

though we may at times find the degree of centralized control somewhat excessive. There is unquestionably a great deal of justification for the conservative trend in defense activities.

I would like to suggest, however, that there are several developments we should watch with great care during the coming years. Each would represent a serious threat to the security of this country, and each, in my opinion, would call for a reappraisal of our present defense policies—especially in regard to the procurement of new weapon systems.

Though I am convinced that our national defense policymakers would react rapidly to any developments that threaten our security, I feel strongly that it is the patriotic duty of the military, industrial, and scientific communities to speak out firmly if they feel the danger signs are not being heeded. I am not contending that the military, industrial, and scientific communities bear the official responsibility for interpreting to the people the peaceful or aggressive intentions of the nations of the world. But we do have a right and duty to express opinions along these lines in direct proportion to the responsibility we bear for defending the country. Our American system provides adequate and proper channels for the expressions of these opinions. I advocate that we use these channels vigorously whenever we feel the security of our Nation is in jeopardy.

In my opinion we must watch three developments with special care. First, new space developments by the Soviet Union that are more in keeping with aggressive than peaceful objectives. Already there is considerable reason for concern about Soviet capabilities in space. Many of the techniques the Soviet Union has developed so far point strongly toward a military space effort. The development of a capability by the Soviet Union to deliver strategic weapons from near space or to deny to the United States the opportunity to continue its present programs in space would amount to a serious threat and would negate our present favorable balance of military power. It is in the arena of space that Soviet technological developments are most likely to bypass this generation of U.S. weapon systems.

At the present time, the United States is busily attempting to assess Soviet intentions in space. Are they peaceful or aggressive? Our national record during the past 20 years in evaluating Soviet intentions has not been outstanding. Very nearly all Soviet acts of aggression have had an element of surprise attached to them. The Soviet space program is being conducted today in the same secrecy that is used to protect military operations, and it too has been characterized by surprises.

Under the circumstances, then, we would do well to keep a watchful eye on the Soviet space program, and to give the benefit of all doubt to our national security and not to unsubstantiated Soviet statements of peaceful intentions.

The second development we should keep under surveillance is Red China's nuclear weapons capability. The implications of the recent detonation of a nuclear device by Red China are ominous from a free world point of view.

Though the Red Chinese do not at present possess an intercontinental delivery system for carrying out a surprise nuclear attack upon this country, the development by them of such a system is within their technical competence. Any effort on their part to develop such a delivery system along with a continuing effort to develop a nuclear weapon would have to be viewed as an extremely serious threat to the United States.

We must recognize that a delivery system for a preemptive nuclear attack by Red China could be very unsophisticated, as com-

pared with one that would have to withstand an initial attack and operate in retaliation.

We should also bear in mind that Red Chinese leaders have often declared that they do not fear a nuclear war and that they believe their massive population could absorb the losses from such a war.

In a related political vein we should also consider the following. At this moment the primary value of Red China's nuclear development is in enhancing its influence in Asia. If, however, Red China's nuclear capability stirs the world to agree to a ban on all nuclear weapons, Red China would gain a major strategic victory by emerging as a leading conventional power in a world of weakened conventional nations.

All signs, therefore, warn us to maintain the strictest watch over Red China's nuclear development and the policies which she will adopt as a nuclear nation.

Finally, we should give very serious consideration to world developments that would result in a further deterioration of the power of the United Nations or of its related regional defense organizations to maintain peace throughout the world. In recent years Communist bloc countries have tried with some success to undermine the efforts of the United Nations and the several regional defense groups in their attempts to apply their legitimate international police powers.

The United States and the free world nations have all endorsed the principle that aggression anywhere is a threat to world peace, and they have supported international police action as a proper means for halting aggression. If the U.N. and the regional defense organizations, however, continue to lose their effectiveness in discouraging aggression, or in suppressing it if it breaks out, then the United States will have to consider adjustments in its defense policies.

An obvious alternative to reliance on the U.N. is a greater reliance on our own power and on the collective power of smaller alliances in which the members share a genuine sense of common interest with us and are prepared to defend that interest. It is my sincere hope that the U.N. and the other regional defense alliances will be able to survive the current degradation of their purpose and authority.

Each of the three development that I have briefly discussed could amount to a serious threat to the United States and the free world, and I urge that the members of the military, industrial, and scientific communities be especially alert to these developments.

Today U.S. military power is supreme in the world. Though we are being challenged in many areas of the globe, our intent and our resolve are more in question than our strength.

The pace of technology, however, threatens our military superiority. To the Nation which has the vision and purpose to capitalize on the promises of technology must fall the military superiority of the future.

To the alliance of the military, industrial, and scientific communities, the promises and opportunities of technology are, therefore, accompanied by a special challenge. And that is the challenge to make more determined and longer ranged plans and commitments. In research, production, and strategy, we must look further into the future to foresee the threats that lie ahead and to provide the means to protect our land and people from those threats. It will take a special courage to make the long-term commitments we will have to make to extend our military supremacy into the next decade and the next generation.

I am confident, however, that those Americans who make up the military, industrial, and scientific communities are competent to make these commitments. I am also sure that their dedication to this country and to

the cause of freedom are equal to their competence.

I thank you again for the honor you have paid me tonight, and for this opportunity to have spoken with you.

