

reducing the price-depressing farm surpluses, especially the grain and corn surpluses, in order to materially raise our farmer's income, which must be done the American, commonsense, business way, and without coercion and unnecessary Federal controls and penalties.

Mr. Speaker, to even infer that to solve the farm problem our farmers must be subjected to stringent Federal controls, fined and even jailed, in order to solve the farm problem, is a rank insult to our farmers and their families.

Had the Congress during the last session adopted the substitute to the 1961 feed grain bill, which nine Members, including myself, from some of the largest corn and grain producing districts introduced, we would by now be 1 year closer to the solution of the farm problem for farm income as a whole would by now be on a higher level, and over a billion dollars of needless Federal expenses would have been saved.

Here is an analysis of our bill which we will again introduce at the proper time during this session of Congress, and we invite other Members to join us regardless of party and place of residence.

Our bill is short, concise, and to the point. It provides for liberal payments in kind for reducing corn and small grain acres below the average acres of the past 2 previous years. For such reduction the farmer will receive a Government certificate entitling him to take 80 percent of the amount of corn or small grain raised on his reduced acres of the aver-

age yield on such acres during the past 2 years, or he can sell his certificate to a neighbor, grain dealer, or to anyone except back to Uncle Sam. In any event, the grain will be taken out of Government surplus storage and gone forever.

The purpose of allowing just 80 percent payment-in-kind is to reduce by the other 20 percent the amount of corn and grain available for feed in order to hold down the available supply of feed so as to increase the market price of such feeds and in turn the price of livestock and poultry. I shall recommend to the cosponsors of our bill that grazing be permitted on the idled acres. I shall also recommend that to be in compliance to be entitled to all the benefits provided in the act, the farmer will be required to put in the program not less than 10 percent nor more than 33 1/2 percent of the last 2 years' average acreage in such crops.

Our bill will not in any way affect the regularly established payment for soil conservation practices on any farm. Such farmers will profit proportionately with all farmers from the increased prices of all farm products which the passage of our bill is bound to bring about and soon after the law would go into effect. That, Mr. Speaker, is the most essential provision of our bill in a nutshell.

I have explained our bill to many farmers in the district I have the honor to represent in Congress, and without a single exception, after they fully understand our bill they have voiced their full

approval. A farmer can easily figure without pencil and paper that if his average yield of corn, for example, for the past 2 years, was 70 bushels per acre, under the provisions of our bill he would receive 56 bushels in kind—of high feed value, or more bushels of corn of lower feed value—from CCC surpluses for every idled acre which he can take and use himself, or sell the certificate for at least the prevailing market price, which would by that time have increased, by the simple fact that the price-depressing surplus would then be in the process of being materially reduced. That being a fact which is bound to take place and on a voluntary basis, due to the dollar inducement provided in our bill, sufficient compliance will be no problem. Our farmers will remain free and independent to enjoy the fruits of their own labors. The billions of bushels of grain in Government storage belongs to you, Mr. and Mrs. American. It is all paid for with your tax dollars. Who among us dares say it shall not be used to solve most of our farm problem?

Let us also be ever mindful of this old adage which holds just as true today as when the words were first spoken, "If our farmers are ever told when and what they shall plant and reap we shall soon want bread."

And so, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we must plead, "Speak up Americans for you are still the masters of your own destiny, if you will but use your constitutional inherent powers, reserved to the people."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 33: 12: *Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.*

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to endow us with reverence and humility as we unite our hearts in worshipping Thee at this noon hour of a new day.

Help us to realize how futile are all our plans and how vain all our searchings for a nobler civilization unless Thy Holy Spirit guides us in the ways of truth and righteousness.

Grant that through holiness of life and heroism of faith we may gain a clearer vision of the spiritual realities and resources which we need for our instruction and inspiration.

May Thy divine will be our law and Thy love our motive as we endeavor to bring the character and capacities of all humanity to a richer and fuller development.

Hear us through the merits and meditation and inspiration.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady;

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961; and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2990. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Evangelos J. Marthakis;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Maria La Bella;

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Bocalery; and

S. 2533. An act to amend the requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program.

The message also announced that pursuant to law, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. The Senator also appointed the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to attend the Canada-United

States Interparliamentary Group Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 28 to March 4, 1962.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

FEBRUARY 20, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of HAROLD M. RYAN as a Representative-elect to the 87th Congress from the 14th Congressional District of the State of Michigan, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 530, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the resolution may continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 530, with Mr. O'NEILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRIS). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 19]

Addabbo	Flood	Monagan
Anfuso	Harrison, Va.	O'Konksi
Bass, Tenn.	Hays	Powell
Bennett, Mich.	Hébert	Scherer
Blicht	Hoffman, Mich.	Shelley
Broomfield	Kirwan	Slack
Celler	McMillan	Ullman
Dooley	Macdonald	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Resolution 530, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 408 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 530 now before us would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which was transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30, 1962. Unless the resolution is adopted by the House within 60 calendar days after the plan is transmitted, the reorganization plan would go into effect automatically pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The Committee on Government Operations believes that the reorganization plan should be allowed to go into effect and, therefore, has recommended that House Resolution 530 be not approved. Another way of saying it, Mr. Chairman, would be: If you are for the reorganization plan, you would vote "no" on House Resolution 530. If you are opposed to the reorganization plan, you would vote "yea" on House Resolution 530.

Mr. Chairman, many things have been said about legislation to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and about this reorganization plan over a long period of time. I am sure no one here would want to play politics or be demagogic about any serious matter which comes before this committee. I would be the first to admit that whatever is said on either side is said with the highest sincerity, the highest motives, and the highest purpose, as long as any other speaker desiring to speak on the subject will give me credit for having the same high motives, the same sincerity, and the same high purpose. However, being rather pragmatic about certain things, I would assume that sooner or later, there might develop a bolt between the eyes, or one lower than that; and I would not be averse, let me say, to wrestling around a little bit if it becomes absolutely necessary. Frankly, I would rather not, because I think that in a logical and reasonable way our differences can be discussed, delineated properly for the RECORD, and that each of us can take what we know our position is going to be on this issue.

The purpose of the plan, Mr. Chairman, is to raise to departmental status the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, so that Federal functions relating to housing and urban affairs can have a voice in the Cabinet and be given the proper weight and position in the overall position of the executive branch. The plan has the basic purpose of providing in the Department better machinery for coordinating and otherwise administering and controlling the functions in order to do a better executive job basically and logically. I

wish to advise that the reorganization plan would do one thing and one thing only: It would create a new department in the executive branch, transferring the existing functions of the Housing and Home Financing Agency and providing for its administration in accordance with sound principles already approved by this Congress for other executive departments. This would, therefore, give us a line organization, which is one of the fundamental principles recommended by the Hoover Commission for executive departments, so that authority would be placed in the Secretary of the new Department for supervision and direction of all functions of the Department which would be the functions of the existing constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This is normal and logical and, as I say, is a method of sound administration that should make for efficiency and economy, which was the basic purpose, of course, as we all know, of the original Hoover Commission recommendation.

Because of some of the things that have been generally misunderstood and certain misconceptions which have arisen, I think it would be wise to get on the RECORD what the reorganization plan, to which House Resolution 530 addresses itself, does not do.

The reorganization plan would not do the following: It would not authorize any new function or program whatsoever. I want to emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would not authorize any new function or program whatsoever; that it deals strictly with the existing constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Now, I know that there are some who would want to raise the question about what is going to happen in the future. Maybe it is all right to raise that question in reason and in logic, because of their own fears. I do not want to debate that right now, but I will say that there is nothing inherent in the reorganization plan itself to raise this question. Any new programs or any new projects which might sometime in the future come into this Department would, of course, have to have the judgment and sanction of this Congress.

I am perfectly willing to let the future rest on the judgment and the reason of the Congress of the United States. I will not presume to make judgment today on what any future Congress will do with respect to enlarging programs or adding programs which may exist now or which may exist in the future. But Reorganization Plan No. 1, Mr. Chairman, does not authorize any new function or any new program whatsoever. Now does Reorganization Plan No. 1 provide any additional funds.

Obviously, as we all recognize and understand, this would take a separate bill, and we are not now considering such a bill. The matter that is before us today came from the Government Operations Committee, and not from the Appropriations Committee. So any misapprehension that may have been let loose upon the public that this plan

would involve the expenditure of tremendous sums of money is exactly that—that is, a misconception, because, Mr. Chairman, the reorganization plan does not provide any additional funds. Nor does the reorganization plan commit or obligate the Congress in any way to authorize any new program or function. This is obvious to all of us here who are fully aware of our responsibilities and our prerogatives and the jurisdiction of the legislative branch of the Government. But unfortunately some people who are opposed to this idea have mistakenly sought to advise some of our friends that in some way, somehow, this Congress could bind all future Congresses on new programming. It would be bad enough, heaven knows, if the thought had been put forward that we could bind future Congresses with respect to existing programs. But I have seen some thinking on this legislation, which really has no explanation, that we in some way in this Congress could bind future Congresses on programs that do not yet even exist. I do not have to point out how obviously fallacious and legally impossible that would be.

Mr. Chairman, this reorganization plan would not remove any authority or control of the Congress over the executive branch. The language is explicit in the reorganization plan. We could not, other than by legislation, in any way delegate any existing authority of the Congress, or remove it or diminish it or modify it or abrogate it. This is not that kind of legislation. There is no language in the reorganization plan which would do any of those things. Specifically, it would not in any way diminish, remove, or modify the authority and control of the Congress over the executive branch of the Government. It does not, Mr. Chairman—and this is a very important point because I have heard it made so many times with respect to earlier proposed legislation and this reorganization plan—I have heard it in the hearings before our committee over the many years that our committee has considered this matter—this reorganization plan does not extend in the slightest any power or control of the Federal Government.

I want to repeat that, Mr. Chairman, because it is very important. I am afraid here again a great many people around the country have a misconception of what this reorganization plan would do. But one of the things it does not do is to extend in any way, in the slightest, any power or control of the Federal Government over any municipality, over any county, or over any State.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize that statement because the allegation has been made, has been printed and circulated around the country, that this reorganization plan would in some way either circumvent, supersede or otherwise interfere, intervene, or impose itself at the Federal level in, over, under, about a municipality, a county government or a State government. I say without any reservation whatever, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of law, as a matter of logic, as a matter of reasonableness, I challenge

any person anywhere to show me the language or the law that the reorganization plan in any manner, shape or form, does anything to article X of the Constitution dealing with States rights; that it does anything with respect to the powers and prerogatives of a municipality, which in most cases is a creature of the State legislature, is chartered by it, and exists at its will; that it does anything to a county government, which in most cases is a constitutional government of the State and can only be modified, abrogated or repealed by the State; or that it does anything to the powers of the States as they exist under our constitutional system.

Mr. Chairman, I have made my statement as a matter of law. I have made my statement as a matter of reason and logic. If there is anything to the contrary in the reorganization plan, it will be brought forth, I am sure, and laid down in the RECORD. But I am here to say, Mr. Chairman, that this reorganization plan would not in itself—nor is it inherent in the language—do any of the things which I have recently discussed with respect to any municipality, county government, or State government. It does not in any way transfer any functions which are not specifically itemized in the reorganization plan. These functions are specifically limited to those constituent agencies and units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that those who oppose this bill do so for a variety of reasons. And it is paradoxical that one group of these people say that the plan is too broad and gigantic, that it would centralize tremendous power, and that it would increase all kinds of powers of government, none of which thinks it really does. Another group says that the plan is not broad enough or large enough because it does not encompass the home loan guarantee program of the Veterans' Administration, that it does not encompass the activities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, that it does not encompass other activities. That is interesting; maybe it is even logical. But I find it difficult to reconcile those contradictory positions, as I find it very difficult in my own mind to reconcile the fears which have been expressed with respect to what this Department would do in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that everyone, including all my colleagues, who have been so far following me carefully, recognize that what I am doing at this point is making the basis for a legal record. I think this is important. I think I also made it plain, Mr. Chairman, that I do not wish to question any other reasons with respect to what my colleagues' positions may be on this or any other issue. This I leave to their judgment and to their ability and to their integrity. They know best how to represent their respective constituencies and to satisfy their own consciences.

But, for the legal record, I must pursue this matter in the manner which I have because of the many misconceptions and apprehensions regarding this

reorganization plan which I say, Mr. Chairman, have been very unfairly attributed to it. So what I am saying is that it is all right for anyone to be opposed to it, because reasonable men may differ on almost any issue, and certainly men may differ on this issue. That is where the issue should be made in the RECORD, for reasonable people. I do not believe, in other words, Mr. Chairman, that issues should be made in the RECORD for unreasonable people.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to refer now to a colloquy we had in the Government Operations Committee hearings on this plan. Let me state that this is not a recent matter. The Committee on Government Operations has had this matter under consideration for a good many years. I do not recall just how long it has been, but it does seem to me that for at least 6 years the Committee on Government Operations has, in one form or another, been concerned with the problem of urban affairs and housing and with the question of giving Cabinet status to this major segment of the economy and the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, this is a colloquy between myself and a Mr. Davis, a very fine gentleman who testified before our committee in opposition, mind you, to the reorganization plan. As I recall it, Mr. Davis spoke on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This colloquy starts on page 101 of the transcript. It is not too long a colloquy. I think it is important for the RECORD, and I should like to read it. I will read it all so that there will not be any misunderstanding with respect to pulling a part of the transcript out of context. The colloquy is as follows:

Chairman DAWSON. Mr. FASCELL, any questions?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have got a few.

