems in the "aging" and deterioration of the Great Lakes, estuarine, and harbor areas. The speed of the "aging" process in such bodies of water is normally measured in millennia. We now have reason to believe that large quantities of nutrients entering our Great Lakes and coastal bays in waste discharges are speeding up this process significantly. Also, we find that even with the overnight elimination of pollutants from these waters—if such were possible—the reversal of the "aging" process, or even its slowing down, appears to be next to impossible under the limitations of present knowledge.

To those in this body from our Nation's heartland, I need not overemphasize the economic impact of water level drops or vegetative concentrations in the Great Lakes.

Shoaling waters, warming waters, and increased vegetation affect shipping, the fisheries industry, recreation, and shore-based industry drastically. We need to learn more about the currents, temperature, and other factors influencing the "aging" process of the Great Lakes. This requires an intensive exploratory and research effort which must be undertaken now before it is too late and economic disaster strikes the heartland of our Nation. In addition we should note



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org