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. WYDLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CLEVELAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. WYDLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CLEVELAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

JOHN J. McLAUGHLIN

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Woonsocket Call carries a column, entitled "This Week 50 Years Ago," which is read by a great many people in my State of Rhode Island. In this column in a recent issue reference was made to a group of distinguished citizens who, back in 1915, called on the then Gov. R. Livingston Beekman at the statehouse to protest against the methods in vogue in connection with the hoof and mouth disease of cattle. Included in this group was a gentleman by the name of John J. McLaughlin, of Cumberland.

While I did not have the pleasure of knowing this John J. McLaughlin personally, I have heard much about him over the years and have come to learn that he was a man whose talents and integrity adequately matched the size of his physical being. He was a big man—big in body, in spirit, in character, and of most importance big in his desire to aid his fellow man in every possible way. I am told that whenever a situation arose where action could add to the well-being of his neighbors, John J. was always in the forefront with his not inconsiderable powers of eloquence and strength.

Although I did not have the opportunity to know this great Christian man, I have been privileged to have as one of my oldest and closest friends, a classmate at LaSalle Academy years ago and a trusted confidant ever since, his son, the younger John J. McLaughlin. Younger John, more affectionately known as "Gedger," is indeed the son of the father. All the attributes commonly accredited and so often heard in connection with the father have been exemplified to an even greater degree in the son. An activist and a bundle of nervous energy, with little regard for his own health, John "Gedger" McLaughlin is in the vanguard of many of the charitable drives in Rhode Island, on the committee of most testimonials, a selfless and energetic worker on all programs for

civic improvement, and a stalwart supporter of anything which will benefit our youth, the downtrodden or the handicapped. A successful businessman, he is the epitome of everything that is best in that often maligned profession.

I consider myself fortunate to have had him for a friend for so many years. It is my earnest hope that the good Lord allows us all to have the benefit of John McLaughlin's goodness for many years to come. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the column from the Woonsocket, R.I., Call, entitled "This Week 50 Years Ago":

THIS WEEK 50 YEARS AGO

William L. Whipple, Elmer L. Cook and Henry S. Darling of East Woonsocket and Aldege Menard and John J. McLaughlin of Cumberland called upon Gov. R. Livingston Beeckman at the statehouse to protest against the methods in vogue in Rhode Island in connection with the handling of the hoof and mouth cattle disease.

By a vote of 3 to 2, the board of aldermen passed an ordinance amendment increasing the salary of the superintendent of schools from \$2,000 to \$2,500 per annum. Aldermen Telephore Desrosiers and Adrien Sylvestre cast dissenting votes.

Chief A. J. Cote and members of hose 5 and truck 2 were hosts at a housewarming at fire station 5 on Social Street on the second anniversary of the occupancy of the station. Clam chowder was served, cigars were distributed and the Eagle Band performed.

The Bellingham Handkerchief Co.'s shop and the residence of the owner, Hadley D. Perkins, at Crooks Corner, South Bellingham, were destroyed by an incendiary fire. The blaze attracted several thousand spectators. Damage was estimated at \$14,000.

Attorney Raphael L. Daignault, chief school census enumerator, reported the number of children in the school age in the city was 9,258, an increase of 786 over the previous year.

Employees of the cloth department of the Globe Cotton Mill presented a purse of gold to William J. Carrigan, retiring after 18½ years of service as overseer of the department.

Miss Christiana Caya, Woonsocket soprano, carried off first honors in a singing competition held in Memorial Hall, Providence, under the auspices of the Rhode Island branch of the National Federation of Music Clubs.

The Winnesuket Canoe Club voted to disband at a meeting in Martin O'Toole's rooms on Main Street. The move was prompted by the destruction of its clubhouse twice within 18 months.

Mr. and Mrs. J. Robert Beckwith of 344 Second Avenue were guests at a farewell reception and supper sponsored by the Ladies' Union of Globe Congregational Church. Beckwith, formerly employed at the Woonsocket Machine & Press Co. as a machinist, was preparing to leave to assist his brother in the operation of a large truck farm in Clinton, N.Y.

One new member was admitted at a meeting of the Jolly Rovers in the home of Edward Monk, 410 Summer Street.

The Woonsocket Cricket Club made plans for its annual banquet at a meeting at the YMCA.

Police Chief Frederick Coe was heading an investigation into the theft of yarn at the Lippitt Mill.

Mrs. Alphonse Lammertyn of 14 Newland Avenue received an official communication announcing the death of her husband, an infantryman in the French Army, who was killed in the battle of Bermeuil-sur-Aisne.

Mrs. Wesley F. Morse of Woonsocket read a paper on the life and works of Henrik Ibsen

at a meeting of the Emerson College Club of Rhode Island in Providence.

Harry L. Kearnan, 20-year-old Whitinsville youth, was signed by Earle Mack, son of Connie Mack, to a contract to play for the Raleigh, N.C., baseball club.

**VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT
AMENDMENTS OF 1965 SECTION-
BY-SECTION ANALYSIS**

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, I have thought that it was timely for the Congress to take a new hard look at the adequacy of the Federal legislation on vocational rehabilitation underpinning the cooperative work that the Federal and State Governments undertake together to restore disabled people to employment.

