

Brawley was Executive Director of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff from 1949 until 1961 when he became Deputy Postmaster General. He had many political contacts in Washington, and was regarded as one of the best informed on post office and civil service matters.

While Day's request to J. Edgar Hoover for an FBI investigation primarily was aimed at the question of whether Brawley retained his stock while a Post Office official, Day also questioned the propriety of Brawley's acquisition of stock in any mail-order house that had such a great stake in legislation dealing with parcel post and other mail rates.

COMMON PRACTICE

On the question of the propriety of buying the Spiegel stock while on the Senate committee staff, Brawley stated "It has been common practice at the Capitol for employees to make such investments and there is no law to prohibit it."

"There are always a lot of tips floating around the Capitol," Brawley said. He estimated that "there must be 50 Senators" who are constantly investing in tips that are available. He added that in his opinion the problem of a possible conflict is much more acute for Senators than for staff members who do not vote.

Brawley said he obtained his stock tip from some of the Spiegel officials and that he borrowed two-thirds of the \$10,000 purchase price from a South Carolina bank in which one of his relatives is an officer.

A Spiegel official had told him the firm was installing electronic computers and other labor-saving devices and was due for a move forward, Brawley said. He said the stock was priced at only about \$10 a share but was paying \$1 a share in dividends.

"The increase was sensational," Brawley said. "I hoped it would go up, but I had no idea it would pay like it did."

Brawley contends that much of his trouble came from a "former friend," Cyril T. Anderson, whom he introduced to Spiegel officials and recommended for a job as lobbyist for Spiegel.

Anderson said he was not sure that it was Brawley who introduced him to Spiegel officials, and did not know if Brawley had recommended him as a Spiegel lobbyist.

Anderson said he had some differences of viewpoint on legislation with Brawley in 1961 and 1962, but that he considered this "normal" since he represented a firm that opposed the Kennedy administration's large mail rate increase.

Day told the Register that he "heard some disturbing reports concerning Brawley."

"I passed the information on to the proper law enforcement authorities for investigation," Day said.

ONE OF THE REPORTS

Brawley said the reports had included a story that he had received a \$10,000 political contribution and had split it with two members of the White House staff.

Brawley said he made a telephone call to a Washington representative of a business publications organization and arranged for the \$10,000 contribution.

He said that he was able to demonstrate that the money was delivered in cash to Matthew McCloskey, then the treasurer of the National Democratic Party, for a box seat at the 1961 gala to pay off the 1960 campaign debt.

Brawley said McCloskey had written a note for the file which showed that he had received the money for the box seat. Brawley said the man who delivered the cash to McCloskey had a witness with him. Brawley said he had no contact with this money.

Since leaving the Post Office Department, Brawley said he has invested in the stock of the National Bank of Commerce of Fairfax County, Va.

Brawley said he is a director of the recently organized bank that received its charter from Comptroller of the Currency James Saxon on August 13, 1963. He said it is his only present investment.

The records of the Comptroller of the Currency Office also list Brawley as the senior vice president of the National Bank of Commerce.

Support for the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1965, the United Nations celebrated the 20th anniversary of the signing of its charter in San Francisco. Our President was present for that occasion and delivered an eloquent and timely restatement of this country's faith in the United Nations. The action of Congress in passing Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 was important in adding to the support given by our Nation to the N.U. Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER's leadership in the House of Representatives in this important area was extremely important.

All of us know the tribulations under which the United Nations has operated in this past year. We have seen first withdrawal by a country of its membership in the political aspects of the United Nations. Many have wondered if this was a repeat performance of problems of the League of Nations and pondered as to whether or not this would signal a breakup of the still quite young United Nations.

It was important for the President to express the support and faith we Americans have in the United Nations at this crucial time. We are fully aware that without this common ground for discussion and action many world crises would not have been eased or averted. The possibility of an all-out nuclear war would be multiplied a hundredfold.

All of us are concerned about a peaceful world. We see the United Nations as an alternative to the power struggle between nations and a resulting nuclear war. But we should not expect more than is reasonable from this young organization. The United Nations is still in its formative years and has much growing to do before it has reached full maturity and strength. We need to give it our full support so that we do not drag it to the ground and ourselves with it.