Mr. DAVIS, I think the first thing we ought to clear up, and the record ought to speak for itself, and that is what the mayor said with respect to one-stop service—

And we were referring to a previous witness—

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FASCELL. So that we don't add any more towering implications to this poor little old reorganization plan that some people are trying to put on it. What he did say exactly was, on page 3—

And here I quote what the mayor said:

"What we small city people need is a one-stop service center in our dealings with the Federal Government on urban programs."

Mr. FASCELL. He did not say this reorganization plan was going to give it to them. The fact of the matter is by reading his testimony it is quite clear that he understands that it doesn't. It doesn't change his opinion on what the need is.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. I just thought in all fairness you would want to understand.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FASCELL. Because I know that my able colleague on the other side is just dying to get on the floor and quote you as saying this bill is going to be a one-stop service center, like a gasoline station.

As I understand it, Mr. Davis, on behalf of the chamber of commerce actually your

feelings on this matter are that rather than to achieve any administrative efficiency in the operation of these programs, what you would really like to do is get rid of the programs.

We were talking about the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration and Fannie Mae, that is, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Continuing the colloquy:

Mr. DAVIS. There are certain programs that we are not in accord with.

Mr. FASCELL. Because as I recall prior testimony, the chamber has presented certain recommendations to other legislative committees for either the modification or the scaling down or the repeal of certain existing programs now.

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. But basically if I gather the intent of what you are saying, that you or the chamber really don't support grant-in-aid programs at a Federal level for any purpose, or for very few purposes.

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. So that you are really at odds with the existing programs.

Mr. DAVIS. Of many of the Federal grant programs such as urban renewal, yes.

Mr. FASCELL. Now are we agreed on this, Mr. Davis, that this reorganization plan, which I am sure you have studied very carefully, does not add any new powers or functions.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize that because here again around the country certain misconceptions have arisen with respect to this reorganization plan. I asked the direct question of Mr. Davis, whether we were in agreement that this reorganization plan did not add any new powers or functions, and his answer was "Yes."

I am now reading from page 102 of the transcript of hearings of the Committee on Government Operations, which hearings were held on February 6, 7, and 8, 1962:

Mr. FASCELL. So that in no way can the reorganization plan be said to be in contravention of amendment No. 10 of the Federal Constitution dealing with States rights.

Mr. DAVIS. I wouldn't like to admit that, because this is like asking, "have I stopped beating my wife?"

Mr. FASCELL. I don't mean to put the question in that phrase, but I think we can do it without resort to a great deal of law or technicality. I think we can do it on the basis of just plain old commonsense.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the expansion of the Federal Government into certain areas that some feel should be better handled by the State or the local government, the resistance to it is because of a fear by some that it is an infringement on States rights—

I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Davis has so candidly said here, and that is that he states resistance is due just to the fear of some that it would infringe on States rights. But there is nothing in the reorganization plan as a matter of law that gives any foundation or reason to that fear—

Mr. FASCELL. That may be true with respect to a particular legislative program that the Congress is going to enact, and the question would then arise as to whether or not it infringes in any way on the State's jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIS. Correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Isn't that correct?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. But under this reorganization plan, since you have no new function or new power, that question doesn't even arise, does it?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. So then it wouldn't really be quite fair in opposing this particular reorganization plan to say that the plan would interfere with the operation of the States.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, it is the fear that this would, of course, promote further Federal inroads into the area of State responsibilities. As to the plan itself as it is written, you are correct.

Mr. FASCELL. You know I might go along with you on the fear as long as you don't relate it to this reorganization plan, because actually what you are saying, is it not, is that what you are afraid of is that future Congresses of the United States will impose additional programs, and this is what you don't want.

I have just got a couple of more questions. In other words, I am not objecting to your opposition, you understand that, for whatever reason it may be, even if it is based solely on fear or even if it is based solely on the idea that you don't like it. I think those are valid reasons. Every man is entitled to his own opinion.

But I think it is only fair and proper that within good reason and good judgment we now are down to the direct issues involved, without trying to embellish them either for or against a particular proposal, because obviously I am just as sensitive as you are about being jumped on or having my logic challenged or my judgment or my sincerity or my motivation.

I don't like it any more than you do. I am willing to test my logic and my judgment with any man alive on any issue and rise or fall with that, if we let it go that way.

I would like to ask another question. Just so we can have a predicate for the statement so we will have a common understanding, I got Webster's Dictionary so I wouldn't be using some other definition that might not be accepted:

"Socialism: A political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods; also a policy or practice based on this theory."

What I wanted to ask you is this, Mr. Davis. Is there anything in this reorganization plan which has to do with the nationalization of the production or distribution of goods?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FASCELL. Then it can't be called socialist, can it?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it can be claimed that the reorganization plan would contribute to the further centralization of the power of government.

Mr. FASCELL. You are not inferring that that is socialism?

Mr. DAVIS. No. I am using the term "centralization."

Now, going to page 104 of the transcript:

Mr. FASCELL. In other words, you do oppose the idea of any further power or authority being rested in the Central Government?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it should be very carefully considered.

Mr. FASCELL. Right.

Mr. DAVIS. There may be other powers that properly should be.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not mean to put words in your mouth, that is not what I meant at all. I am trying to make a distinction in your position. You are saying positively that this organization plan is not socialistic.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the terms of the Webster definition, correct.

Mr. FASCELL. If we don't agree with that—

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with that.

Mr. FASCELL. That is the reason I used the common definition.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. Now, this reorganization plan we agreed earlier doesn't add any new authority or power, does it?

Mr. DAVIS. Correct.

Mr. FASCELL. So that you can't use additional authority or power as an argument that the centralized Government is getting any bigger, can you?

Mr. DAVIS. I assume that this would require further Federal administrators, expense which would be possibly some increase in the Federal Government.

Also, for instance, I think it takes some of the agencies a little further away from Congress, such as FHA. They would be one step removed from Congress, FHA being under the Housing and Home Finance Agency would then also be under Urban Affairs, and I think that tendency is one which gets it a little further removed from Congress and from the people.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you think you can get any closer to the people than the Congress of the United States?

Mr. DAVIS. No. That is why I say if you put this on Cabinet level instead of its present situation—I was afraid that it would get a little further away.

Mr. FASCELL. Let's analyze that for a minute. Do you believe that the Congress of the United States ought to be the administrative body?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you think it ought to be a legislative body?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. In accordance with the divisions of power in the Constitution. So actually what we are really saying is that no agency or department or commission of the Government is any further away from the Congress than the Appropriations Committee, is it? Is that right?

Now don't misunderstand me. I understand what your objection is, and I understand what the chamber's objection is. I would only say this: That when the time arrives that you can raise the issue of greater centralization of power, or when the time arrives that you can raise the issue of additional powers or functions being added to those which now exist, I think they can properly be raised.

I won't deny the fact that you can have the fear, whether it is well founded or not is a question of judgment on which reasonable men can differ. You will admit, will you not, that some time somewhere in the processes of administration, it is wise and efficient to clear up channels of command and responsibility.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that because here is a distinguished businessman who understands the necessity for an efficient Government, who recognizes the necessity of command responsibility in a line organization as being the most efficient and economical type of administrative operation.

In direct answer to that question he says, Yes, he recognizes that and knows it should be done.

To continue from the transcript:

Mr. FASCELL. And that this is an important step sometimes in a large operation. Also one of business judgment, is it not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not presume to my colleagues that this is all of the

testimony in the record or that this colloquy to which I have referred in full is even the preponderance of the opinion of the record. But I would say that as far as the majority of the committee are concerned, and certainly as far as I am concerned, I think the colloquy delineates exactly what the plan is and what it is not in law and in reason, as well as in fact.

There are some other things which I ought to touch on very briefly, and we have so many speakers that would like to say something on this subject, Mr. Chairman. We would do several things by this reorganization plan. One, which I have alluded to, is the fundamental recommendation of the Hoover Commission for the establishment of line organizations. Before somebody jumps up, I do not mean that the Hoover Commission recommended Cabinet status for this particular agency. I am talking about the fact that the reorganization plan seeks to establish and pinpoint responsibility through the type of administrative line organization recommended by the Hoover Commission.

The plan also provides that all of the powers and functions, and the direction, responsibility, and control of those functions, shall vest in the Secretary. This is important because of the present legal status surrounding our HHFA and because of the question that has been asked: Why, if you want to clarify responsibility, do you not take the present agency and do it within that agency? Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 set up the HHFA. In that plan the administrator of HHFA was given the coordination and supervision of the functions of the constituent agencies. But very specifically he was not given—I repeat—he was not given direction and control of those agencies. By statutory law, therefore, and by the reorganization plan itself, there remained in the heads of those constituent agencies certain residual powers of direction and control.

This became important enough so that in 1955 the dilemma was recognized by our own Committee on Appropriations in the writing of the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, where they endeavored to put emphasis on what the President and the Congress had sought to do in the provisions of the reorganization plan of 1947 by way of giving broad authority to the Administrator. The language written into the appropriation bill was thought to be designed to recognize broad authority in the Administrator. But both the language itself and its legislative history indicate that this was declaratory legislation and therefore was not intended in any way legally to change the status of the constituent agencies or the authority of the Administrator as established under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 or the statutory law creating the constituent agencies.

The Congress in 1955 under the powerful and able direction of the Appropriations Committee recognized the virtual impossibility of doing business inherent in the existing authority and tried to give its weight, emphasis and thinking to straighten this matter out. Unfortu-

nately, this was not accomplished. It does take either a reorganization plan or legislation to straighten the matter out. That is what this reorganization plan would do. It would put all those functions in the Secretary and resolve the question of the residual powers of direction and control of the constituent agencies under existing law to the extent they were not dealt with in the reorganization plan of 1947.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. No additional powers will accrue to the proposed Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs other than those which are contained in the constituent agencies themselves at the present time; is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I appreciate his clarifying point on the question of law. There are no new powers or functions, and there is no increase in the existing powers and functions of the constituent agencies as they exist under statutory law or under the old reorganization plan. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would simply bring them together and eliminate the question of the division of authority and control.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a further question.

Mr. YATES. Does this not bear on the argument made by opponents of the plan that this plan is likely to result in a great deal of increased expense if HHFA is made into a department? If there are no new powers added or no new duties, is it likely that there will be increased expense as a result of the reorganization plan?

Mr. FASCELL. Of course, I thank the gentleman for that statement. I had dealt at length on the point that the plan does not as a result of any increase in powers or functions. There would be a net cost increase as a result of the differential between old positions under the present status and new positions which would come into being under the reorganization plan. But I submit that the net increase in salary cost would be minimal. It would be less than \$50,000—\$49,430. If the gentleman is talking about what the reorganization plan itself would do, that is what it is. Then, if the gentleman is talking about cost of the reorganization plan, one must limit the cost to the estimate with respect to the creation of the new positions, which would be less than \$50,000 under the plan.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not true also that any increase in positions in the department and any new activities will be subject to the continued scrutiny of the Congress?

Mr. FASCELL. Well, not only that, but I would say the Appropriations Committee first—I do not know about the Congress, because I never quite got past

the Appropriations Committee myself. I want to wind up here very quickly, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the whys and wherefores of this reorganization plan.

We have the legal problem of the division of authority which the record has substantiated, I think, beyond any question as a real problem. The mayor of Chicago came before our committee and testified just exactly how this division of authority under existing law creates a tremendous problem for a municipality trying to work out its programs which now exist and which Congress has already approved. As I recall the testimony, it took them 2 years with respect to one project, because they had to go from the Administrator, to the FHA, then to the PHA, and finally back to the Administrator, in order to get them all together to work this thing out. This is extremely costly because you have funds tied up that are accumulating interest charges, and you have other losses and costs which are obvious to anybody who has had any connection with present municipal programs under the Federal law. This is something which should be resolved by this reorganization plan in the interest of efficiency and economy in government, and for the benefit of the municipalities themselves, because the plan would pinpoint the responsibility. The Secretary would have, by law, the direction and the control of all these programs. Therefore, while his subordinates obviously will have a major part in decision making, the responsibility will be his to make the ultimate decision, if he wants to, with respect to the program.

This is one thing that time after time witnesses from large cities and small cities have testified to before our committee. It is an important thing; it bears directly on the recommendation for achievement of administrative efficiency laid down as a principle by the Hoover Commission; namely, setting up a line organization for command responsibility.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we talk about making a Secretary at Cabinet level. I would not for 1 minute diminish the importance of doing this thing. I want to say why it is important and why this reorganization plan seeks to do it. It is because the present Agency is an important agency dealing with the major portion of our housing functions in this country and the urban problems in this country. Right now, for example, the Housing and Home Finance Agency had gross expenditures of \$3,981 million for the fiscal year 1961 and had 12,261 employees as of December 31, 1961.

Let us compare that with other executive departments to see the relative importance of HHFA's functions. And I do not say that this is the entire case at all. I just say it is a factor which should bear on the question of making this a Cabinet office.

State Department: \$258 million, and 39,000 personnel. I shall round out the figures.

Treasury: \$9,900 million and 80,000 personnel.

Justice: \$302 million, and 30,000 personnel.

Post Office: \$4.4 billion with 811,000 people.

Interior: \$973 million, with 53,000 people.

Agriculture: \$10 billion with 91,000 people.

Commerce: \$3 billion with 28,000 people.