In my capacity as chairman, for 15 years, of the subcommittee that deals with appropriations for vocational rehabilitation, I have had a unique opportunity to become familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the enabling legislation, and the operating programs that have been undertaken by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration with the money we have entrusted to their administration. They have built an impressive record of accomplishment in rehabilitating constantly increasing numbers of people each year. The totals increased from 56,000 in 1954; to 88,000 in 1960; to more than 102,000 in 1962; to 110,000 in 1963; and up to 120,000 in 1964. We anticipate even greater progress in 1965. Good as this record is, it has not been possible to keep up with the disabled being added each year to the backlog of previous years. We must do more to reach and rehabilitate all who can be helped.

The record will show that I have constantly urged and encouraged the Commissioner, Mary Switzer, and the various Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, both Democratic and Republican, to ask for more money and to put more effort into this program. I have proposed measures to expand its responsibilities and coverage where appropriate. I have supported all appropriate means of encouraging the States to provide matching funds to be used to put disabled people back to work. The alternative, which no one really advocates, is to leave these disabled people untrained, and hopelessly dependent upon private or public charity for the satisfaction of their elementary needs for food and shelter. I prefer, and the Congress as a whole has shown by its support of this program that it prefers to give the Secretary and the Commissioner better legislation and more money to accomplish the vocational rehabilitation of substantially larger numbers of people that have been served and rehabilitated in the past.

Ten years of experience under the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954 demonstrate that additional authority and some new approaches are needed if we are to reach and surpass

the goal we set of 200,000 rehabilitated each year. I introduced legislation in the 88th Congress to expand and improve the vocational rehabilitation program which, I want to point out, is one of the first and best of the Federal Government's efforts to train and return unemployed and underemployed people to wage-earning, taxpaying status. Other Members did the same, including the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and, of course, our colleague in the other body, Senator LISTER HILL.

I am today introducing a bill, sponsored by the administration, to achieve some of the same improvements that I have recommended in previous years. In so doing, I join my associate, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, who introduced the administration's proposal on March 18. These amendments have been developed with the advice and consultation of many groups concerned with the rehabilitation of disabled people.

The report of President Johnson's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke calls for the prompt enactment of legislation to put into effect what we now know about rehabilitating people who have suffered from these diseases. The late President Kennedy's task forces and commissions on mental illness and mental retardation emphasized the need for greatly expanding the provision of both medical services and vocationally oriented services including counseling, training, job tryouts, and other specialized help that will enable these people to return to productive activity.

This bill is timely. It is aimed at the rehabilitation of the hard core of the unemployed—the disabled. This bill is consistent with the effort of the administration under the manpower training programs and the Appalachia and anti-poverty programs to upgrade the basic training and education of our citizens so that they may enjoy and contribute to the fruits of the better society we are trying to create under President Johnson's inspired leadership.

The bill contains a series of proposals, including many amendments that I recommended last year. One of the most significant is the establishment of a new grant program to States with 75-percent Federal funds to help pay the cost of evaluation services to determine whether a person can be vocationally rehabilitated. Another series of recommendations will enable the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to construct and equip new workshops, to help improve existing workshops and training services which are so vitally needed in the rehabilitation of increased numbers of disabled people.

I am submitting for the RECORD the text of the bill and a fact sheet which describes each section.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title: This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965."

Section 2. Determination of vocational rehabilitation potential:

(a) This subsection would replace the obsolete transition provisions in section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with provisions authorizing a new program of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation evaluation services to determine rehabilitation potential.

Under subsection (a) (1) (A) of the amended section 12, from the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of providing vocational rehabilitation evaluation services each State would be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the product of its population and its allotment percentage (as defined in section 11(h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

Under subsection (a) (1) (B) of the amended section 12, each State would be assured a minimum allotment of \$5,000 for each fiscal year, or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the appropriation act for that year. The amount necessary to provide each State with the minimum allotment would be derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of States having been allotted more than the minimum.

Subsection (a) (2) of the amended section 12 provides for reallocation of any part of a State's allotment not required by that State.

Subsection (b) (1) of the amended section 12 provides that the Secretary shall pay, out of each State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fixed year the Federal share, or 75 percent, in the case of any State which provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that its expenditures from State or local sources for vocational rehabilitation services under its plan (except for expenditures pursuant to sec. 3) will not be less than such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, of the State's costs of providing vocational rehabilitation evaluation services to substantially handicapped individuals (including costs of administration) under the State's plan.

Subsection (b) (2) of the amended section 12 precludes dual payment with respect to any cost.

Subsection (c) of the amended section 12 defines "vocational rehabilitation evaluation services" to mean those services provided to any individual under a physical or mental disability constituting a substantial handicap to employment, during the period determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary to be necessary for, and for the purpose of, ascertaining whether it may reasonably be expected that such an individual will be rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation through the provision of vocational rehabilitation services, and which would constitute vocational rehabilitation services if his disability were of such a nature that he would be a physically handicapped individual; however, the period during which evaluation services could be provided could not exceed 18 months for individuals who are mentally retarded or who have some other disability designated by the Secretary, or 6 months for any other disabled individual; and the services that could be provided could not include placement services, management services and supervision for any business, the acquisition or provision of tools, vending stands or other equipment, stocks, or supplies for use in any business or remunerative occupation, or the establishment of rehabilitation facilities or workshops.

(b) and (c) These subsections would amend section 1 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to authorize appropriations for grants to States under section 12 to assist them in meeting the costs of vocational rehabilitation evaluation services, and would amend references in sections 1 and 5 of the

act to the section 2 or section 3 grant programs so that they would also refer to the new section 12 program.