As the United Nations grows in responsibility and strength, we hope to see it equipped with the tools to enable it to avoid the conflicts and pitfalls of the Congo, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic. More than that, it may show us through cooperation the way to eradicate hunger, disease, and ignorance. Let us join those who call for a strengthened United Nations through vigorous U.S. support.

To Get the Best Takes Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very timely and thoughtful commentary on a major domestic problem was written by Mr. A. T. Burch in the June 18 edition of the Chicago Daily News. Since Mr. Burch is a respected journalist whose objectivity is above question, I feel his words deserve careful consideration:

TO GET THE BEST TAKES MUCH MONEY

(By A. T. Burch)

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court decided that legally enforced segregation of public schools violates the equal protection provisions of the U.S. Constitution.

It struck down the Court's previous approval of "separate but equal" provisions for Negro education. It asserted that separate school systems are inherently unequal.

On several occasions, the Reverend Martin Luther King has asserted that the Court had declared de facto segregation, arising from neighborhood residential patterns, to be unconstitutional. This might seem to be implied in the proposition that separate education cannot be equal. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court has not actually said that de facto segregation in the schools is illegal.

In at least three instances, it has refused to reverse decisions by U.S. Courts of Appeals which had held that the neighborhood school system, which often results in some actual segregation, is not unconstitutional in itself. These courts approved the neighborhood system provided it arises naturally from the facts of population distribution, and is not the result of a prior purpose to create segregation.

The Supreme Court has not made any extended declaration of its own on this subject. It merely refused to review the decision of the lower courts.

It has not, however, said exactly what the Reverend Mr. King says it has—not yet, at least.

One inference some people appear to have drawn from the Supreme Court's 1954 opinion is erroneous in fact and mischievous in its practical results.

The dangerous inference comes in two parts. The first is that, since the Supreme Court has held separate education to be unequal, integration by itself will raise the achievement of underprivileged children to equality with the achievement of children of well-educated parents and stable homes. White or black, the children of well-educated parents will generally have an advantage over those of illiterate parents, in any school.

The second part of the fallacy is the assumption that integration, by producing "equal" education, will by itself produce good education. This, by itself, it will not do. The content of the curriculum, the size of the classrooms, the training, skill and dedication of teachers and their personal rapport with the children—all these things are important. To get the best takes money, much money.

To be sure, very exceptional children inspired by any influence with a determination to improve themselves can sometimes achieve distinction despite poor schools, poor teachers, or none. Abraham Lincoln went to school 1 year in his whole life; Thomas A. Edison 3 months. But such self-starting geniuses are rare.

Bill file
June 28, 1965

On Presidential Disability and Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week House and Senate conferees agreed upon a much-needed Presidential disability and succession amendment to the Constitution. The author of this proposed amendment is my distinguished colleague from Indiana, Senator BIRCH BAYH, who has provided outstanding leadership in meeting this important problem.

This week the conferees' report will come to the floor of both houses for consideration. I know that this is a matter of serious concern to all Members of Congress and, therefore, I, under unanimous consent, include in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the South Bend Tribune this month: "No Time To Stall," June 7, 1965, and "At Last" June 25, 1965:

NO TIME TO STALL

Both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives have approved a constitutional amendment dealing with presidential disability, but the amendment is in danger of never reaching the States for ratification because the two Houses of Congress can't agree on one small point.

At issue is the question of how long Congress would be allowed to take in deciding who is President when a Vice President challenges the right of a once-disabled President to resume office.

The Senate version of the amendment imposes no time limit. Senate tradition holds unlimited debate to be an all-but-sacred privilege and the thought of even a constitutional deadline on any Senate decision apparently appals the members of the world's most exclusive club. The House, which has a more practical attitude toward debate, put a 10-day limit in its version of the amendment.

There are reports that House conferees are willing to stretch the limit to 21 days, but they won't remove all limitation. And we don't blame them. It is hard to imagine Congress requiring even 10 days to make such an urgent decision as deciding whether a President may reoccupy his office.

Such a period would be difficult enough for the Nation to weather without congressional stalling and indecision. A time limit is in order, and the shorter the better.

Let the Senate swallow its "unlimited debate" mystique on this important issue so that the States may get on with the business of ratifying a vital constitutional amendment.

AT LAST

The agreement of House and Senate conferees on a constitutional amendment for the determination of presidential disability and succession is most welcome.