Labor: \$1 billion with 7,000 people.

HEW: \$3.6 billion and 72,000 people.

Defense: \$45 billion with 1,059,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from reading that list that the Cabinet office under this reorganization plan would be exceeded in importance in these terms by only 3 or 4 others. One of the constituent agencies which would come under the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing is the Federal Housing Administration. This is in a very important area in the life of this country as we all recognize. Let us look at some of these figures, and again I am going to round them. The exact figures are available, of course.

Under title I, section 2, "Modernization and improvement, we had 25 million units and \$14 billion worth of insurance.

Home mortgage insurance, 6 million units and \$49 billion in insurance.

Project mortgage insurance, 937,000 units with \$8 billion of insurance.

So we have some 32 million units affected with over \$72 billion of insurance, in just one of the constituent agencies.

I only point this out to show the ramifications of the Agency itself and the impact it has, as we all understand it, on our country and on our people.

I know none of us advocates the abolition of the FHA, which has done a fine job and will continue to do an even better job. But, I think it is reasonable and logical that an agency as important as this one, an agency which has as much direct economic impact on every family in the United States, ought to be represented at the Cabinet level along with these other Cabinet officers.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in the last 100 years in this country. We are strong economically and militarily. Perhaps, the most important distinction among many, between what wonderful things we have under our system and what is to be had under other systems that exist around the world, is that all of our people have been able to participate in political matters, in the evolution of power politically, and in economic matters. We find that in this flexibility, which is so much the trademark of our system, the great majority of our people have moved from the rural areas to the urban areas. At the time the Department of Agriculture, for example, was organized and placed at Cabinet level, 70 percent of the people of this country lived in rural areas. Since then there has been a great migration, and today approximately 70 percent of the people of this country now live in urban areas. I am not advocating, by any stretch of the imagination, the abolition of the Department of Agriculture; nor am I trying to use it as a crutch or as a reason for the establish-

ment of this agency. I make the comparison solely to point out the fact that if the location of our population had a bearing on the question when the Department of Agriculture was established, and which, of course, it did have, then I think it is reasonable and logical to say that the location of the great majority of the people of today, the places where they live and work, has a bearing and should have a bearing on the question. The Housing and Home Finance Agency with its constituent agencies should be raised to the level of Cabinet status. If we consider that 70 percent of all the people of this country now live in urban areas and are directly concerned with the problems attendant upon urban growth so that it can no longer be said that they can be completely ignored, then I think it is within reason and within logic, and we have the right, to say it is important to lift this Housing and Home Finance Agency out of an independent agency status reporting directly to the President and place it at the executive department level under a secretary, thus giving it the importance it deserves at the Cabinet table. If this is done, Mr. Chairman, I believe we will have made it possible to take a very important step in the matter of efficiency and economy in the operation of this administration as it continues to serve the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would create an 11th department of the Federal Government to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, transferring to that Department the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies intact. No new functions or powers would be vested in the new Department and no other Federal activities relating to housing or the many other and different Federal activities of interest and assistance to municipalities would be vested in the new Department.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 is premature, unnecessary, will not accomplish what its proponents represent, and is contrary to sound principles of Government organization. It should not become law.

CREATING NEW DEPARTMENT A SERIOUS MATTER

The creation of a new department of the Federal Government is an important, historical step and ought not to be undertaken lightly or frivolously. In the 173 years of the Republic's existence, only 10 departments of the Government have been created. None has ever been abolished, although in 1949 the War Department and Navy Department, together with the Air Force, were merged into the Department of Defense with a single Cabinet member as head. This reduced the number of departments of the Government to nine.

The following is the chronology of the establishment of Cabinet departments:

Department of State, 1789.
 Department of the Treasury, 1789.
 War Department,¹ 1789.
 Department of the Navy,¹ 1815.
 Department of the Interior, 1849.
 Department of Agriculture, 1862.
 Department of Justice, 1870.
 Post Office Department, 1872.
 Department of Commerce, 1913.
 Department of Labor, 1913.
 Department of Defense,¹ 1949.
 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1953.

The 10th Department—Health, Education, and Welfare—was created in 1953 by House Joint Resolution 223 of the 83d Congress which became Public Law 13 when it was signed by the President on April 1, 1953. This joint resolution incorporated the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 by reference and provided that the Department should come into existence 10 days after the joint resolution was signed by the President. Thus it may be said that no department of the Government has ever been created by reorganization plan.

In view of the seriousness of such a step, it is my judgment that no department should be created by reorganization plan, but should be created, if at all, only through the regular legislative process with opportunity for thorough committee consideration of alternatives and all points of view, weighing the advantages and disadvantages against general public interest with full opportunity for amendment both in committees and on the floors of the respective Houses of Congress.

It should be elementary that the burden of proof should be upon those who assert the desirability of creating a new Department and that desirability should be established by clear evidence, cold logic and sound principles of governmental organization and not upon a tacit assumption or emotional generalities. This was conceded by the principal witness favoring Reorganization Plan No. 1, the Director of the Budget, David E. Bell, on page 14 of the hearings of the House Committee on Government Operations in the following colloquy:

Mr. MEADER, Mr. Chairman?
 Mr. Bell, as Budget Director, is it your function to attempt to minimize expansion of bureaucracy and expansion of expenditures of the Federal Government? Are you, in a sense, an opposing force to Parkinson's law?

Mr. BELL. I should hope to merit that description, yes, sir, Mr. MEADER.

Mr. MEADER. Would you agree that in addition to the two criteria that you mention on page 4 of your statement, for the establishment of a department there perhaps should be another one: That the burden of proof that a new department should be established is upon those who assert that proposition, and that the presumption would

¹ In 1947 the War Department, the Department of the Navy, and a newly established Department of the Air Force were consolidated in one National Defense Establishment, now known as the Department of Defense.

be that there should not be a new department unless a strong case is made for it?

Mr. BELL. Well, I would certainly agree that a sound case must be made for any action which modifies the structure of the Government.

This point was made in "Minority Views" to the report on H.R. 8429—House Report No. 1053, 87th Congress—establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing as follows:

According to its published calendar, the Committee on Government Operations has had before it a score or more bills in each of the last three Congresses (85th, 86th and 87th) to create new Government departments. These bills would have created a Department of Mineral Resources, a Department of Public Information, a Department of Public Relations, a Department of Rural and Suburban Government, a Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs, a Department of Transportation and Communication, a Department of Urban Affairs, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, a Department of Urbiculture, a Department of Aeronautics and Space, a Department of Consumers, a Department of Peace, a Department of Science and Technology, a Department of Veterans' Affairs, a Department of Civil Defense, a Department of General Services, and a Department of Science.

How many times can the Cabinet be augmented without passing the point of diminishing returns? If the urge to create a new department were yielded to each time it asserted itself, the Cabinet would become so large and unwieldy that it would lose much of its value and a seat at the table would not mean much.

Let me interpolate at this point, Mr. Chairman. From the demonstration of Colonel Glenn yesterday, the fact that space is here to stay and that it is a legitimate important function of the Federal Government, it can be argued that it is much more in order to create a new department of the Government out of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency than it is to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

A CASE HAS NOT BEEN MADE FOR A NEW
DEPARTMENT

Proponents of establishing the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing have not met the burden of proof. No factual or logical foundation for establishing a new permanent organ of Government has been laid. The proposal to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into a department does not meet the criteria which should govern the establishment of a department of the Federal Government. These criteria are:

First. A department should have responsibility pursuant to a policy laid down by the Congress over an important area of Federal authority and activity.

Second. The functions and powers of a department should have been determined by the Congress to be permanent or at least of indefinite duration.

Third. So far as practicable, a new department should be comprised of all Federal activities related to the field of the Federal responsibility to be entrusted to the department.

I want to discuss these criteria one by one to show how this proposed Depart-

ment of Urban Affairs and Housing falls far short of meeting criteria for establishing a new department.

A department should have responsibility pursuant to a policy laid down by the Congress over an important area of Federal authority and activity

The proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing falls far short of meeting the first standard which should govern establishment of departments.

First, housing is primarily an activity of the private business community and the Federal Government's role has been and should be limited to the assistance in providing financial aid and credit thought to be necessary for a healthy housing program, but beyond the capacity either of private financial markets or such financial assistance as local communities and States are able to provide.

For the Federal Government to do more in home construction than to provide this limited financial assistance would be to put the Federal Government in private business and constitute a socialization of the home building industry.

With respect to urban affairs, our Constitution vests no power in the Federal Government, which is one of limited powers, with respect to the establishment of municipal corporations or other local governmental units. The power in this field was expressly reserved to the States or the people themselves by the 10th amendment of the Constitution. No major Federal responsibility, control or direction over municipal and other local governmental organizations could be assumed by the Federal Government without an amendment to the Constitution. Thus, the great bulk of governmental responsibility for municipalities and local governments will remain with the States. Urban affairs are not a Federal responsibility.

The functions and powers of a department should have been determined by the Congress to be permanent or at least of indefinite duration

It would seem to be basic that an activity of the Federal Government should not be frozen into the governmental structure by making it a department unless it has been established by the Congress as a permanent Federal activity of indefinite duration. This is not the case with housing.

Construction by its very nature has a termination date. Buildings get finished. It is true, of course, that with the massive migration into our metropolitan areas, housing shortages, slum clearance, mass transit problems, and other metropolitan needs which the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies are designed to alleviate may reasonably be anticipated to be with us for some time to come. Yet no one can foresee future developments, including the recommendations which may emanate from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and its studies of metropolitan problems. No one can be sure that these municipal

problems and needs may not be met in such a fashion as to diminish the need for Federal assistance, or that alternative ways of meeting these problems may not be found. Whether this be true or not, Congress has seen fit in adopting housing legislation to fix terminal dates when the authority created by the statute would expire.

The reorganization plan would create a Department of Urban Affairs out of the HHFA and constituent agencies which the Congress has not established as permanent entities of the Federal Government. The authority of most of the constituent agencies is limited or temporary. Either dollar limits or specific expiration dates are expressly provided in statutes creating their powers and functions.

For example, the Federal National Mortgage Association, under its charter act, provides a means for its transfer to private ownership. It presently has approximately 8,600 private stockholders holding \$80 million in common stock.

The Public Housing Administration was given 100,000 additional units by the Housing Act of 1961 and according to the chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee during the debate on the housing bill this was to launch a phasing out of the program. In addition the Congress authorized a \$5 million demonstration grant program to find new ways to house low-income families. One of the methods to be studied involves direct subsidies to low-income families. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which now handles public assistance programs would be a more appropriate vehicle for the disbursement of shelter subsidies to tenants.

The Federal Housing Administration was extended for 4 years in the Housing Act of 1961. Of the major programs under FHA, the middle-income submarket interest rate rental housing program has a 4-year life; the 3 percent down, 35-year program approved by the 1961 act has a 2-year life.

The fourth and remaining major program in the HHFA complex relates to the Urban Renewal Administration. This agency was given contractual authority for an additional \$2 billion under the 1961 act. While it is conjectural how long the Federal Government will continue this program, certainly there is insufficient evidence that it is permanent enough to justify creation of a new executive department.

Thus, in another decade, we may find that we have established a permanent department of the Government, headed by a Secretary, having an Under Secretary, assistant secretaries, general counsel and all the trappings of a bureaucracy but with no powers or duties. Congress may have permitted the authority of the constituent agencies to expire finding that the Federal assistance had accomplished its purpose and was no longer needed, or had established alternative mechanisms for dealing with housing problems. The Department would still be there and all the high brass therein would be drawing their salaries, but with nothing to do.

It is basically unsound administration to convert agencies, which by their terms are temporary, into a permanent department.

This is in clear contrast with the programs administered, for example, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the proponents of the plan are fond of citing as precedent. In an examination of the statutes authorizing programs conducted by the following constituent agencies of HEW—Public Health Service, Office of Education, Social Security Administration, Bureau of Public Assistance, Children's Bureau, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Food and Drug Administration, St. Elizabeths Hospital and Howard University—no specific references were found limiting the amount of money available for carrying out the provisions of the authorizing legislation, nor was any time limit imposed on the operation of these programs or agencies.

So far as practicable, a new Department should be comprised of all Federal activities related to the field of the Federal responsibility to be entrusted to the Department

Proponents of the plan have indicated that establishment of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will create a one-stop agency where municipal officials may find all of their needs met in one place without being shunted around from bureau to bureau in Washington. This is a snare and delusion. The one-stop agency will be no more as a Department than it is as a one-stop agency of the Housing and Home Finance Administration.

A multitude of Federal functions useful to metropolitan areas in meeting many of their problems will remain where they are now and in no way be affected by the organization plan. The Bureau of Public Roads administering the Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways through municipalities as well as city streets will stay right in the Department of Commerce where it is now.

Water pollution or sewage disposal programs will remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where they are now.

Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now.

These and other programs will in no way be affected by the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which at best will have jurisdiction over only a minor fraction of Federal activities and funds aimed at assisting States and municipalities to solve metropolitan problems.

Only about one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities will be encompassed in the new Department. The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will continue in their autonomous status.

They account for approximately 63 percent of the housing financing activities engaged in by, or under the auspices of, the Federal Government.