(d) This subsection would make the amendments made by the preceding subsections effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966.

Section 3. Construction of rehabilitation facilities; workshop improvement; experimental projects; removal of architectural barriers: This section would redesignate section 13 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as section 17, and would insert after section 12 the following new sections:

Section 13. Grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops: subsection (a) would authorize the Secretary, for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, to make grants to assist in meeting the costs of construction of public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities.

Subsection (b) provides that, in order to be approved, an application for a grant for a construction project must contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that the facility will be used for the purposes for which constructed for at least 10 years after completion of construction, that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the facility's cost of construction and to meet the cost of operating the facility, and that minimum standards of construction and equipment will be complied with. The application must also be approved by the State agency, and must contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that laborers or mechanics employed in the construction will be paid prevailing wages.

Subsection (c) provides that the amount of a grant under this section shall be equal to the same percentage of the cost of the project as the Federal share determined for rehabilitation facilities (as defined in section 625(g) of the Public Health Service Act) in the State; except that if the State elects to provide for variations in the Federal share among projects under subparagraph (A) of section 625(b) (1) of the Public Health Service Act, the percentage of the cost shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary designed to achieve results comparable to the results obtained under that subparagraph.

Subsection (d) provides that upon approval of any application for a construction grant the Secretary shall reserve the amount of the grant, and may pay the amount reserved in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

Subsection (e) provides that if, within 10 years after completion of any workshop or facility for which funds have been paid under this section, the facility shall cease to be a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, the United States may recover from its owner the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value of the workshop or facility as the amount of the Federal participation in the cost of construction bore to the total cost of construction.

Subsection (f) would authorize the Secretary to make grants with respect to any workshop or rehabilitation facility for which a grant for a construction project has been made under this section to cover part of the costs of compensation of professional or technical personnel of such workshop or facility for 4 years and 8 months after the month in which the workshop or facility commenced operation. Such grants may not exceed 75 percent of these costs for the 15-month period following the month in which operation commenced, 60 percent of such costs for the first year thereafter, 45 percent of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 30 percent of such costs for the third year thereafter.

Subsection (g) would authorize the Secretary to make grants to the State agency to

assist in meeting the cost of determining the State's needs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities and, upon application approved by the State agency, to public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations to assist them in meeting the costs of planning workshops and rehabilitation facilities and the services to be provided thereby.

Subsection (h) provides that payment of grants under subsection (f) or (g) may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

Subsection (i) would authorize appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the next 4 fiscal years for carrying out this section, and provides that sums appropriated shall remain available for payment with respect to construction or staffing projects approved under this section prior to July 1, 1970.

Subsection (j) contains the following definitions:

"(1) 'Construction' is defined to include construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings;

"(2) The 'cost' of construction is defined to include the cost of architects' fees in connection with construction, but it does not include the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements;

"(3) A project for construction of a workshop may include such construction as may be necessary to provide residential accommodations for use in connection with the rehabilitation of mentally retarded individuals."

Section 14. Workshop improvement: This section would authorize, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1971, grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to pay 75 percent of the cost of projects for providing training services to physically handicapped individuals in public or other nonprofit workshops. Training services would include training in occupational skills; related services, including work evaluation, work testing, occupational tools and equipment required by the individual to engage in training, and job tryouts; and payment of weekly allowances to individuals receiving training. Allowances could not be paid to any individual for more than 2 years and could not exceed, for any week, \$25 plus \$10 for each of the individual's dependents, or \$65, whichever is less. In determining the amount of such allowance, consideration would be given to the individual's need for an allowance, including any expenses reasonably attributable to training, the extent to which an allowance would help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and other factors as specified by the Secretary which would promote the individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation. The Secretary would make a grant for such a project only after his determination that the purpose of the project is to prepare physically handicapped individuals for a remunerative occupation, that the individuals will be only those who have been determined to be suitable for and in need of such training services by the State agency or agencies designated in section 5(a) (1) of the State in which the workshop is located, that the full range of training services will be available to each such individual as needed, and that the project will meet such other requirements as the Secretary may prescribe. Payments could be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Secretary, and on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

to include within the meaning of vocational rehabilitation services, for small businesses operated by severely handicapped individuals and whose operation can be improved by management services and supervision by the State agency, the provision of such services and supervision, either alone or together with the acquisition by the State agency of vending stands or other equipment and initial stocks and supplies for use in such businesses.

Section 11. Technical amendment: This section would amend section 4(d)(3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, authorizing compensation of members of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation at rates to be fixed by the Secretary but not to exceed \$50 per day, plus travel expenses, to allow Council members to be paid up to \$100 per day plus travel expenses.

FACT SHEET ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION: THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—S. 1525; H.R. 6476

Determination of vocational rehabilitation potential: This would authorize grants to States to assist in meeting the cost of providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals to determine whether they can reasonably be expected to become able to engage in remunerative employment. Services under this section could be provided up to 6 months, except that 18 months would be authorized for mentally retarded individuals and for such others as may be designated by the Secretary. Funds would be allotted on a formula reflecting population and per capita income, with reallocation. The Federal share would be 75 percent. Effective July 1, 1966.