The agreement gives Congress 21 days to decide the issue when the Vice President contests the right of a once disabled President to resume office. The earlier House version of the amendment imposed a 10-day limit. The Senate, with its strong feelings for unlimited debate, set no limit.

It is to the credit of the Senate that it swallowed its pride on this vital question and accepted a time limit. Obviously, a matter of such importance to the Federal Gov-

For the vast majority of us, good schooling is necessary if we are even to hold a passably good job. And the outer bounds of the physical sciences, important today not only to ordinary industry but also to national security, can be reached only through intensive, specialized, formal education.

Fortunately, the notion that integration by itself will make good schools seem to be fading. Increasing emphasis is being placed on special teaching, as individualized as possible, to compensate for deficiencies in the home environment. Educators, among them Chicago's Superintendent Benjamin Willis, are emphasizing the need for preschool, compensatory, and remedial education.

Still, the myth that integration by itself will do everything apparently lingers on. Otherwise how explain the total lack of involvement of recent demonstration leaders in Chicago in the effort to get a substantial appropriation from the Illinois Legislature for compensatory education? Future education in Chicago faces a real educational crisis, not in heaps of people blocking traffic at State and Madison Streets, but at Springfield.

I do not recommend that hundreds of people sprawl over the statehouse steps or block traffic at any intersection of downtown Springfield. The effect would be negative. But there are dignified and appropriate methods by which responsive friends of better education can communicate with State senators.

Even if one assumed that integration, by itself, would produce better education, a realistic observer would have to note the difficulty of achieving it, totally, in other big cities.

Washington, D.C., is a city where the school administration interpreted the 1954 Supreme Court decision as a call to abolish de facto segregation as well as legal segregation.

After 11 years, its schools are the most segregated in the Nation, outside the South.

In 1964, about half of Washington's school-children were white. Now the proportion of Negroes in Washington schools is about the same as the proportion of Negroes in Chicago's public housing—not many points away from 100 percent and getting closer all the time. Still, a clergyman from Washington has participated in the recent Chicago demonstrations—to teach us what?

New York tried hard, on the same principle, with results which the Allen Commission reported last summer amounted to less than nothing. Each year the number of segregated schools in New York grows. New York's superintendent has been fired, and the president of the school board has resigned. What next?

I consider it educationally desirable that white and Negro children should get to know each other. But the organization of any big city school system so that the numbers in every class reflect the exact racial proportions of the school age population is not merely difficult. It is plainly impossible.

Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations

SPEECH OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, on this 20th anniversary of the United Nations, I should like to add my voice to those of other Congressmen in the praise of this international organization.

Although many imperfections still exist and its effectiveness is particularly in question now owing to disagreements among the major powers, the United Nations still remains the greatest hope mankind has against the scourge of war.

My hope would be that the Congress and the Nation, in our desire for peace and justice to men everywhere, will find expression through cooperation with one another. The United Nations gives us this chance.

The Nature of the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1965.

The Vietnamese Communists cannot be whitewashed. Their brutality and immorality should be obvious to all.

The editorial follows:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY

Those who regard war as immoral, or American involvement in Vietnam as immoral, will consider the slaying of an American prisoner by the Vietcong and the bombing of a Saigon restaurant as a natural consequence of the military actions of the United States. But most Americans, we believe, will draw different conclusions.

War is, from its very nature, a brutal business and revolution is more brutal still. In South Vietnam, North Vietnam is waging war through revolution. It should not be forgotten that the division of Vietnam was intended to make a rough (very rough) geographical separation of Communists and non-Communist areas, and that many non-Communists left their homes in the North for sanctuary in the South. The free national elections specified in the Geneva Treaty were rejected by the South because Communist rule in the North would have made any countrywide "free" election a mockery. So the North, and the Communists still in the South, undertook to subvert the South by propaganda and terror.

This process was well advanced before the United States fired a shot. When it did so, the Americans observed the rules of war; they tried, and are trying, to attack only military targets and to spare the civilian population as much as is humanly possible under the conditions. The Vietcong observe no such inhibitions. They bomb, for shock effect, in civilian centers, just as they terrorize the farmers of the countryside. And when their agents are executed for specific acts of treason and terrorism, they retaliate against an American soldier who has fallen into their hands as a prisoner of war.