Following is a list of the various departments of the Federal Government whose activities are of importance and assistance to municipalities:

PROGRAMS UNDER DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY
 Highway construction, Commerce.
 Improvement of rivers, harbors, and waterways, Corps of Engineers.
 Water pollution control, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Control of communicable diseases, including tuberculosis and venereal, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Services to crippled children, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Health centers and clinics, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Disaster relief, Office of Emergency Planning.
 Civil Defense, Defense Department.
 Employment security, Labor.
 School lunch program, Agriculture.
 Special problems of federally impacted areas, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Airports and air terminals, Federal Aviation Agency.
 Old age and survivors' insurance for local government employees, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Hospital planning and construction, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Suppression of crime, Justice.
 General welfare assistance, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Categorical assistance under the Social Security Act, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Vocational education, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Vocational rehabilitation, Health, Education, and Welfare.
 Donable surplus property, Health, Education, and Welfare.

It would seem logical if there is to be a Department of Urban Affairs that these various functions should be brought together under one administrative roof where municipal officers could truly get one-stop service.

This type of consolidation of functions would likewise be in accordance with the philosophy of the Hoover Commission recommendations, would lead to the elimination of duplication, overlapping, and parallel administrative services and might actually accomplish something.

An alternative means was suggested for bringing Federal activities of interest to municipalities together; namely, the transfer of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where most of the grant-in aid programs of interest to municipalities are already located. While this would seem to make some sense, it has not been studied thoroughly and was rejected out of hand by those who wish to establish the new department and a new official of Cabinet rank. The cursory dismissal of this proposal indicates, first, that the reorganization plan does nothing to create a one-stop agency for municipalities; second, that it flies in the face of sound administrative structure in failing to bring related functions together; and, third, that the plan has been hastily concocted and prematurely presented without adequate study.

Would it not be far wiser to await the recommendations of a permanent agen-

cy only recently created by the Congress; namely, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a bipartisan agency—which has already undertaken to cope with metropolitan area problems and has issued two reports already in this field: "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Mass-Transportation Facilities and Services in Metropolitan Areas," issued April 1961, and "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," issued July 1961?

This Commission is composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, Governors of States, mayors of cities and representatives of county and township governments. The two studies above mentioned are only the first of a series of studies in the important area of municipal problems and it is noteworthy that the Commission, on page 56 of its report of July 1961, refrained from recommending the establishment of a National Department of Urban Affairs. The Congress should follow this example of the bipartisan study group it created and likewise refrain from taking hasty action to establish a department in advance of thorough study.

FEDERAL ENCRoACHMENT ON STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

My colleague referred to Federal encroachment on States and municipalities.

Proponents of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 belittle the fears of some stalwart advocates of local autonomy, independence and self-determination by arguing that the new Department will not seek to encroach upon rights and prerogatives of States and local governments, pointing out that no powers will be vested in the new Department which do not already exist in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Those of us, however, who have watched burgeoning bureaucracy are somewhat skeptical of representations that the new Department would remain in status quo. There will be pressures for new programs, new funds, new responsibilities and new powers to be added to this new creature once it is established. In fact, some of the Governors and mayors indifferent to the prerogatives and powers of governmental units they head seem to advocate and welcome the possibility that the new Department would assume more and more of the responsibility, as well as the authority, of local units of government.

One would have to be unperceptive indeed to see the bloated expansiveness of centralized government as a lifeless skeleton. According to the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, civilian employment in Government increased 74,262 during 1961 alone, to a total Federal employment of 2,430,999.

The mushrooming tendency of a new department is attested to by the development of the latest one, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which came into being on April 11, 1953, by virtue of Public Law 13, 83d Congress.

The average number of employees in the Department has grown from 36,613

in fiscal year 1953, when it was established, to an estimated 63,154 in fiscal year 1961. Appropriations have increased correspondingly from \$1,987.8 million in fiscal year 1953 to \$3,823.4 million in fiscal year 1961.

Bureaucracies once established have a way of growing not only in size but in power. That is especially true with bureaucracies which handle vast sums of public funds. It may well be that the new Secretary of Urban Affairs may never be granted any constitutional power by the Congress to direct the affairs of a municipality. But it would be naive for anyone to suppose that conditions and criteria would not be established in the dispensation of loans and grants for municipal purposes which might induce hungry local officials, outbid in the taxation of the people by the huge take of the Federal Government, to surrender some of their autonomy and self-determination in exchange for Uncle Sam's largesse.

Money is power, and whatever may be said of the present Administrator, no one can be certain that some future housing czar will have the fortitude to oppose Parkinson's law and refrain from establishing a nationwide pattern for community development.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], member of the committee.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting House Resolution 530 and opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

In my considered judgment, the proponents of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing fail utterly and completely in their efforts to establish a genuine need for such a Department.

Those efforts have become clouded in partisan politics to the extent that the basic issues are hardly recognizable. I am hopeful that this debate today will serve to separate the wheat from the chaff and that once this proposal is laid open for all to judge it on its merits, this body will respond with a resounding vote for disapproval.

On what grounds do the supporters of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seek approval? They claim that urban dwellers have no voice in the Federal Government, and that this plan will give them one. They claim it will solve a great need to coordinate the various Federal programs having a bearing on urban problems. They claim that communities have no place in Washington to bring their problems, and that this plan will give them one. They claim that this plan will bring about greater economy and efficiency in government. They claim that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have sufficient status to represent and promote the great programs under his direction. Let us take a look at these claims.

When the proponents of this plan say that urban dwellers have no voice in the Federal Government, I cannot for the life of me fathom which branch of

the Government they are talking about. Are they saying that the leadership in Congress is unresponsive to the needs of our urban communities? Are they saying that the many Members of this body who represent urban constituencies are not vigorous or resourceful enough to pursue the interests of their constituencies? Are they saying that the great Banking and Currency Committee in this body is unmindful of urban problems? I do not think they are saying these things because they would not be speaking the truth if they were.

What then are they trying to say? Are they trying to say that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not carrying out its responsibilities? Are they saying that the members of the President's Cabinet ignore the needs of our great cities? Are they saying that the President of the United States himself is unable to speak for the benefit of urban dwellers? I hardly think they are trying to say these things. If they are, I will find it difficult to agree with them.

Are they saying that urban America, in order to survive, must have one single voice to represent it, just as rural America ostensibly has in the Secretary of Agriculture? If they are then they must be saying that urban America needs a man who will try to control its very life and breath, just as the Secretary of Agriculture is trying to control rural America. If having a Cabinet-level department does for urban dwellers what it does for our farmers, then I certainly want no part of it.

Who would this single voice be? Would he be a man who could speak out on such problems as air and water pollution? Would he be a man who could speak out on such problems as juvenile delinquency and public health? Would he be a man who could speak out on the location of highways and arterials and interchanges? Would he be a man who could speak out on unemployment or on public works? He most certainly would not, because the sponsors of this plan have done nothing to give the proposed new Secretary of Urban Affairs any authority over these problem areas so important to urban development. The new Secretary could speak out on nothing beyond what the present Administrator of HHFA can speak out on because this plan does not enlarge responsibilities, it merely transfers them.

Let us look at the claim that urban America needs a Cabinet officer in Washington to better coordinate the Federal programs relating to urban problems. If the proponents of this plan claim that we need just one single man to coordinate, then why do they not propose to place under this new Department authority over the multitude of existing Federal programs designed to cope with urban problems? All this reorganization plan will do is to elevate urban renewal, the community facilities program, and a minority share of existing Federal housing programs. It does not bring within the jurisdiction of the proposed new Secretary any of the other farflung programs which might need to be coordinated. To give one man greater control over and coordination of Federal

programs aimed at urban problems, proponents of this new Department would merely upgrade the programs which presently exist under common direction and leave the rest of the pertinent programs right where they are. This plan would give the new Secretary nothing more to coordinate than that which the HHFA Administrator presently has.

Proponents of this reorganization plan argue that urban officials have no place in Washington to come with their problems. I find it very difficult to accept this reason as a valid one.

I represent the city of Syracuse, N.Y. Syracuse is one of the finest and most progressive cities in the country. Syracuse has had considerable experience with the existing public housing and urban renewal programs and, in light of this experience I am unable to accept the argument that there is no place in Washington for the cities to take their problems.

Syracuse has been one of the pioneering cities in the country in the construction of public housing for low-income and elderly families, and in the undertaking of broad-scale urban renewal programs for the betterment of the community. Representatives of the city, both Republican and Democrat, have worked in close cooperation with Federal officials, under both Republican and Democrat administrations, while the city's projects were in the making. I am not aware of any significant difficulties encountered during the course of these negotiations and dealings with the Federal Government. I have contacted Federal officials on a number of occasions in connection with these projects and I have experienced no problems myself.

Let me cite some examples of the manner in which Syracuse has been able to work with Washington for the progress and betterment of the community.

Syracuse obtained over \$4,467,000 from the Federal Government in 1938 to build a public housing project; \$4,547,196 in 1952 to build another; \$3,059,684 in 1956 to build an annex to the earlier development; in 1956 Syracuse undertook an urban renewal project with the aid of \$2,108,000 from Washington; in 1958 \$9 million was obtained from the Federal Government to place yet another public housing project under construction; in 1960 Syracuse received a contract for \$11,928,000 in Federal funds to undertake its ambitious Near East Side urban renewal project; in 1961 a reservation was approved for 350 additional units of public housing, for which there is no dollar estimate yet available; there is presently pending an industrial project which could well bring another several million dollars in Federal assistance; and at the present time still another project is under study, with no dollar estimates yet available.

Including estimates for amounts not yet made definite, this could total roughly \$40 million in assistance from the Federal Government under the public housing and urban renewal programs alone. I ask you, does this give the appearance that a city has no place to go in Washington for help?

I think a worthwhile rule of thumb is that any community which has a constructive and sound program to better itself and is willing to bear the substantial amount of responsibility necessary to put that program into effect will neither have trouble finding nor obtaining the various forms of assistance presently available from the Federal Government. The line is, and should be, drawn when a community wants Washington to do all of its worrying, planning and financing for it. This, I am afraid, is at the root of the proposal which is under consideration today.

The supporters of this plan argue that it will bring greater economy to Government. How can this be? This proposal is clearly designed to give the Federal Government a bigger, and eventually controlling, voice in the handling of community problems. Inherent in this design is the probability that constant effort will be exerted to expand and extend existing programs, to broaden spheres of influence, and to get bigger appropriations. How this will cut costs is beyond me.

I do not see how this plan will bring increased efficiency to Government. By the admission of its supporters, this plan will do little more than upgrade an existing administrative agency. It will not give the proposed new Secretary any additional programs to administer, nor will it give him any authority over his present programs that he does not already have the power to exercise. Is there something magical about working for a department that is absent when one works for an agency? Can one do more work for the former than for the latter? I would be interested in hearing our Government personnel people comment on that.

Proponents of this plan apparently argue that the Administrator of HHFA does not have sufficient status in the bureaucracy to obtain a fair shake for the programs under his direction. They apparently argue that whoever holds that position does not have sufficient status to work out on an equitable basis conflicts between his programs and those of the Cabinet departments. Is our President unable to establish priorities or to dictate the bases for resolution of differences among members of his own team? Maybe the President does not consider the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as being a member of the team. If these problems exist, I do not think they can be remedied by attaching a new title to a job.

Although I cannot agree with any of these arguments, I will say at least that they are directed to the merits of the reorganization plan. That is more than I can say for what appears to be the primary method for gaining acceptance of this program. Rather than seriously attempting to sell this plan on its merits, which admittedly would be an extremely difficult task, supporters apparently take the position that anyone who challenges the program is *prima facie* against the urban dweller and against the Negro race. This is being implied at every turn and is as despicable and irresponsible a pitch as I have seen in many years.

Proponents will not admit that this plan can be opposed in good faith by a person who fully appreciates the problems of our growing urban communities and by a person who is genuinely interested in the progress of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. Nor will they admit that it can be opposed in good faith by a person who would like nothing better than to see a member of the Negro race become a member of the President's Cabinet. This is low, cheap demagoguery and I am certain that the American people will see through it.

The plan put forth here today will do nothing to speed the solution of urban problems. It attempts to pinpoint difficulties without doing anything about them. It has very little inherent value and is unworthy of the support of this body.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Florida introduced his bill last year to create a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs and Housing I am personally convinced that he did so in the honest belief that this measure represented a meritorious approach to the problems of urban dwellers. However, the measure which we consider today, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, is a politically inspired document which a Member of the other body and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee has excitedly labeled the first big political issue of the 1962 and 1964 elections. Indeed, a Washington newspaper yesterday morning in its lead editorial felt obliged to comment:

This plan is mired in politics and it is haunted by hobgoblins. For the politics the administration must bear some of the blame.

However, I would certainly join with my colleague from the State of Florida on the committee and seek to lay aside the political issue and try to consider this proposal on its merits.

The major premise of those who have sought to present a logical case for this new Department is that 70 percent of Americans live in urban areas. There has therefore been a not-so-subtle inference from supporters of this plan that if we as Members of Congress oppose Reorganization Plan No. 1, we are somehow opposed to the best interests and to the welfare of 70 percent of the American people. This argument becomes even more astonishing when you contemplate the fact that a reorganization plan can create no new functions. It can create no new powers.