Notation: Under present law, State rehabilitation agencies are expected to determine, after initial diagnostic workup—but before any services are rendered—whether or not a handicapped person can reasonably be expected to become employable after a program of services is completed. For large numbers of handicapped persons, with severe disabilities or complicated problems or both, this is virtually impossible. As a result, many of these handicapped individuals do not receive services. This provision of the bill would authorize the State rehabilitation agency to render services up to a maximum of 6 months (or 18 months in the case of the mentally retarded and any other subsequently designated by the Secretary), observe the handicapped person's response to services, and then determine whether further services could be expected to result in employment. For this part of the total Federal-State program, special Federal financing (above) would be authorized.

Grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops: This would authorize a 5-year program of project grants to assist in the cost of construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops by public or other nonprofit organizations. Grants would be available for new construction, expansion, remodeling, alteration and renovation, and for initial equipment. Financing would be the same as Hill-Burton financing. Rehabilitation facilities would be those primarily of a vocational nature. Planning grants of two types and purposes would be authorized: (1) grants to assist States in the cost of assessing and determining statewide needs for facilities and workshops in vocational rehabilitation, as a basis for orderly development and growth; (2) planning grants where necessary to assist in the cost of planning for such a facility or workshop. Provision is also made for grants for initial staffing in connection with a construction project, with a maximum period of 4 years and 3 months, and with Federal funds to be available for a maximum of 75 percent of the initial staffing costs for the first 15 months and decreasing annually to a share of 30 per-

cent in the final period. Provisions are also included covering safeguards for the Federal investment in the project, standards of construction and labor practices (Davis-Bacon Act), and for residential accommodations in the case of workshops for mentally retarded individuals. Effective fiscal year 1966; appropriations authorized for fiscal 1966 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

Notation: This proposal would help determine and meet the urgent need for new rehabilitation centers and workshops in various places in the country, offer aid for centers and workshops planning to expand their institutions, and give assistance with staffing during the initial years of a project. State vocational rehabilitation agencies would conduct continuing studies for surveillance of relative needs within States.

Workshop Improvement—Grants for projects for training services in workshops: This would authorize a new 5-year program of project grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to help provide training services to handicapped persons in public or other nonprofit workshops. The Federal share of the cost of such projects would be 75 percent. Grants would be made only to the State vocational rehabilitation agency for a project in cooperation with a workshop, except where unusual circumstances call for other arrangements. The "training services" in such a project would include (1) training in occupational skills, (2) other services directly related to training such as work evaluation, work testing, occupational tools and equipment required by the trainee to engage in the training, and job tryouts, and (3) payment of a weekly allowance to the trainee. Such allowances (1) could not exceed \$25 per week plus \$10 for each dependent, with a maximum payment of \$65 weekly to any individual trainee, and (2) could not be paid to any trainee for more than 2 years. In determining the amount of such allowance for an individual, consideration would be given to his need for such an allowance (including any expenses reasonably attributable to his engaging in training), the extent to which such an allowance would help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and such other factors, specified by the Secretary, as would promote such individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation. To be approved, a project would have to show that the training can be expected to lead to a remunerative occupation; that the individuals to be trained will be those found suitable for and in need of training by the State vocational rehabilitation agency; that the full range of training services authorized will be made available, as needed on an individual basis; and that the project will meet other requirements prescribed by the Secretary. In administering this grant program, projects would be approved only where the participating workshop meets the policies and criteria established by the National Policy and Performance Council (below). Effective July 1, 1966.

Notation: This proposal is designed to assist handicapped persons and workshops in several ways, to encourage more severely disabled people to undertake and complete training; to provide a broader and more specific basis of cooperation between State rehabilitation agencies and workshops; to furnish a more planned and stable arrangement for use of workshops as training resources by the State agencies; to increase the number of disabled people vocationally rehabilitated and, in conjunction with the proposals for workshop improvement grants and for the National Policy and Performance Council, to help improve and elevate the effectiveness of workshops generally.

Workshop improvement—workshop improvement grants: This would authorize a 5-year program of project grants to work-

shops to pay part of the cost of analyzing, improving, and increasing professional and technical services to handicapped individuals, business management, and other parts of the workshop operations as they affect employment and services for handicapped clients. (Funds would not be available for acquiring, constructing, expanding, remodeling, or altering buildings.) Effective on enactment.

Notation: This proposal would offer project grants to help workshops analyze, improve, and elevate the quality and quantity of services they provide to disabled persons. In making grants, the State vocational rehabilitation agency would, in connection with its continuing survey of facilities and workshops, advise and recommend to VRA on the need for such a grant, and the extent to which a workshop improvement grant would help a workshop to meet the standards and criteria established by the National Policy and Performance Council (see below), plus various other considerations.

Workshop improvements—technical assistance to workshops: This would authorize the provision of technical assistance of various kinds to aid workshops in solving their operating and technical problems. Individuals, panels, or groups would, at the request of a workshop, be detailed for a limited period to consult with a workshop to give highly skilled professional and technical advice in professional, business, and related aspects of workshop improvement. Effective on enactment.

Notation: This proposal responds to many expressions of workshop directors on the need for expert professional and technical assistance. The VRA would secure the cooperation of experts in various phases of professional services; similarly, the VRA would arrange for the assistance of experienced businessmen in several fields, particularly management (plant layout, personnel, production, equipment, supplies, work simplification, sales, accounting, etc.). They would be made available for short periods of time, without cost to the workshop.