It is a curious moral obliquity which can justify the acts of the Vietcong and find nothing but condemnation for those of the United States; which would have this country abandon South Vietnam to a system that began the war with terror and proposes to unify Vietnam with terror. That is the nature of the enemy we are fighting—and whatever hard choices the United States may face in southeast Asia cannot be obscured by whitewash.

ernment and the Nation should be disposed of with all reasonable speed.

The amendment also provides for insuring that the Vice-Presidency always will be filled, which is an intelligent advance in treating the matter of presidential succession.

While immense satisfaction can be taken from the action in Congress in the last few days, it is a little sad to reflect on how long it has taken to come to grips with the problem.

The country repeatedly has found itself without a Vice President. And after President Dwight D. Eisenhower had been disabled by a heart attack in 1955 the voices for treating the disability issue became loud and insistent. It took 10 years to reach an agreement. That's too long for so important a matter.

B. Frank Heintzleman of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaska has lost a dedicated and devoted Alaskan in the death of former Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman. Mr. Heintzleman, who died last Thursday night in Juneau, spent nearly 50 years of his life in Alaska working for the good of Alaska, first as regional forester of the U.S. Forest Service, then as Governor, and then, in official retirement. Unmarried—he made the people of Alaska his family and Alaska's development his life's work. I am but one of his host of friends and admirers who mourn his passing.

State flags were ordered to fly at half mast by Gov. William A. Egan, in recognition of the enormous contributions made to Alaska by this tireless worker, this highly respected, widely loved Alaskan, Frank Heintzleman. As a token of my deep personal regard and admiration for this great American and dedicated Alaskan, I insert here an Associated Press article from Juneau telling of his great career and Alaska's loss:

STATE FLAGS AT HALF STAFF FOR GOVERNOR HEINTZLEMAN

JUNEAU.—State flags were flying at half staff today for former Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman who died here Thursday at the age of 77.

A Pennsylvania native who devoted nearly a half century to the economic development of Alaska, Heintzleman succumbed a week after suffering a severe heart attack.

Among Heintzleman's effects was found a note directing that burial take place at Fayetteville, Pa., where he was born.

He also asked any services in Juneau, his home since 1937, be limited to memorial services.

Memorial services are scheduled for 3 p.m. Sunday in the Northern Lights Presbyterian Church, Juneau, with the Reverend Dr. Edward Holborrow officiating.

Heintzleman graduated from the Pennsylvania State School of Forestry with a bachelor's degree in forestry in 1907. He earned a master's degree in forestry at Yale University 3 years later and entered the U.S. Forest Service the same year.

After working in Oregon and Washington, Heintzleman was transferred to Ketchikan

in 1918, and spent the rest of his life in Alaska.

From 1918 through 1937 he was regional forester for the territory. He was instrumental in the establishment of the Ketchikan Pulp Co., of Ketchikan, and the Alaska Lumber & Pulp Co. facility at Sitka.

Heintzleman was appointed as Governor of Alaska by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower March 16, 1953.

He served as Governor until January of 1957 and then retired from political life.

When Alaska Gov. William A. Egan heard of Heintzleman's death he ordered all State flags flown at half staff until the burial.

Egan remarked, "Alaska has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. Governor Heintzleman dedicated his life to the progress of Alaska."

A native of Fayetteville, Pa., Heintzleman was born December 3, 1888.

He came north to Ketchikan in 1918 and spent the remaining years of his life in his newly adopted State.

From 1918 through 1937, when he was appointed regional forester for the territory, Heintzleman served in various Forest Service positions in Alaska.

When President Eisenhower moved into the White House in 1953, Heintzleman quietly sought the appointment as Governor of Alaska.

Eisenhower announced the appointment of Heintzleman on March 16, 1953, and Heintzleman took office the following month, but he found soon that being in the political spotlight was substantially different from the life of a Government administrator.

When he left office, Heintzleman gave firm indication of his future plans in the following statement to newsmen:

"I won't be idle.

"I shall continue to live in Alaska and work on pending and prospective projects for the welfare of the territory."

Candidate Lindsay—Democrats Worried in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, national columnist, Roscoe Drummond, writing this morning in the Washington Post has caught the spirit of excitement that the candidacy of our colleague Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY for mayor of New York City has created all over the country.

Pointing out that Congressman LINDSAY has the intelligence, energy, and popularity which New York City so desperately needs, Drummond is coming to grips with the fundamental responsibility of any political party: to provide competent government.