Here by way of digression I might mention it has been very interesting to me, as a member of the subcommittee, to notice the transformation in the arguments that have been made and to watch the progress of this legislation. We first held hearings in May of last year on the bill of the gentleman from Florida and today we come to a consideration of the reorganization plan itself. Originally this was presented and this was outlined to us as a real monument, as something that was absolutely essential, as something that would solve

the problems of 70 percent of urban dwellers in this country. Now today we are being told that it is nothing of the sort; no new powers; no new functions—it is merely a regrouping of agencies, of the present constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing. Well, if that is so, then how in the same breath can the gentleman argue that those of us who sincerely and who for philosophical reasons oppose the creation of yet another bureaucratic monstrosity in the Federal Government somehow are opposed to minority groups and that we are opposed to city dwellers. It simply is not so, by the very arguments they themselves have made.

I would like to address myself to one point mentioned by my colleague in his opening remarks; namely, that the principal reason for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is to give the housing administrator the authority to reorganize constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, on a more economical and efficient basis. Those are certainly very attractive words; are they not? We are all for economy and we are all for efficiency. Recently, in an address at Rutgers University, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator described his agency as "an administrative monstrosity" and he contended he needed Reorganization Plan No. 1 in order to reorganize his agency and his constituent agencies on a more economical basis. However, as I think has been already pointed out by my colleague, the Congress in the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act gave the Administrator, and I quote, "full authority to assign and to reassign functions and to reorganize his agency to promote economy, efficiency and fidelity in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Now there has been some misunderstanding on this point and I want to invite the attention of the Committee to the majority report. It is in error in relating the proviso that I have just read from the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act—in relating that to a House report of the independent offices appropriation bill for the previous year, which was 1954.

I call your attention to the majority report on page 18 which states that House Report No. 276, 83d Congress, which accompanied the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955 indicates that the provisions would have a limited effect.

However, the majority report in this case is in error because House Report No. 276 did not accompany the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act from which I quoted this proviso.

The language in a report on a 1954 appropriation act is certainly not evidence of the intent of the Congress with respect to a provision which was inserted in an appropriations act 1 year later.

I think it is also very significant in this regard to point out that it was during the spring of 1954 that the Banking and Currency Committee of the other

body launched a thorough investigation of the Federal Housing Administration, particularly some of the irregularities that have grown out of the section 608 program. It was as the result of these investigations that the FHA Commissioner, the General Counsel, the Assistant General Counsel, and the Assistant Commissioner for multifamily housing were removed from office. Then at this time there was some doubt as to the control which the then Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Mr. Cole, had over the FHA and other constituent agencies. There was some doubt, in other words, as to his ability under the powers that had been granted the Administrator under the Reorganization Act of 1947 to clean up the constituent agencies and to correct these abuses. It was then, following that, and this apparent deficiency in the earlier reorganization plan, that the conferees on the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955 agreed to add this proviso which granted the Administrator full authority to assign and reassign functions. It strikes me, therefore, that there is ample authority in the existing statutes for the administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to promote the kind of efficiency and economy that the proponents of this reorganization plan say is the sole reason for presenting this plan.

It has been said we are merely rattling the bones of centralized government, and that we are raising unfounded fears when we say that by the adoption of this reorganization plan we may well be taking a step in the direction of usurping the responsibility and the ability of the State and local governments to handle their own problems.

I would point out in this connection that today the Federal Government is collecting roughly two-thirds of all of the tax revenues that are collected in this country. It is basically because State and local government are suffering from too little revenue that some problems have been neglected. Yet the other day in the other body when an amendment was offered to remit half of the federally collected cigarette tax to the State for disbursement, it managed to get hardly a corporal's guard of support in that body. Why? Because of the apparently growing conviction on the part of many that State and local governments, with or without revenue, are unable, are incompetent, to deal with local problems, problems that up to this time we have regarded as local. I feel that this bill can certainly in the future lead to a further debilitation of State and local government no matter how sincere its proponents may be today in saying that that cannot happen.

I want to call your attention to a quotation from the Solicitor General of the United States in his brief which was filed in the case of Baker against Carr. You will recognize this as the Tennessee Malapportionment Case. He has this to say regarding our existing system of bypassing States:

Urban governments now tend to bypass the States and to enter directly into cooperative arrangements with the National Government in such areas as housing, urban devel-

opment, airports, and defense community facilities. This multiplication of national-local relationships reinforces the debilitation of State governments by weakening the State's control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions.

If that is true now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we adopt this reorganization plan, if we establish the trappings of yet another vast Federal bureaucracy, that we will have proceeded another very long step indeed along the road to eroding still further the powers and the responsibilities of local government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that this body has a measure or a problem before it that has generated as much debate and as much noise and at the same time bears as little significance to the people it is supposed to help. We have before us a reorganization plan known as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. It is a plan that even its most ardent proponents admit does nothing. This, I think, is evidenced by the testimony that was presented before the committee in so many different instances. It is evidenced by the fact that it provides no new authority, no new moneys, and no new activities.

I suppose we might well use as substantiating evidence the statement that was made by Mr. Bell, the Director of the Budget, when he stated in response to my question relative to the authority—this is found on pages 28 and 29 of the committee hearings, and which reads, as follows:

Mr. BELL. No, sir; there are no new authorities. I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding, Mr. LANGEN.

There are no new legal authorities to be granted by this plan.

In further response he made the following statement:

Mr. BELL. Well, as I have stated, this plan simply transfers authorities that exist now to the new Secretary.

So by virtue of these statements we now realize that we have a plan before us that does nothing more than to elevate the status of an agency and provide new titles to a total of three people, some of whom are already holding positions.

Before going any further, let me state here and now that I recognize the fact that cities and urban areas have difficult problems; problems that should be given attention. My objection today is in the use of the good people of our urban areas as a whip to promote a plan that merely elevates an existing, workable agency to departmental status. There is no guarantee that "status" alone will create miracles for our urban people.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

It is deplorable that the problems of urban communities should be used as a pawn to create a new department. Calmer considerations should be given in an effort to actually help urban communities without being panicked into adopting a premature, unnecessary reorganization plan.

In the last Congress a bill was reported favorably by the Government Operations Committee to establish a permanent bipartisan Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. That proposal became Public Law 86-380 and established a commission to, among other things, bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for the consideration of common problems.

Let me make a reference to a few assignments of this Commission. It is to provide a forum for discussion of administration and coordination of Federal grants and other programs requiring intergovernmental operation. It is to encourage discussion at an early stage and in merging problems that are local and require intergovernmental operation. Here is a commission designed to deal directly with the problems that we have been referring to.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 accomplishes nothing in the field of cooperation. In fact, it proposes absolutely nothing that is not already in existence.

There is one item with regard to this that puzzles me a bit.

It is the zeal with which the reorganization plan is being championed. Since these proponents admit there is nothing new, nothing extra, then I suspect there are hidden provisions that we cannot, or are not intended, to see. There must be some other purpose for the creation of another cabinet post.

Perhaps we can get some insight into possible hidden intentions by looking at some of the provisions contained in the original proposal to create an Urban Affairs Department. Under those provisions, no community could escape the solution of its problems.

Reading in part from that original proposal:

For the purpose of this act, the terms "urban areas" and "urban communities" are intended to include all communities, regardless of size, whether incorporated or unincorporated.

Presumably a couple of houses at a country crossroads would have qualified. I bring this up only to demonstrate what some of the original intentions were, and what they may still be. Proponents of the plan before us today perhaps have settled for the simple elevation of an agency to departmental level on the theory that great things automatically happen when you achieve Cabinet status. But by their own admission, there are no new programs, no new moneys and no new actual authority. So, some of us wonder just what the real purpose is—how many hidden intentions will suddenly come forth to plague State and local governments in the name of urban affairs. This very title puzzles me a bit, too. Urban affairs? Seems as if we are making it the affairs of centralized government.

If the many accomplishments the supporters claim for this legislation are going to become a reality, then obviously it means a further concentration of power in Washington whereby State and local authorities will be circumvented. Supporters claim this would not be so;

that there are no new provisions in the plan. If not, why bother with the plan at all?

To proceed a little further, I think we should at this point recognize that the existing agencies are doing a good job, such as the Housing and Home Finance Administration and all of the others. It is admitted that they are doing a most commendable job, and I am not sure just what changing the status of a department is going to do to help the urban people. You know, in Minnesota, or the farm where I come from, some of them at times in jest refer to us farm people as being "agronomic engineers." Of course, that is a pretty fancy title and maybe gives us status of some kind, but I fail to see where it is going to improve the crops we raise or the work we do.

Now, while we are on the subject of agriculture, I was particularly amused to note the number of people testifying before the committee, and it has been referred to here on the floor today, that because we have a Department of Agriculture it now becomes desirable and beneficial that we should also have a Department of Urban Affairs. This has been referred to by the President and a good many others. So, by virtue of these statements we need to have this department because the rural people have a department, let me call to your attention just a couple of items relating thereto. While we have a large Department of Agriculture, now employing about 90,000 people, spending some \$6 billion a year, I submit to you that there are still some problems in the farm area that are presently being considered by this House. But, probably more significant—and I refer to the statistics that were produced by the census in connection with my own State of Minnesota—according to the last census the per capita income of the farm people is \$2,294, while at the same time the income of the urban workers is \$3,906. Yes, the per capita income of urban people is \$1,620 higher.

Now, what puzzles me at this moment is whether or not the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is intended to bring the urban people down to our class or whether it is intended they are going to leave us even further behind.

Inasmuch as committee hearings brought out emphatically that there were to be no new programs, services or moneys, nor could they prove specifically any clear-cut advantages to urban people that cannot now be accomplished through existing agencies; we must therefore conclude that the approval of this reorganization plan can result only in a new title for three people and an agency without rewarding benefits to the people we are trying to help.

In view of these statistics, I submit to this House that if we respond in favor of this measure, which actually does nothing, has no evidence that it is going to improve the situation in the urban areas, that we are responding to the noise rather than to the statistical facts that accompany it. For these reasons I feel that the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 should not go into effect.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, on January 15 of this year I sent a letter to every Member of Congress citing my opposition to the enactment of the proposed new Department for Urban Affairs and Housing and the creation of an additional Cabinet post for this new Department. I stated then, and I state now, that I am convinced that the enactment of this new Department for Urban Affairs, as now set forth by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, would result in too great a concentration of power. I am a firm believer in States rights and I fear that this proposed new Department would put an end to home rule and States rights.

Such a department would continue to grow much in the same manner as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has grown over the past 10 years. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a prime example, for in 1953 the agencies which became the new HEW employed some 40,000 people, their combined payrolls approximated \$170 million and the HEW spent over \$1.9 billion. Today, for the fiscal year 1963, the President's budget estimates that HEW, 10 years later, is expected to spend \$5.2 billion, that their total payroll costs will be in the area of \$473 million, and further that the HEW employee force will have risen to some 79,000 people.

This, Mr. Chairman, is an increase of 100 percent over the number of employees which HEW had 10 years ago, 200 percent more in payroll dollars, and an increase of 250 percent in overall departmental expenditures for HEW.

Now, with regard to the proposed Urban Department, the President's budget indicates that the agencies and programs which would be consolidated into the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would have the authority to spend \$13.7 billion for the current fiscal year and by the end of this current fiscal year these agencies will have outstanding direct and insured loans totaling \$52.9 billion.

Should the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing be established, and should it expand at the general growth rate of HEW, it would by fiscal year 1973 become a \$165 billion department.

The new Department would comprise the existing urban renewal program, the college housing program, public facility loan program, housing for the elderly, open space land program, Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, and the functional components of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

You could call this new Department, the Department of Back-Door Spending, for every major program and agency proposed to be consolidated into this new Department for Urban Affairs and Housing spends through the back door. Their total spending for the current fiscal year is estimated at \$13.7 billion

and all but \$300 million is spent through the back door. Authority to spend proceeds from the sale of Federal bonds under contract authorizations, and out of revolving funds, all outside of effective appropriation control, are among the more readily recognizable forms of back-door spending.

Since we have had experience with HEW and its growth rate, it will not be difficult to imagine what would happen to back-door spending in the new Department for Urban Affairs over a 10-year period at the same growth rate.

Was this not the method of spending which we rejected on the floor of the House last year when we discussed the foreign aid legislation? Why now should we open a new avenue to another form of back-door spending?

Besides the vast expenditures involved, I have the distinct feeling that many proponents of this centralized control agency would be among the very first to rue its consequences. I would venture to say that a Secretary of Urban Affairs would be in a position to pull strings in all of the cities throughout the United States. The mayors and the city officials would merely become puppets directed by this new Department.

Big government and centralized control is leading this Nation of ours straight into socialism. Over the past 20 years, the Congress has departed from the basic principles set forth by the Constitution, with three separate branches of Government having clearly defined authority. Fear and frustrations have been embedded in the hearts of the people and this Nation for the truth has been withheld. Let us turn toward those basic Jeffersonian Democratic principles upon which this Nation was founded and resist that influence expounded by Khrushchev. Let us preserve States rights and lessen the tendency to turn to the Federal Government for every fringe benefit. Let us not flounder away the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Congress.

I am convinced that the creation of this Department at Cabinet level is not necessary. It is not necessary for the purpose of giving status to the various housing functions of the Federal Government. The proponents of this Department are not really concerned with the Department rank for this housing agency of the Federal Government, but rather they wish to completely dominate the State legislatures, and put the control in the hands of a few city politicians who presently usurp too much power in some of our larger cities.

As you will note in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 particular consideration is given to special problems of small towns and communities, and to urban areas and urban communities, and even the smallest hamlet can be considered a town in the language of this legislation, so that no individual in this country would ever be excluded from the purview of this newly created Department. In actuality, this Department would become a department for national affairs with hardly any limitation as to the jurisdictional boundaries and further, through regulation of Federal legisla-

tion, which would be initiated in this Department, the Urban Affairs and Housing Agency would become the Federal overlord of every owner of land and home in this country.