Workshop improvement—National Policy and Performance Council: This would establish a National Policy and Performance Council of 12 members appointed by the Secretary, with a chairman appointed from among the membership. Members would be selected from among leaders in vocational rehabilitation, workshops, government, business, organized labor, related professions, and the general public. Members would have a term of 4 years, with automatic rotation. The Council would be primarily concerned with helping to initiate and carry out the program of grants for projects for training services in workshops (above). The Council would (1) develop and recommend to the Secretary the policies and criteria to be observed in making grants for training services, (2) advise the Secretary on workshop improvement generally, and the extent to which the workshop improvement section of the act is accomplishing its purpose, and (3) perform such other services with respect to workshops as the Secretary may require. Effective on enactment.

Notation: This proposal would provide a basis for securing the collective views of workshop directors and others directly concerned with the operation and use of workshops and their service programs, with respect to requirements for an adequate training services program in which disabled individuals may receive allowances while undergoing training. The Council would be concerned with both the general factors in a workshop operation and in the adequacy of an organized training program for such trainees. The Council would be advisory to the Secretary and would, in addition, be available for such other advice regarding workshops as the Secretary may request.

and other small business operated by disabled persons.

Technical amendment: This would amend section 4(d)(3) of the act to authorize not to exceed \$100 per day compensation for members of the present National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation. (Present law authorizes \$50 per day.) Effective on enactment.

Notation: Self-explanatory.

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT—BEGINNING OF A NEW ERA FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to have the opportunity to support H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965. In my judgment, with approval of this bill we will be entering upon a new era of security and happiness for our older citizens.

Earlier this year I had the privilege of introducing H.R. 674, the Senior Citizens Act, which has substantially the same provisions as this bill we considered. So I was particularly happy to support H.R. 3708.

This measure represents the essential first step in achieving our objective of assuring older citizens of full participation in all the benefits and pleasures of American life.

Under H.R. 3708 there will be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a new operating agency, the Administration on Aging. This action has long been overdue. Up to now responsibility for dealing with the complex and myriad problems of our senior citizens has been dispersed through numerous Government departments and agencies. There have also been complicated interrelationships between Federal and local programs, as well as between governmental agencies and private organizations.

A high-level agency giving complete attention to the problems of our aged will enable us to most effectively develop and coordinate efforts to solve them.

The 5-year program of grants to the States and to public and nonprofit agencies will be of significant help in developing the community programs which President Kennedy, in his special message in 1963, called "the heart of our program for the elderly."

While the primary responsibility for caring for and working out the problems of our senior citizens rests with State and local governments, with the new Administration on Aging and the grant program we can provide the leadership and what I would consider "seed money" to attack these problems.

The policy we have outlined declares that the Nation's older people deserve adequate retirement income, the best possible health, suitable housing, restorative services, opportunity for employment without discrimination, and meaningful activity. A most important element of this policy, however, is that

it recognizes the responsibility of governments at all levels to secure these needs for our senior citizens and at the same time emphasizes that they are entitled to "freedom, independence, and the exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

Mr. Speaker, very soon we will take the next, and undoubtedly the most major, step to carry out this policy when the House acts on the bill to provide a landmark health benefits program for the aged within the social security system. We have within sight a program we have sought for years, one vital to achievement of the goals we have determined essential for our older Americans. The President has rightly termed the Ways and Means Committee action "an historic one."

At long last we are beginning to act to meet the needs of those who have given so much of themselves in the development of our great country.

THE U.N. CONGO MISSION

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who regretted the termination of the U.N. peacekeeping role in the Congo in 1964 at a time when it was evident that instability would seriously jeopardize the future of that important government. Yet there were many views about this peacekeeping operation. As it now becomes history, we need to draw from that experience all it can offer as a guide to the future.

A study of the Congo operation was recently published by the Brookings Institution. Because Members may wish to avail themselves of this important study, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD a review of that study recently published in the Brookings Bulletin:

COMPLEX, CONTROVERSIAL, AND INCONCLUSIVE, THE U.N. CONGO MISSION SERVED THE CAUSE OF PEACE

Whether the United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Congo from 1960 to 1964 was successful may appear to be a moot question while the country remains wracked by a bloody civil war. Yet as the largest and most difficult operation ever administered by an international organization, it is "rich in lessons and warnings for the future" which are analyzed in a new Brookings book by Ernest W. Lefever to be published in March.¹

The volume provides the first full account of the Congo peacekeeping mission, and is based on firsthand observation by the author in 1962 and 1963. Mr. Lefever also interviewed scores of persons directly involved in the action. His analysis places in new perspective many obscure and confusing aspects of the complex story.

Certainly the Congo experience was the most controversial, as well as the largest, of the dozen or so peacekeeping missions which have engaged the United Nations (the much larger Korean effort, while under U.N. aegis, was a "sanctions" as opposed to a "peaceful

settlement" force, and was under the operational command of the United States). It was undertaken in a strategically located and rich country almost the size of Western Europe which had overnight become a new arena in the struggle between the Communist bloc and the West. The Congo quickly became a major foreign policy problem for all the great powers and many other governments. Thirty-four states sent a total of 93,000 soldiers to man the U.N. Force, and 126 of them lost their lives in the operation. It cost \$402 million, of which the United States contributed 42 percent. It established new procedural and legal precedents, it was used by the Soviets to precipitate a constitutional and financial crisis for the world body, and it was the overwhelming preoccupation of the Secretariat for its duration.