The disarray among the opposition, Drummond notes, could benefit Congressman LINDSAY, but he is quick to state that Congressman LINDSAY "is the only opposition mayoral candidate who has made a serious impact on the press and on the New York electorate in a long time and the only one who is giving the voters in the biggest metropolis in the country a meaningful choice."

Mr. Drummond's column follows:

CANDIDATE LINDSAY—DEMOCRATS WORRIED IN NEW YORK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

NEW YORK.—Ever since Representative JOHN LINDSAY took the cold plunge into the New York mayoralty race, he has been showing the Republican Party all across the Nation what it most needs if it is going to make a significant comeback next year.

What it most needs are younger, vigorous, intelligent, and attractive candidates.

Many Republicans give the impression that they feel politics is a "dirty business" in which they would prefer not to be involved. This makes it hard for them to draw the most qualified Republicans into public life. President Eisenhower tried to repair this weakness and made little headway. So did Richard Nixon with the same result.

The Republicans have had another self-imposed handicap. Since they genuinely believe that less government is desirable, they find it difficult to get good candidates to make less government better.

And now comes LINDSAY, who is making running for the most headaching office in the Nation—mayor of the most problem-laden city in the Nation—seem worthy and worthwhile—and downright exciting.

Most Republican leaders, including all the five living GOP presidential nominees except Barry Goldwater, are not in the least distressed by the fact that LINDSAY is not flaunting his party label in a city which is 3 to 1 Democratic.

That's not important. From the standpoint of basic philosophy, there is no such thing as a "Democratic" mayor or a "Republican" mayor of New York. The only thing that counts is whether there is going to be a competent mayor.

What is important from the Republican standpoint, is for the voters to see that the GOP is giving them from its ranks a candidate worthy of the race. That's all the credit a party needs. That will be plenty—if LINDSAY pulls it off.

You don't have to be in New York long to see that he has the Democrats here very worried.

For one thing, for the first time since LaGuardia, a Republican is virtually monopolizing the headlines. At this stage LINDSAY is the almost daily focus of the campaign. On the day this column is written, the New York Herald Tribune had a banner head on LINDSAY on page 3, the New York Times ran three Lindsay stories, and in the World Telegram and the Journal American he got a big play.

Not that the New York papers are all committed to LINDSAY. They aren't. But he is the only opposition mayoral candidate who has made a serious impact on the press and on the New York electorate in a long time and the only one who is giving the voters in the biggest metropolis in the country a meaningful choice.

They seem to like it.

LINDSAY not only has the advantage of political popularity in depth but the Democrats have the disadvantage of bitter intra-party competition in depth. Right now they have:

One candidate who has withdrawn—Mayor Wagner.

Four candidates who have announced that they will run against each other in the primary—City Council President Paul Screvane, Representative WILLIAM RYAN, Councilman Paul O'Dwyer, and the latest, Queens County District Attorney Frank O'Connor, who is basing his bid for the Democratic nomination on a denunciation of Mayor Wagner for "vacillation, indecision, and ineptness."

Two other candidates appear to be standing in the wing willing to join the parade if encouraged, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.,

June 28, 1965

and Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel P. Moynihan.

Obviously it is too early to foresee how LINDSAY will fare in the election. The professionals figure he will likely win if there is a divisive Democratic primary. The ploy which one hears in some city Democratic quarters is that President Johnson may name Mayor Wagner as Cabinet Secretary for Urban Affairs and thus squash a primary fight by enabling Screvane to inherit the mayoralty before the primary.

Our Healthy Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our country is enjoying an unprecedented period of prosperity. The following analysis of the economic situation by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, tells the facts.

Mr. Drummond's column appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1965, and follows:

THE HEALTHY ECONOMY (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Nothing is more vital to everything the United States is trying to do in the world—at home and abroad—than the state of the economy.

This is why it is important not to get the stock market mixed up with the valid thermometers of economic health.

The market has had its scare. It still may be a little jittery. But the truth is that the state of the economy is good, the outlook is for more of the same as far ahead as one can reasonably see, and no one, including Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, sees a recession around the corner.

This isn't just a Lyndon Johnson peptalk, although the President has been saying as much at recent press conferences. This appraisal comes from looking at the objective facts. It is an appraisal shared by most private economists. It reflects a pervasive confidence on the part of the whole business community.

It isn't wishful thinking. It isn't political organ music to quiet the stock market.