In closing I wish to quote from Thomas Jefferson, which I feel is applicable when considering a reorganization plan such as the one before us today:

I place economy among the first and foremost virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Let us give our children as much, if not more, of what America stands for than that which we received, so that they may have an incentive in life and the will to continue to fight for those principles upon which this Nation was built. Let us turn from vast spending programs and start building a strong basic economy today.

Let us not put the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 into effect. A government that is big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take everything you have got.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it gives me considerable anguish to vote against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, even though I know that there is no justification for such a department, because I know that my vote is subject to misunderstanding by many of my friends of the Negro race who cannot divorce their feelings about the Government issue from their deep desire to bring about the promotion of Mr. Weaver.

Many of them interpret any vote against the new Department as a vote against Mr. Weaver, and the President has made it virtually impossible for them to do otherwise.

I am not opposing the new Department because of Mr. Weaver. I believe that we should select the best qualified men and women for public office without regard to race or religion.

The President has an opportunity to demonstrate that he cherishes the same constitutional principle, and that his interest in promoting a Negro to Cabinet rank is not simply a device to use race as a lever in establishing a controversial new agency. He has an opportunity to prove this in the near future.

It is an accepted fact here and in Connecticut that Gov. Abe Ribicoff, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will resign shortly to campaign for the Senate.

Perhaps because of the underprivileged status of the Negro through many generations, there is no field of government in which Negro men and women have become more expert than that of social welfare, human relations, and education.

Last night in my hometown a distinguished young man, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, honored a number of the Canton men and women who have labored to improve community conditions.

Mr. Young, a graduate of Kentucky State College, holds the master's degree in social work of the University of Minnesota. He has served the Urban League, an outstanding agency in the field of social work and community relations, in Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kentucky. He was dean of the Atlanta School of Social Work from 1954 to 1960. He has been a member of the faculties of St. Catherine's College, the University of Nebraska and Creighton University.

Mr. Young is now on the advisory committee of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a member of the executive committee of the National Social Welfare Assembly, and the advisory board of the New York School of Social Work at Columbia University.

Here is a man whose lifelong devotion to the programs that comprise the chief interests of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare qualify him admirably for recognition as Secretary of that Department.

Need I say that there are others, both Republicans and Democrats, from whom the President could make a distinguished selection.

In closing, I wish to express this public assurance to Robert C. Weaver that my vote today is based upon my sincere conviction that we do not need and should not have a new Department of Urban Affairs, and on no other consideration.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been brought on today under rather unusual circumstances. I respectfully contend that it has come up under action that, as far as I know, is entirely unprecedented. On Monday last, my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], simply advised the Speaker of the House that he would call the matter up today. Normally matters of this kind are settled upon consultation between the majority and minority members of the committee and the majority and minority leadership of the House. This has been the practice in every single instance that I know anything about since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

In this case the Speaker was not asked for his opinion. The Speaker was not asked for his advice. He was simply told after the program had already been made up and announced for this week that the matter would be called up today. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] was within his rights. The rules provide this method of bringing these resolutions of disapproval to the floor, but I would think the rule was meant to protect against undue delay or arbitrary action on the part of committees or of the leadership. Now, what were the circumstances in

this case? The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. Dawson], expeditiously conducted hearings on this matter and expeditiously filed his report. I think it was well understood that the resolution would be called up at an early date. I think the distinguished minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] knew this, and I want to say now that what I am saying has no reference to the minority leadership of the House. We could have brought this matter up last week, but in cooperation with the Republican leadership we gave the Republican Members a recess as we always like to do during the week of Abraham Lincoln's birthday.

Nobody at any time suggested that the matter was being delayed or that we should get together for the purpose of agreeing upon a time or of speeding up the time when this matter should be brought up for consideration. I want to state on behalf of the Speaker and the majority leader, and on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, that it had been our intention to program this resolution regularly and expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sound reorganization plan. The Congress has always kept step with the growth of America's population, industry, power, and prestige. In 1849 when Congress saw the need to group agencies concerned with internal affairs, it created the Department of Interior, and transferred to it the General Land Office, the Office of Indian Affairs, the Pension Office, the Patent Board, and a few other boards.

By 1870 the Office of the Attorney General, established in 1789, had become so important that the Congress created the Department of Justice. In 1872 it created the Post Office Department from the Postal Service. Then, as our Nation grew, congressional concern with economic and social problems of national scope increased. In 1889 Congress created the Department of Agriculture. In 1903 it created a Department of Commerce and Labor, and in 1913 split this Department into two departments. In 1947 and 1949 we drastically reorganized the military departments, and established the Department of Defense. In 1953 we allowed and in fact accelerated the effect of the reorganization plan creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Beginning in the 1930's, the Congress enacted a series of acts to permit the President to initiate reorganizations in the executive branch, subject to a congressional veto.

Since 1949 we have allowed 47 reorganization plans to go into effect. In many respects, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here quite similar to that of 1953 when President Eisenhower sent up a reorganization plan to create the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That plan created no new functions but merely raised the Federal Security Agency to Cabinet status. In connection with that the President said:

But good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their

success upon efficient, responsible administration. Now the establishment of the new Department provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 will give the needed additional assurance that these matters will receive the full consideration they deserve in the whole operation of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I should hate to see the vote on President Kennedy's plan confirm what some people say about my Republican colleagues; that is, that they have not voted in accordance with what they know is best for the country but rather have voted to secure some momentary political gain.

In 1949 President Truman sent up a plan to create a Department of Public Welfare, which was defeated in another body. In 1950 President Truman sent up a second plan to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and this time the Republican vote in the House was 143 to 1 against. But in 1953 when the Republican President sent up a plan almost identical to the Truman plan the Republicans not only supported it but even pushed through a resolution to accelerate its effective date by a Republican House vote of 195 to 13; and on the same resolution the Democratic Members of the House supported the reorganization plan by an affirmative vote of 96 to 73.

Of course, it is well known that the White House announced on the day it sent its plan to Congress that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby would be the Secretary of the new Department, and this fact was referred to frequently.

As I have already noted, the reasoning of President Eisenhower is precisely applicable, it seems to me, to the plan we are now considering. The plans are clearly parallel in nature and in objective.

On July 2, 1957, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller as Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization stated:

It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent.

And he also stated that the growth of the housing and urban renewal programs logically require that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be superseded by such an executive department.

On May 6, 1960, Mr. Norman P. Mason, President Eisenhower's HHFA Administrator, with the approval of President Eisenhower's Budget Bureau, reported to Congress:

Judged against this entire background, and taking into consideration the necessary complexity of this agency's functions and their importance and magnitude as they affect the well-being of a majority of our citizens, I believe the time is near when the principal responsibilities of the Federal Government in the field of housing and community development ought to be organized into a new executive department.

Mr. Mason then proposed that the Department be established by a reorganization plan rather than by the particular bill which was then pending before the Congress.

Witnesses who strongly supported the plan before the Government Operations Committee included Mr. Bruce Savage, Republican Public Housing Commis-

sioner under President Eisenhower, and the Honorable Gordon S. Clinton, Republican mayor of Seattle, Wash., and president of the American Municipal Association.

Mr. Chairman, I have reserved judgment on whether there will be a flip-flop on the part of our friends on the other side with respect to this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, in a radio broadcast which took place last Sunday, a high-ranking Republican was asked a question as follows:

The image of the Republican party across the country is pretty sorry right now. It is that of an obstructionist rather than of a leader, I would think.

In reply, the high-ranking Republican said this in part:

I agree with you that we have too often, at least, through some of our leaders, appeared to be obstructionists. And in the cities particularly we have failed to carry the message. But we have a heart for the people. I think the heart is there. I know how I feel about it, but we have got to do better.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the majority leader does he think that the people in cities of all sizes are going to remember what is taking place here today and recognize the politics of the other party for what it is?

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is a sound observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I like most Members here today, I think, have been impressed with the arguments during this debate and I am especially impressed with the fact all are concerned about this problem. I was grateful, too, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] gave us the benefit of his study and that we have his statement and his thinking in the RECORD on which to base our judgment on this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, because I am interested in this problem in this general area, I have read extensively and studied the subject and the problems involved and have discussed this with people who I believe are real students in this area of Government responsibility, including two very distinguished and very able professors at the great University of Iowa, Dr. Russell Ross and Dr. Deil Wright.

First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest that Reorganization Plan No. 1, the administration proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, seeks to deal in the wrong way with a very real and genuine problem. I certainly feel no prejudice against urban areas because I know firsthand from study and experience the existence and reality of the problems that the proposed plan seeks to resolve. As a member of a cities and towns committee of the Iowa Legislature, I first became familiar with these problems and developed a sympathy for them and, I be-

lieve, an understanding of them. I feel strongly that they need resolving through complete and intelligent application of policy and principle that would come from such a study as I have suggested.

My desire to work for a solution of these problems is strong and genuine, and, because it is, I must oppose this reorganization plan and the creation of a new department along the proposed lines which would merely, I think, give the illusion of coping with the problems rather than providing the substance of real solution.

The arguments against the establishment of a new department are many and, to me, they are very convincing. Let us look at some of them.

In the first place, it would create some new political difficulties and, I believe, intensify older ones. I refer to the relationship between the cities and the States. The sudden and tremendous growth of metropolitan areas in the past few years has left this relationship uncertain and, I believe, hazy. It is frequently asserted that the States have not done enough for the cities. In many cases this is undoubtedly true, and the charge is justified. But the fact remains that the cities are the creatures of the States and it is of vital importance that the government powers be so distributed that this fundamental relationship and balance is not upset.

As metropolitan areas have mushroomed, the tensions, the strains, and the misunderstandings between themselves and their States have proportionately grown. The great need is to close this breach rather than enlarge it.

One of the principal sources of this friction has been the role of the Federal Government and its increasingly direct intervention and assistance in coping with urban problems. The creation of a Department-level Federal agency designed to aid the cities would surely greatly intensify this problem.

It is almost inevitable that cities would come to look more and more to Washington for a solution to their problems. They would certainly come to depend more and more on Federal money as the easy answer to the great demands being made upon them for services.

With Federal aid and Federal intervention on such a massive scale, it is reasonable to assume a consequent increase in Federal control over local plans and activities. Almost nobody wants this; almost everybody concedes that such developments would be unfortunate. Yet it is difficult to see how it could be avoided, no matter how well intentioned both the Federal and local officials might be, if a full-scale Department of the National Government devotes all of its time and energy and money to the plight of the cities. If Washington foots the bill, it is a virtual certainty that Washington will also have a very loud voice in directing the action.

We cannot foresee all of the effects that this course of action might have on the relationship between the States and their urban areas. We cannot foresee, either, what the ultimate effect might be on local government. But certainly what might happen is not pleasant to contemplate for those of us—and I think

I can include virtually all of the American people—who believe that strong and vigorous State and local government are indispensable ingredients of American democracy.

Increasingly, the American people are turning, or are being turned, to Washington as the fountainhead of all that is good and desirable. This is a dangerous trend and frequently an unnecessary course of action that seems to be the easy way out. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be one more gigantic push in this same direction.

Another argument against the creation of this contemplated new Department is that there is no reason to think that such action would be administratively sound. In fact, there are good grounds for maintaining that from the standpoint of administration, it would be a backward step.

As Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach have written in their book, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas":

Not only are there strong political arguments against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, but there is a strong case against it on grounds of administrative soundness. Creation of a department has come to be regarded as a panacea for all administrative ills. * * * Establishment of a department, indeed, may only delay the cure or force it to take place in different surroundings. Back of the proposal is the idea that a simple organizational change will provide the answer for urban and metropolitan problems. This is a false belief. The mere creation of a new administrative unit is not the answer to a problem as complex as that presented by the phenomenon of metropolitanization.

Even more unfortunate than its potential administrative failure is the very real possibility that the creation of a new Department might actually make the metropolitan dilemma worse than it already is. A new organization chart by itself has never solved anything; but it has often created the comfortable delusion that mere manipulation and reshuffling are the answer.

Organizational changes can keep people busy while at the same time diverting their minds and energies from the real substance of the problem. This could be a very real difficulty with the new Department as the administration has proposed it because there is as yet no really clear-cut idea of what the role of the Federal Government ought to be in metropolitan affairs.

This is an extremely important matter, a very basic and unresolved issue that should be settled, or at least clarified, before the new Department is established. Let me quote again from Connery and Leach:

Creation of a department (of urban affairs) would beg the most important question of all, What is the Federal Government's proper role in urban areas? The answer is not merely to assign urban affairs to a single organizational unit. It is a matter of principle and philosophy, not of method. To create a method without first having established a philosophy to base it on is to put the proverbial cart before the horse. Coming as it does at this time, when the basic issues of intergovernmental relations

in metropolitan areas are still unresolved, such a proposal is clearly premature.

It may be that the problems of metropolitan areas and housing have, in their present proportions, come upon us so fast that we have been too busy struggling with them really to sit back and think them through. It is my belief that the formulation of a sound philosophy, a long-range policy, has been too long delayed and should certainly be our next step.