The peacekeeping effort was complicated by internal conflict in the Congo, the lack of preparation for self-government, and the abrupt and premature withdrawal of Belgian authority which caused the breakdown of law and order in the summer of 1960. The mandate given the operation was vague and ambiguous. The member governments of the United Nations held conflicting interpretations of what the Security Council resolutions meant. There was an unbridgeable gap between the far-reaching goal of restoring the peace and maintaining territorial integrity in the Congo and the limited legal authority of the "peaceful settlement" force operating with the consent of a divided and incompetent host government. The U.N. Force was operationally less than efficient, it made many small mistakes, and it suffered from hostile and unfair propaganda which was carried by much of the world press.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lefever finds that the U.N. Congo operation was largely successful in its basic mission of contributing to peace and security in Central Africa and in the wider world. It curtailed Soviet attempts to exploit the crisis by direct intervention. It helped end Katangan secession, thus preserving the territorial integrity of the Congo. It made a positive contribution to internal stability by its support of a united Congo with a moderate constitutional government representing all factions. It was a major factor in maintaining law and order and deterring the spread of tribal warfare.

In spite of four years of U.N. peacekeeping, disorder still characterizes the Congo. The situation today appears little better than it was in 1960. Despite political changes, the Central Government is still weak, faction-ridden, inexperienced and assailed by tribal and provincial revolts. It would be unrealistic to expect the U.N. to have brought lasting order, given the situation, but does it share responsibility for the failure to create greater stability?

Partly, Mr. Lefever finds: The U.N. Force did not succeed in one of its most important assignments—to train and reorganize the 35,000-man Congolese Army. The army is still almost as irresponsible and unreliable as it was in 1960, and this is a principal reason for the Government's inability to maintain order. However, the blame must be shared by the Congolese Government which failed to cooperate with U.N. efforts to retrain the army. These efforts were also handicapped by lack of specific legal authority.

The U.N. Force also did not do anything to contain the insurrections supported by Red China which today are a principal cause of continuing disorder. Here, however, the Force itself cannot be blamed. When the rebellions broke out in early 1964, the Congo and the other governments had already agreed to disengage the Force as quickly as possible. Many of the neutralist states were interested primarily in decolonization, and not the preservation of law and order or sta-

¹ Crisis in the Congo: A United Nations Force in Action, about 200 pages, cloth \$3.50, paper \$1.95.

bility in central Africa as such. Their support for the operation in the first place was based primarily on their desire to end Western colonialism in the Congo. With the end of Katangan secession in early 1963 and the expulsion of the Belgian "imperialists" and the mercenaries, they felt the job was completed and their interest in the operation subsided.

In the final analysis, the U.N. Congo operation must be judged as having served the interests of the Western governments and the moderate neutralist states which sought stability in central Africa and a united Congo under a responsible government. Consequently it served the broader interests of international peace. Ironically, Russia and many neutralist states which supported the operation initially as a means of expelling Western influence later found that the U.N. mission frustrated their efforts to install an extreme nationalist or pro-Communist regime in Leopoldville.

Ironies abound in the Congo story. The operation served British and French interests in African stability, although both nations opposed the operation in part or in whole. In retrospect, it clearly served the interests of the United States, although at times American support of the operation was seriously questioned in responsible quarters in and out of the Government.

A member of the foreign policy studies senior staff at Brookings, the author was formerly on the staff of the Institute for Defense Analyses (which provided substantial support for the study) and head of the Foreign Affairs Division of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service. His book was prepared under the special program of U.N. policy studies made possible by a Ford Foundation grant. Among other projects in progress under the program is a study of the U.N.'s civil and conciliatory operations in the Congo.

AGONY OF SELMA

(Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Texas) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the agony of Selma became the agony of America. Out of thousands of personal commitments we have experienced a national anguish. Individuals in personal and group conflict, black and white, confronted each other in Alabama to produce moments of truth for themselves and for all of us.

I was profoundly moved by the journal of one man who was there to report his experience, Mr. Hoke Norris, literary editor of the Chicago Sun-Times. I commend his "Pilgrims' Progress in Alabama." He has recorded vividly the human mechanics of those significant days in Selma and Montgomery and between, the strategy and tactics of both sides; but he has also captured the spirit of the men and women who moved history in that torturous arena.

Mr. Norris, himself a native of the South, brought to his journal a sensitivity that gave substance and poignancy to his description of the white man's world on Selma's Broad Street and the Negro's world on Sylvan Street. Between them, he captured the texture of the old South confronted with the demands of the new South. I submit Mr. Norris' report to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PILGRIMS' PROGRESS IN ALABAMA—WITH ACHING FEET, THEY VOTE FOR FREEDOM

(By Hoke Norris, Sun-Times Staff Correspondent)

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—This is the cradle of the Confederacy, and may be its grave. Here Jefferson Davis was inaugurated as President of the nation that was not to be, and here was its capital in the first bright, joyful days of the Civil War.

But now Montgomery has been marched upon and, if not captured, at least subdued and shaken. The past, if not dead, is dying here in the Alabama spring with the redbud blooming, and the trees gray with winter but faintly green in their upper reaches. There will be other springs, but perhaps never again another like this one in Alabama. This is the spring when the impossible, the unthinkable, the preposterous became the reality. The Negroes marched upon Montgomery and demanded the right to vote.