There are reasons why the business community is not nervous about the future even if the market has been having some nervous vibrations. Among them are these:

Federal revenue is going up, Federal spending is going down and the budget is getting nearer to balance.

The Treasury finds business activity and personal income will yield \$1.6 billion more in taxes than it estimated last January—this despite the substantial cut in rates last year.

Government spending will be \$900 million below the estimate made 6 months ago.

This combination of an increase in revenue or of lower tax rates and a decline in spending means that the Federal deficit at the end of this month will reach a 5-year low.

All of this reflects a remarkable continuity in the healthy state of the U.S. economy.

There has been sustained prosperity and sustained economic growth for the longest period in American history—and nothing to the contrary is on the horizon.

Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler sees a

the rest of 1965—and beyond. This disagreeing on some things, the liberal Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, and the conservative Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, share the view that no recession is in the making.

Mr. Martin's Columbia University speech did not start the downturn in the market. It had already begun. His speech, with its warnings against inflation and the still unresolved balance-of-payments gap, undoubtedly gave it a further push—more of a push than he intended because his warnings were played so much more prominently than his assurances.

Basically the warnings were well taken and timely. But the dissimilarities between now and 1929 are far greater than the similarities—and Mr. Martin said so. Few read his speech in full.

The most reassuring fact is that none of the ingredients of a recession show up in any of the economic indicators.

Just the opposite. Inventories are not bulging. They are actually lower today than when the boom got underway. Business is not overexpanding and that was what, in large part, brought on the recession of 1957. The expansion of productive capacity has been running just about even with the expansion of consumer demand.

The economy is in good health and Mr. Martin is rightly saying: Let's be alert to keep it that way.

U.N. 20th Anniversary Observance

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago a world was weary with war. Hardly a nation on the face of the earth had been spared the demolition of its cities, the death and maiming of its troops or the despair and devastation of its citizenry.

Millions had perished. Hundreds of millions lived in rubble and with hunger. A war had just been won in Europe. But both victor and vanquished lived in the midst of misery.

Another war was soon to be won in Asia. But with the sudden end of that war would come a new age—the nuclear age, the age of the atomic bomb and the ultimate weapon.

In most parts of the world, there was one hope and one goal, and that was that another world war would never again be visited upon the human race.

In an effort to bring that goal to realization, a new organization was formed, the United Nations. In the midst of war and turmoil, this organization came into formal being with the formal signing of the United Nations Charter on June 26, 1945.

Two decades have gone by. Some call the United Nations an unqualified success. Others claim it is succeeding too well and is subverting national governments. Still others see the U.N. as a failure, a flop, a burst balloon of vain hopes and unattainable goals.

The United Nations is none of these.

To say that the United Nations has been an unqualified success would mean that it has helped substantially to keep us out of war. We know that it has not. We know that Americans are dying now in Vietnam, that many died in Korea and that troops of many lands have engaged in battle under the flag of the United Nations.

But there has been no worldwide conflict since the creation of the U.N. There has been no brutal confrontation of big powers in open conflict which has dragged the rest of the world into the battle.

There have been brush fires but no all-out conflagrations.

To say that the United Nations has had no influence on the foreign and domestic policies of the United States would be unrealistic. The U.N. most certainly has done so.

More than any other organization, the United Nations has created—or rather discovered—something called world opinion.

It has helped to formulate a sort of consensus of conscience in the world community which has had its affect upon our own Nation in our dealings with other nations and even upon such internal affairs as race relations and civil rights.

We have not been alone in, at times, receiving criticism from the world community. The Soviet Union has found itself in the same position on many occasions and its policies have been modified and tempered at least partly because of world opinion.

Yet, despite this influence, the criticism that the U.N. is too weak and too slow to be an effective force in world affairs most certainly has its advocates.

The U.N. has not been successful in finding a solution to the conflict in Vietnam. It has not been successful in ending the race to join the nuclear club.

But it has not been a flop in heading off conflict, as witness the U.N. force in the Middle East, the open and worldwide debate in the U.N. when the Cuban missile crisis was upon us, the end to the bloodshed in Cyprus and the Congo.

The United Nations has not attained all the goals, fulfilled all the hopes, or brought to reality all the dreams of its founders.

But it has consistently and constantly moved in the direction of these goals. It has helped man to know himself in myriad ways. It has helped nations to know themselves and to associate themselves with the larger community of the world.