To work toward these philosophical and policy objectives I would vigorously support the creation of a new, small organization which might be called the Council of Urban Advisers. Such a Council should be a staff agency set up on a continuing basis and composed of full-time experts. The agenda and the services that this Council might concern itself with are both numerous and important. It could conduct research, seek a coordination and integration of related activities, and make recommendations. Perhaps most important of all, it could think about and work toward the formulation of a basic policy which we do not now have.

I am so firmly convinced that the creation of a Council along these lines is the next proper and logical step that I am now working on legislation to implement the idea.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency which this reorganization plan would elevate to departmental status has been a useful agency of the Federal Government. It has served the American people well.

It should be permitted to continue to serve them in the future as it has in the past until the complex questions with which the new Department supposedly would deal are more thoroughly understood and thought out. A change in name, a change in status will not solve these problems and may very well only obscure them.

I shall vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1, not because I am unfriendly to urban areas and housing problems but because I am sensitive to them and in sympathy with them. We cannot find the right answers with the wrong methods, and the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing at this time would be a serious mistake.

To establish the fact that I have referred to some real students who are recognized authorities on the subject I should like to point out that Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach are distinguished scholars of the subject area of Federal Government and metropolitan areas and their problems.

Robert H. Connery holds degrees from the University of Minnesota and Columbia University, receiving his Ph. D. from the latter. He has taught at Columbia, Catholic University, Stanford, and the University of Illinois and Duke University.

Over the past 25 years he has served as consultant to numerous Federal, State, and local governments and officials including, among others, the National Resources Planning Board, the President's Committee on Administrative

Management, the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Hoover Commission, and the City Administrator of New York. He has been a Fellow as well as a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution.

During the Second World War he served for 5 years in the Navy as a commissioned officer. In that capacity he was assigned to Secretary Forrestal's office to write an administrative history which later was published as "The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II—1950." He is also author of "Governmental Problems in Wild Life Conservation—1936," "Administration of an NRA Code—1939," and other Government reports and articles.

Richard H. Leach is joint author of "The Administration of Interstate Compacts—1959," of "In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice—1959," and of numerous articles. He was graduated from Colorado College in 1944 and received a Ph. D. from Princeton in 1951. He taught at Georgia Institute of Technology before joining the Duke faculty. He has had considerable practical experience in government as a member of the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board from 1953 to 1956, and of the Army Security Agency.

Both men are now members of the Department of Political Science at Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, this matter should certainly be considered solely on the merits, and should have been considered on the merits alone right from the beginning. In my judgment it is too bad that it has become a political roller coaster to the extent it has, and that extraneous considerations have been interjected in.

I favor the reorganization plan and I am going to vote for it, in other words against the resolution. You cannot have a scotch-tape approach, in terms of the Federal Establishment, to the exploding problems of the exploding metropolises of this country. From my examination of this problem, both as a legislator and as a member of the executive branch of the Government I have been of the opinion for a long, long time—I have written some articles on the subject—that we need a reorganization in the Federal Establishment in this field. When you have separate agencies and separate subagencies and bureaus all dealing with the subject of urban masses without the type of line organization that is necessary, you do not have a sound administrative structure.

When President Eisenhower created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare he was not invading the responsibility of any State of this country. What he was doing, in fact, was to clarify areas of responsibility between the Federal Government, States, and localities.

Three years ago I introduced a bill on this subject which I think provided a

better approach than the reorganization plan before us today. The administration sent up a bill to Congress 2 years later. I think my bill is a better bill than the administration bill. In any event we should have before us today at least one of those bills under a proper rule so that amendments could be offered. Then if such a bill is not sufficiently embracing—and I do not think the reorganization plan does enough—or if relationships between Federal and State Governments are not properly spelled out, additions and changes could be made. If the House wants to work its will, a bill under any open rule is the proper way in which to do it.

I think it is appropriate for me to point out that when the Rules Committee was expanded early in this Congress all of us thought we were giving the majority the necessary tools with which to put their legislative house in order. It is high time they did put it in order. Right now we are faced with a situation whereby we have in effect a closed rule.

Reasonable men can agree or disagree on this subject. For example, some who favor the subject of a Department of Urban Affairs argue that this particular reorganization plan does not do enough, does not cover the subject of the relationship between the Federal establishment and the States, or does not provide for mandatory coordination between the Federal and State Governments. Therefore we should have a bill which we should be free to amend. I intend to vote for the reorganization plan because I am strongly convinced we should have a reorganization, that we do need a Cabinet-level officer in charge of a Department on Urban Affairs. At the same time it is regrettable, in my opinion, that our friends on the majority side of the aisle cannot put their legislative affairs in order enough to give us a proper rule and to give us a bill on the floor we can work on, submit amendments to, and argue about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote in favor of the negative resolution—House Resolution 530—because I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1 for the following reasons:

The United States has become strong because of the independence of its people, and the strength of the United States lies in the ability of its people to govern themselves on the local level without domination and control from a Central Government.

The establishment of an Urban Affairs Department with a Secretary at Cabinet level would weaken and dissipate this strength. As a matter of fact, it was Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, who was the strongest advocate for local government as opposed to Central Government.

I do not recognize this action today as a racial question. I am not voting against this because it might deny Mr.

Weaver a position in the Cabinet. I would be opposed to it if President Kennedy proposed to appoint ex-President Eisenhower to this post.

I recognize Mr. Weaver as a competent Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I would not oppose his appointment to the President's Cabinet.

I am opposed to the establishment of the Department—not the man who is proposed to be appointed to the post.

If President Kennedy wants to appoint Mr. Weaver to a Cabinet post, let him appoint him Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will soon be vacated because of the resignation of Secretary Ribicoff, who has announced that he will resign to run for Senator in Connecticut.

I think we should do all we can here in Congress to make local government strong and to depend upon themselves—not to become weak and to depend upon the Federal Government for the things they should and can do for themselves.

This is making big government bigger, and I am certain that many of the advocates and supporters of an Urban Affairs Department will live to regret their support of it.

There is a real fear that establishing a permanent Department of Urban Affairs and Housing may siphon away from States and municipalities some of the governmental authority that they now enjoy in meeting and deciding, on the basis of the wishes of the residents of the community through their elected representatives, the nature of the communities and the environments in which they live.

Bureaucracies once established, however, have a way of growing not only in size but in power. That is especially true with bureaucracies which handle vast sums of public funds. It may well be that the new Secretary of Urban Affairs may never be granted any constitutional power by the Congress to direct the affairs of a municipality. But it would be naive for anyone to suppose that conditions and criteria would not be established in the dispensation of loans and grants for municipal purposes which might induce hungry local officials, outbid in the taxation of the people by the huge take of the Federal Government, to surrender some of their autonomy and self-determination in exchange for Uncle Sam's largesse.

The following letter to Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, from the League of California Cities against the establishment of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:

LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES,
Berkeley, Calif., July 26, 1961.

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Government Operations Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The board of directors of the League of California Cities meeting in Los Angeles, July 19-21, unanimously voted to oppose the above-numbered measures which would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This was the third time the league board considered the subject matter but the first time the bills establishing such a department were reviewed.

The bills depart in some respects from proposals which have been suggested in the past in that they seem merely to upgrade the Housing and Home Finance Agency and related agencies to departmental status while purporting to make possible the coordination of Federal activities affecting urban affairs by statements of national purpose and policy designed to influence all Federal agencies. The League of California Cities is opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and it is opposed to S. 1633 and H.R. 6433.

The league board of directors is fully aware of the various activities of the Federal Government and its many agencies which affect cities and urban areas. The league has supported Federal legislation where there is a clearly demonstrated national interest. We fully agree with the need for coordination of such activities and the need for consistent and uniform policies in connection with Federal-local relations. The Federal Government, for example, makes money available for comprehensive planning, urban renewal and redevelopment and a workable program which includes development and enforcement of adequate housing, building and subdivision codes. Federal agencies notoriously and rather consistently then proceed to take the position that they are not bound by nor need they pay any attention to local comprehensive plans and regulations. For these and many other reasons which could be cited we agree wholeheartedly with those who feel that such coordination and uniform policies are absolutely essential to the orderly growth of our urban areas and the general welfare and security of the Nation. We do not believe, however, that either a Department of Urban Affairs or a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is the best method of achieving such coordination and development of consistent national and local policies.

The board of directors of the League of California Cities urges the creation by the President of the United States by Executive order of the position of special assistant to the President for urban affairs. Where an administrative controversy exists between departments of the Federal Government or there are inconsistent policies developed by Federal agencies in their relationships with local governments, the ultimate decision must be made by the Chief Executive or someone who can speak for the Chief Executive. It is for this reason that we urge creation of the position of special assistant to the President for urban affairs and assume that such an office would be adequately staffed to undertake the functions assigned to it.

The League of California Cities is against creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing for several reasons. In the first place we believe that the new Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing, even though he has Cabinet status, would be unable to coordinate Federal activities located in other Federal departments. Not only would he have junior status among other Cabinet officers, but the record is not encouraging as to the ability of one Cabinet officer to coordinate the activities of his department and the activities within departments of other Cabinet officers. The most recent Executive order with respect to civil defense is a clear indication to us of reliance placed on senior rather than junior Cabinet departments or other Federal agencies having a lesser status. The same order also demonstrates the difficulty of properly placing a coordinating function outside the office of the President. On the surface it appears that lines of Federal-local civil defense relations will be more tangled than ever.

No one has suggested nor are they likely to suggest consolidation in one department of all Federal programs dealing in any way with urban affairs. Obviously this would re-

tard rather than facilitate the administration of many important Federal-local activities and relations and would involve the creation of an unmanageable, bureaucratic giant which would rightly be looked upon by local governments as a real threat to the most basic of our democratic institutions (cities) which existed long before either the Federal or State Governments.

It is alleged that a President, not particularly sympathetic to the Office of Special Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, could refuse to continue such an Office whereas a department once created by the Congress would continue until abolished by similar action. This contention overlooks the total urban problem and population and actually, the Secretary of a department as an appointee of the President would reflect Presidential policies or be replaced. Nor do we believe that creation of a Special Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs would be looked upon by Cabinet Secretaries as the creation of a super-Secretary. Inasmuch as the President or a spokesman for him must decide executive controversy, it is our belief that a fully informed and adequately staffed Special Assistant would do a better job of coordinating Federal activities affecting urban affairs than a department. He would do so with far less suspicion on the part of local government officials, fearful of the creation in this country of a controlling central agency or ministry of municipal affairs commonly found in other free countries of the world than would a department. He would not be confronted with the problem of being last man on the Cabinet totem pole.

We are not opposed to upgrading HHFA to Cabinet status. Neither do we support such a measure. Undoubtedly, equally convincing arguments can be made for upgrading other Federal agencies to Cabinet status. We simply do not believe that the need for coordinating Federal activities relating to urban and municipal affairs should be used as a screen for upgrading any Federal department.

The scope of the national purpose, national policy, and findings made by the Congress in both bills can only lead to the conclusion that local governments are unable to solve any municipal problems without Federal encouragement, intervention, or assistance. Rather than repeat the statements, we simply refer you to section 2(a) of S. 1633 and H.R. 6433. We can conceive of nothing done by local agencies which cannot be construed as coming within these broad statements.

We believe that there is a need for many partnership relations between Federal and local governments, but we also believe that these relationships can be developed in the future as they have been in the past on the basis of demonstrated need and national interest and that coordination of these activities can best be achieved through the office of the President.

Sincerely,

RICHARD CARPENTER,

Executive Director and General Counsel.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked the question if it is not a little embarrassing to come up here and tend to murder my legislative child. Well, I appreciate the recognition that I was one of the first to introduce legislation in this field, but I hasten to say this reorganization plan has little in common with what I had in mind as a department that would function in our urban territory. This reorganization plan, and it is agreed by all the testimony, includes only the Housing and

Home Finance Agency, which is all in one agency.

I do not agree with the implied criticism that has been made by Mr. Dillon and those who testified on this bill that the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not doing a good job, that he could do a good job if they only gave him a different title. I think that is an implication that is not borne out by the facts. I have heard no criticism of the administration by the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I do not believe he should be criticized for the increase in the foreclosures by FHA. That is due to economic conditions which do not seem to be improving very much. I read in the paper last night that unemployment in the District increased 4,700 last month. The article does not say whether the 4,700 are displaced Republicans or eager Democrats who are awaiting to be absorbed. If they are in the latter class I am sure they will be absorbed shortly because so far employment in the Government has increased 175,000 during the past year.

No, that is not a legitimate criticism, and I think that Mr. Ted Lewis, in his column in the New York Daily News yesterday probably hit the nail on the head, and I would like to quote what he said:

The honest statement by Speaker JOHN McCORMACK that he lacks the House votes to save President Kennedy's proposal for an Urban Affairs Department would appear to be a crushing blow to the administration. But it is neither a jolt nor a surprise.

Kennedy on this and certain other key issues, is seeking to establish a legislative record this year not on what he gets from Congress but on what he asks Congress for.

And then later on he said:

Yet there is little argument that the President was from the start more interested in the political value he could squeeze out of the urban affairs issue than in its actual passage.

And then again:

When Harry Truman sent to Congress his proposal for a Health, Education, and Welfare Department, he tied in with it an announcement that Oscar Ewing, a controversial party politician, was his choice to head the new agency. Congress thereupon turned down the Department. It came into being only under Dwight Eisenhower.

As I said before the committee, I voted for that HEW reorganization plan. I was new in the Congress and I did not know the implications. But, I have found out that that was not the way to create a department. Education is still scattered over many agencies of the Government. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the other day on the radio was asked the question:

Well, how about the investigation of Mr. POWELL into the \$2 billion that is being spent for education?