How did it happen? What was it like, in Montgomery, in Selma, and on the concrete and piney-wood miles between? It isn't a tidy story to tell. The march on Montgomery was often conducted with more enthusiasm and dedication than efficiency and dispatch. Meetings were announced but never held, or were held without announcement. Here were many amateurs, undertaking a vast professional job, and the few professionals among the thousands were often overwhelmed by the numbers, by the magnitude of the task and the sheer logistics of getting from here to there. But it did happen, and this, roughly, as one man saw it, is how it happened.

You can't get to Selma without first coming to Montgomery. This is where the airlines land, and the cars are rented. Whatever your preconceptions about the city, and the South, arrival in Montgomery is as ordinary as arrival anywhere. Montgomery might be anybody's hometown, or Peoria. The rented car rolls along a divided highway into town—the much-marched Highway 80—past that same sort of scenery that most towns choose to exhibit to newcomers, and to sons coming home again. Filling stations, garages, warehouses, motels, restaurants, used car lots, here and there a farm that has somehow withstood the encircling city—these are the greetings. But there is a Holiday Inn—in fact, two of them, and soon to be a third. The swimming pool is empty, the mist falls out of a gray sky, the wind is April in Chicago, and the lobby is busy. The clerks are brisk with unsouthern briskness; they have many guests. Later, at dinner, there is no southern cornbread to eat with the pompano, but the baked potato is splendid and serves, after a fashion.

I found myself remembering Mississippi—there was a motel there, too, with a swimming pool, and surly, sullen cops that snarled and sneered, and at least one that may have fingered three young men for the murdering Kluxers. But I found to my amazement that the Montgomery police had established a press trailer where reporters could come for information, telephones, coffee and pleasant conversation.

A young police officer named Dick Payson was the official greeter. He did a splendid chamber of commerce job. "Welcome," he said, "and have a seat. If you will just let me see your credentials, please * * *. Have some coffee while I copy this off * * *. If you have any trouble, show this card, and if you still have trouble, call us or come to see us. Glad to have you with us."

Not only was there coffee, but it was good coffee. An assistant police chief, George Owens, acknowledged my compliments and appreciation, bowed and said, laughing, "Well, it gives us a chance to get in out of the wind. Have some more coffee."

From the trailer the visitor could see the capitol, through March mist and drizzle, it is

a long, immaculately white building, Georgian, with a small romanescque dome and a neo-Greek porch. Two black ironwork balconies hang at the upper floors, beyond six fluted columns. It is set among pines, oaks, and magnolias, at the center of a circle of equally white and clean office buildings. Fifteen gray cars stood in line at the curb, at the foot of the long, wide marble steps. Each car bore a red dome light, the words "State Trooper" and a Confederate flag of tin where other cars would exhibit a front license plate.

"Only 15 of them?" Payson said, with a laugh. "You should have been here yesterday. They were everywhere."

A reporter hurried in, and to a telephone. "They just arrested 43 more up there," he said.

"Did it go smooth?" Payson asked.

"It went smooth."

"Thank God."

In Montgomery, a white-columned mansion is now the office of the Mutual Savings Life Insurance Co., and if one can forget the words of the Governor, and what has happened here, and in Selma, he might believe that this capital of Alabama has somehow found the mainstream.

Nobody knows, yet.

Two other men on the plane from Atlanta didn't know. They were both from Ipswich, Mass., William Wasserman, Jr., the publisher of three weekly newspapers, and the Reverend Goldthwaite Sherrill, rector of the Episcopal church in Ipswich and son of Bishop Henry Sherrill, once presiding bishop of Episcopal Churches in the United States and once president of the World Council of Churches.

"I waited until just before I left before I called my father," Sherrill said, "so he wouldn't get involved in what I was going to do. I told him, and he said, 'Well, son, I thought you might be planning that.'"

They were going to join the march. "We'll do whatever they tell us," Wasserman said.

"I plan to call the bishop in Birmingham," Sherrill said. "He's a fine old gentleman, and he'll say to me, 'Well, son, how's your father?'"

(Later the Episcopal bishop, the Roman Catholic bishop, and the Methodist bishop, with ecumenical unanimity, of a sort, issued statements deploring the march, the Catholic bishop called the marching nuns and priests "eager beavers").

"I want to talk also to one of the Episcopal lay leaders in Selma, a prominent banker," Sherrill said. "It was the Selma Episcopal Church, you remember, St. Paul's, that turned away Malcolm Peabody and his group the other day. He's the brother of the former Governor, Enidcott Peabody, of Massachusetts, and his mother was arrested down here in the South some time ago in a civil rights demonstration.

"I understand that 19 of them went to St. Paul's. The pastor was away—his ulcers were bothering him. The vestrymen told them that the white laymen and all the rectors, Negro and white, would be admitted, but not the Negro laymen. I think they were violating a canon of our church."

Wasn't this, he was asked, the first cause to bring together large numbers of the clergy—Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic?

"It is," he said. "I don't suppose that it's ever happened before. And I think that President Kennedy brought it about. You know how it was before he was elected. But he was elected, and he did a splendid job of bringing us people together. That—and Pope John. What a great thing his election was. It almost makes you believe in the Holy Spirit again, doesn't it?"

And so they came to Montgomery, and to Selma.