By expecting nothing less than perfection from man and country in the attainment of its basic goals, the United Nations has gone a lot further down the road toward peace and freedom than we had any right to expect in such a small slice of history.

As the prime creators, the instigators, and the implementers of the United Nations, our United States has more at stake than most other countries in its success.

As the world's prime believers in the worth of work and freedom, we have more at stake than most in seeing to it that the United Nations continues to succeed. The doctrines and beliefs put forth in

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct my remarks on page 8320 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 1965, in the following manner:

Change the 12th and 13th lines from the bottom of column 1, and following the words "went down to Alabama" to read "Emily Taft Douglas, herself a former distinguished Member of the House, and the."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE THOMAS A. FLAHERTY

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with heartfelt regret that I announce that former Congressman Thomas A. Flaherty of Boston passed away this morning. Mr. Flaherty was elected to the Congress in 1937 and served until 1942. He was one of the most beloved, able, and competent officials we ever had in our area of the country. Tom was loved by all.

After he left the Congress of the United States, willingly—he did not run for reelection in 1943—he became a public utilities commissioner. He enjoyed a full life of many honors working for the public. He was a man of greatest ability and outstanding integrity.

Mrs. O'Neill and my family offer our very heartfelt sympathies to the family of Mr. Flaherty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise to pay tribute to my good friend and former colleague, Thomas A. Flaherty, who has passed away.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and all America has lost a valuable public servant and I feel a great personal loss.

Thomas Flaherty not only knew his Government, but he had a great faith in our way of life and the institutions of democracy.

He was born in Boston on December 21, 1898, and attended the public schools of that city. He also attended Northeastern University Law School at Boston.

During the First World War Mr. Flaherty served as a private in the U.S. Army in 1918. Subsequently he continued to serve his country, and especially the veterans, when he was employed with the U.S. Veterans' Administration in Boston from 1920 to 1934.

His vital interest in the political life of our Commonwealth caused him to run for public office and he served as a member of the State house of representatives for 2 years.

He was elected as a Democrat to the 75th Congress of the United States to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of John P. Higgins and was reelected to the 76th and 77th Congresses. He served in this legislative body from December 14, 1937, to January 3, 1943, and was not a candidate for renomination.

Returning to his native city, Tom Flaherty served as transit commissioner of the city of Boston for 2 years; as chairman of the Department of Public Utilities of Massachusetts from 1936 to 1953, as commissioner from 1953 to 1955, and chairman of the board of review, Assessing Department, city of Boston, from 1956 to 1960.

There is one thing we can never forget about Tom Flaherty, and that was his constant demonstration of the results of hard work. He made his own way in the world and never complained. He looked toward a goal and attained it.

He was a loyal Democrat, but first of all he was a loyal American.

Time will continue to reveal Tom Flaherty's contributions to his local community, to his State, and to his Nation. He was a fervent patriot. He loved his country. He respected the Congress and the House of Representatives. He was completely devoted to duty. I am proud to have called him my friend.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Flaherty our deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in paying tribute to our late friend and colleague, Mr. Flaherty.

It was my opportunity and pleasure to serve with him in the House where I became acquainted with him. He was a delightful gentleman, a very able Representative and, as the gentleman said, he left the House willingly to return to the State of Massachusetts in other positions.

I remember at the time we all wished him well. He left many friends behind, and we are grieved at his passing.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes

the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Arends	Giaino	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashbrook	Gibbons	Powell
Ashley	Goodell	Redlin
Bandstra	Halpern	Resnick
Baring	Hanna	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Hansen, Wash.	Rogers, Tex.
Brademas	Hawkins	Schisler
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Scott
Cooley	Holland	Sisk
Corman	Jarman	Stephens
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Keith	Toll
Dickinson	Latta	Van Deerlin
Diggs	McDowell	Waggonner
Dingell	Moeller	White, Idaho
Duncan, Ore.	Morrison	Willis
Everett	Morse	
Farnsley	Nix	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CELLER, ROGERS of Colorado, CORMAN, McCULLOCH, and POFF.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM F. BRUNNER

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce the death of the late lamented William F. Brunner, a former Member of this House. Our former colleague and my esteemed friend, Bill Brunner, has unfortunately left us. He will be sadly missed by all who knew him and the many for whom he performed countless acts of kindness with humility and without fanfare.

Mr. Speaker, Bill was a lifelong resident of Queens County of the city of New York. He served as a member of the New York State Assembly from 1922 to 1928 and then was elected as a Democrat to the 71st and three succeeding Congresses, when he resigned in 1935 to

serve in other public offices of the county of Queens and New York City.

In later years Bill resumed the insurance and real estate business but he never lost active interest in civic affairs and the community in which he lived. The Peninsula General Hospital in Edgemere, Long Island, of which he was president, was near and dear to his heart and he worked tirelessly to expand and help improve its facilities.

I knew him as a benign character. He was always kind in words and in action. We were enriched indeed by his having passed amongst us, and we are saddened by his departure. He has gone to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns.

He leaves a good name, and a good name is like the acrostic; you read it from right to left, or up or down, and a good name always spells goodness. As the Psalmist said:

Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils.

Our condolences go forth to the members of his family, and we mourn his passing.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 81]

Arends	Hawkins	Pool
Ashbrook	Holland	Powell
Ashley	Hull	Randall
Baring	Hungate	Resnick
Bates	Ichord	Reuss
Belcher	Jacobs	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Jarman	Schisler
Brademas	Jones, Ala.	Schwelker
Brown, Calif.	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Conte	Karsten	Senner
Cooley	Keith	Sisk
Corman	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
Culver	Lindsay	Sullivan
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Dingell	Martin, Mass.	Toil
Duncan, Oreg.	Mathias	Tupper
Everett	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Farnsley	May	Waggonner
Gialmo	Moeller	Weltner
Gibbons	Moorhead	White, Idaho
Gubser	Morrison	Williams
Halpern	Morse	Willis
Hanna	Nix	Young
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, on the first quorum call today I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 339 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 339

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker House Resolution 339 provides for consideration of S. 4, a bill to amend and expand the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It would establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the substitute now in the bill.

No more important single problem faces this country today than the problem of good water. Water is our greatest single natural resource. The issue of pure water must be settled now for the benefit not only of this generation but for untold generations to come. The need for good quality water for all

of our Nation's uses—public and private—is a paramount one.

The Calumet industrial region of Indiana comprises the First Congressional District which I represent in Congress. It is the No. 1 congressional district in the United States in relation to industrial concentration in the Gary, Hammond, East Chicago, Whiting area. Three major steel mills; Carnegie Illinois, Inland, Youngstown, and a number of smaller steel and smelter plants along with refineries of all major oil companies, and several hundred other large and small industries are located in this area. During the last quarter of a century these industries have expanded many times in production capacity. The major pollution to lakes and streams and especially beautiful Lake Michigan comes from the industrial waste from these plants.

Adjoining the Calumet region on the north is the large industrial complex of the city of Chicago and the same statement can be made regarding the pollution and waste expulsion into the waters of Lake Michigan as exists across the State line in Indiana.

The Hammond, Ind., Times reported recently a speech made by Richard Woodley of the Indiana State Board of Health. Mr. Woodley declared:

The people are fed up with pollution and they want something done about it right away regardless if the action is local, State, or Federal.

Mr. Woodley is chief of the industrial waste section of the Indiana Board of Health. He continues:

As examples of the heavy concentration of pollution in the area waterways, Woodley reported outfalls were detected on a daily basis in these amounts: Oil, 106,000 pounds per day of which steel industries were responsible for 90 percent and the oil refineries the remaining 10 percent; ammonia, 500,000 pounds; phenols, 5,000 pounds; cyanides, 3,000 pounds.

These examples show why there is a large-scale effort underway to halt pollution.

The drinking water supply for approximately 600,000 people in the Calumet region and millions in the Chicago area is taken out of the waters of Lake Michigan adjacent to the shores from which this great industrial concentration is daily pouring industrial waste and other contaminating pollution into Lake Michigan. The health of approximately 7 million people in the Chicagoland and Indiana area is jeopardized and threatened by this inexcusable pollution into the formerly pure waters of Lake Michigan. Inland lakes and streams not only in this area but throughout Indiana, Illinois, and other States in the Union have already been contaminated by Government indifference toward enacting legislation to halt this health hazard to millions of our citizens.

The New York Times of April 18 had an extended three-page comment in its magazine section regarding the Raritan River in New Jersey. The Raritan River at the turn of the century was known as the "Queen of Rivers" with pure flowing