And the Secretary said:

Well, it is not all in our Department. There is too much scattered all over the Government.

And, it is true. Had that been established by legislative process, it would not be that way.

Now, I agree with our fine chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. He was kind enough to give me credit at one time for being the father of this legislation, but told me my name would not be connected with the bill. And, that is very fine. But, I feel on this bill just like you did, on the health, education, and welfare bill. I am going to vote against this plan as he did on the health, education, and welfare plan and I am sorry I did not vote as he did then.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from an area that I think could well be classified as urban, representing the capital city of Ohio, Columbus, with a population of nearly half a million people, I conducted a poll—of course, it did not hit everybody in my district, but I think it is representative, because it went into reasonably large numbers—which showed that 9 out of 10 answering this question of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs indicated their opposition to it. I do not know whether it is because of this particular Department or whether it is what the Department of Agriculture has done to the rural population of our Nation; I do not know. The gentleman from Florida indicated that the population shift has moved from 70 percent in the rural areas to 70 percent in the cities. Each Member will have to answer for himself whether or not this movement might have been due to the policies of the Department of Agriculture that brought about the shift to the cities. Now, do we want to create a Department for the cities that will drive the city folks back into the country? I think the American people are fed up with more control in Washington, creating a vast, sprawling bureaucracy that this would create. I think the proper vote would be a vote of aye indicating your disapproval of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER].

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution and in opposition to the proposed reorganization plan which would create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Chairman, the case has been sufficiently made, as far as I am concerned, and there is absolutely no need for this proposed reorganization and the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I think we very definitely need an abatement and not an extension of the affairs of the Federal Government into the affairs of the States and our citizens back home.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned the Government should leave this to the imagination, initiative, and ability of the taxpayers back home who make the money to run this Government. They have the ability whether we agree or not. We need to defeat this proposed reorganization plan. I am going to vote against it and urge you to do the same.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the establishment of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Chairman, there is a marvelous supply of nonsense in this world. I want to take about 3 minutes to describe to this House one of the more arrant pieces of nonsense that is being peddled by the opponents of the President's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

This particular piece of nonsense concerns the omission in the President's plan of any reference to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the housing programs of the Veterans' Administration. Some of those who are inveighing against the President's proposal use this as one of their grounds of objection.

Mind you, they are against setting up such a Department at all. Just why they should want these important and popular programs included in a proposal which they are against in its entirety, they do not say. Perhaps they feel that if the Board and the VA programs were included they could be against the plan more, longer, and louder. But let us not make them squirm by inquiring why they raise the question; let us answer it instead. And it is really very easy and very simple.

Let us take the VA first. I think that a great many people—probably including a large number of veterans themselves—would agree that it may well have been a mistake for Congress to establish this program in the VA instead of the Housing Agency. It would have saved everybody a lot of time and trouble to do it the other way.

But that is beside the point. The Congress did establish the program in the Veterans' Administration, and there it has been all these years. The problems created by having an insurance program in the FHA and a so-called guarantee program in the VA have long since been worked out. The program is operating smoothly. The VA field offices understand it. The veterans understand it. The homebuilders understand it.

Bear in mind that, by its very nature, the VA housing program is a temporary affair—whether it runs for another 5 years, as the law now provides or for another 15. In due course, it will be over and will be liquidated. After a dozen years in its present organizational location, what earthly good does anyone think it would do now to uproot it and transfer it to another agency?

The plain fact is that it would cost an immense amount of money to make such a transfer, to accomplish practically nothing. Hundreds of people would have to move. Dozens of field establishments would be disrupted. God knows how many thousands of file cabinets of records would have to be loaded on trucks and dragged off to some other location. Whole accounting systems would have to be torn apart and put back together again. Individual veterans and builders would find themselves delayed for

months trying to find out where their applications had gone, and what office, if any was now working on them. And for what?

I would agree, and I suspect that the President might well agree, that if we were starting the veterans' housing program today, from scratch, it should be assigned to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or to the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. But that is not the situation. The mistake, if it was one, was made many years ago. Let us not talk seriously about compounding it now.

Now, what about the Federal Home Loan Bank Board? Why should it not be included in the new Department?

Well, let me say as one Member of this House that I think it probably should. And why then is it not? Because the Congress—this House—decreed otherwise. The Board and all its operations used to be a part of this very Agency that the President now proposes to reorganize as a Cabinet department. The Congress, by legislation, took it out of that Agency. The President did not recommend that. The Congress did it on its own initiative. Have we changed our minds? I know of no evidence that we have, and evidently the President knows of none.

So let us not play games about this. Let the reorganization plan go into effect. Then, if any of the carping critics be—I will not say sincere but rather serious about this—let him introduce a bill to transfer the Board to the new Department. Then we shall see where the votes are. In any case the executive branch contemplates no such proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not be diverted from the serious business of this reorganization plan by monkey-shines of this sort. The President of the United States has submitted, in accordance with law, an important change he wishes to make, which he believes will help him in his task as Chief Executive. The Congress should not deny him what he thinks he needs for light or frivolous reasons. In my judgment, there is every reason for the Congress to permit Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to go into effect.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I favor the President's reorganization plan.

Mr. Chairman, last June it was my pleasure to appear before the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, when the subcommittee was holding hearings on proposals to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I believed then, and I believe now, that the most efficient way to handle the problems confronting our large urban centers is through the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. For that reason I support the President's reorganization plan.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is further justified when one looks at the reasons for the creation of some of the existing departments. The Department of Labor, first organized as a

Bureau under the Interior Department in 1884, was created March 4, 1913. It was pointed out at that time that the "purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." Today there is another interest which must be protected—the interest of the urban dweller. Never before have the inhabitants of our cities been plagued with so many problems; never before have the solutions proved so difficult. A Department of Urban Affairs would be the boon to the urban dweller that the Department of Labor was to the wage earner.

The Department of Agriculture was created in 1862 and raised to Cabinet status in 1889. At the time of the creation of the Department, Congress stated that the general purpose of the Department would be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects concerned with agriculture. In a like manner the new Department of Urban Affairs will disseminate information to local units of Government in order to provide assistance in the solution of their difficulties. Another reason for the creation of the Department of Agriculture was to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants. Surely the Department of Urban Affairs will perform services for the urban dweller which are as important to him as the distribution of seeds was to the farmer.

The newest Cabinet-level Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will provide us with another example. When the reorganization plan was submitted to Congress on March 12, 1953, it was stated that:

The purpose of the plan is to improve the administration of the vital health, education, and security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens.

Functions of similar scope and magnitude in regard to our great cities are being carried on by numerous Federal agencies today. Just as it was vital in 1953 to elevate functions of health, education, and security to departmental status, so it is necessary today to elevate the functions of these other agencies to the Cabinet level in order that they be most efficiently administered.

As a final example, let us look at the Department of Commerce. In the middle of the 19th century there was much agitation for the establishment of a Department of Commerce in order that the rapidly increasing volume of capital invested in commerce and manufacture could be the subject of Government supervision. In 1900 it was noted that the same arguments advanced for the Department of Agriculture were applicable to one for the commercial and industrial life of the country; that the manufacturing interests in the United States exceeded in volume and in impor-

tance the industrial interests of any nation in the world, and yet there was no Government office specially charged with any duties relating directly to them, and in this respect the United States was almost alone among the nations of the world. Just as the Department of Commerce was created to aid and supervise the commercial interests of the Nation, so must a Department of Urban Affairs be organized in order that the resources of our cities be fully developed. A new department would enable the urban centers to provide the best lives for their inhabitants and contribute to the general welfare of the entire Nation.

One of the most vital problems that plagues our metropolitan areas is that of human relations. Never before have so many different races, religions, and nationalities been brought so close together. Unfortunately, this close proximity of so many divergent groups breeds friction and the cities are saddled with another problem. The proposed Department of Urban Affairs is in a position to help in this area. This plan calling for the establishment of the Department paves the way for a bill which will call for the establishment of a Federal Bureau of Intergroup Relations. This would be a great stride in fostering better relations among the many diversified peoples who make up our Nation. This is a problem which cannot be ignored; it must be attacked and the proposed Department can provide the means to help stamp out this problem.

The problems of the urban areas can be solved. The cities themselves have taken great strides in this path toward progress. But, there is a limit to the abilities and to the financial resources of the metropolitan areas. The solution lies not in the hands of the cities, not in the hands of uncoordinated Federal agencies, but rather in a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the crisis facing our cities demands the most efficient use of our national resources. Deterioration of irreplaceable urban values and destructive urban sprawl will destroy the valuable economic assets in our cities unless we take action now. The degree of blight, the lack of efficient planning and administration of renewal work, and multiplicity of urgent problems facing our cities necessitates a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing which can facilitate the organization of research, planning, and programs in the critical area of housing and urban affairs.

The tremendous urban expansion, particularly in the suburban regions of our metropolitan areas has put unprecedented financial pressures on our cities. Explosive growth in my own city of Philadelphia will by 1980 put twice as many cars on our already congested roads as there are today. Somehow, an efficient mass transit system will have to be achieved to prevent the ensuing traffic jam from stifling the central business

district which is an integral part of the economy of the Greater Philadelphia metropolitan area. Another \$3 billion or so will be needed to provide the next generation with other municipal facilities like the ones we now have. Nationally the bill for these vital municipal services has been estimated as high as \$80 billion, exclusive of highways. These are matters of national concern and require a specific Department of Urban Affairs.

Such a Department of Urban Affairs is equally imperative for smaller suburban communities. Many burgeoning suburban areas, which in Philadelphia amount to over a million and a half in Pennsylvania and another 725,000 across the Delaware River in New Jersey, are in an even worse predicament than the older core cities. Orderly transferral of some 600 square miles from farm uses to residential and industrial sites in the Philadelphia area will require overall planning for which there are no adequate facilities at present. In addition, hospitals, schools, sewage systems, and similar facilities will be needed to serve a new urban population which is expected to equal that of Philadelphia today. The expense of these facilities will press even harder on the slender tax base of the governmental units in these urban fringe areas than it would on the tax base of the bigger central cities.

One of the basic justifications for a unified Federal Department of Housing and Urban Affairs such as is proposed by the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 is the inability of local governments to finance the necessary urban redevelopment and provide the municipal facilities and services which are an essential part of urban life. Most cities are already allocating the maximum funds possible to renewal work, but what is currently being spent is not nearly enough to prevent the further spread of blight in urban areas. Nor can the States be counted upon to furnish all the financial resources that will be required to meet these growing demands. Only about four States now give any aid for urban renewal. Historically, the rural-dominated State legislatures have been notably unresponsive to urban problems. Moreover, the State's resources are limited and must be allocated among many pressing needs. The resultant dilemma of expanding needs and only limited financial resources makes this one of the major problems now facing us.

There has been a distressing lack of unified research, planning, and administration of urban-oriented programs on the Federal level. Urban renewal in Philadelphia and in many other cities has been slowed down by the fragmentation of Federal activity in this field. One of the biggest problems local redevelopment officials have to face is the confused Federal procedures and requirements, the papershifting from one Federal agency to another, and the general redtape in Washington. Outright conflicts can and have occurred between agencies administering the same program or between projects of different agencies. A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing which can better co-

ordinate these programs can eliminate this needless waste of time and resources.

We can no longer afford to ignore these and other critical urban problems. This is a national problem which must be faced squarely and soon. I therefore urge that the House promptly approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support the resolution. I oppose the reorganization plan. It is particularly unfortunate that for reasons beyond the control of the legislative branch of the Government that an extraneous issue, wholly unrelated to the merits of the reorganization plan, has been injected into the question before us today.

Like most Members of this body, the gentleman from Georgia has carefully studied H.R. 8429, the purpose of which was the same as the plan of reorganization. This careful study has indicated to me that not a single function of Government now being carried on by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and by the other agencies of Government whose functions would be incorporated into the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is not as efficiently and appropriately carried out under existing law, as would be the case if the plan should be approved.

I have neither heard nor read of any argument in favor of the plan of reorganization which has attempted to deny the accuracy and correctness of the foregoing statement.

When H.R. 8429 was reported out of the Committee on Government Operations it was in the regular legislative form by which this issue could have been brought up on the floor of the House. The Committee on Rules rejected H.R. 8429 and the House of Representatives will probably confirm the judgment of the Committee on Rules today.

On this particular plan of reorganization upon which the House of Representatives is to vote today, there is every indication that the vote will not be anywhere near close. There will probably be more than 100 votes difference. Even though there will be many votes against the resolution to reject, there will not be a great amount of enthusiasm for the plan of reorganization.

As stated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, sections 1 and 2 of the plan establish a new department, in the executive branch, the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, to be headed by a Secretary appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, and provide for an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel and an Administrative Assistant Secretary to perform duties prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 3 of the plan transfers to the Secretary the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and of the Public Housing Administration and its officers. It also transfers to the Department, as entities, the Federal Housing Administration, including the Office

of the Federal Housing Commissioner as the head thereof, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. The functions of the Federal Housing Administration are transferred to the Secretary and are to be carried out under his direction by the Federal Housing Commissioner. The Secretary would serve as Chairman of the Board of the Federal National Mortgage Association as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator now does. Statutory powers with respect to the programs of the Community Facilities Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration are now vested in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Administrator's functions would be transferred intact to the Secretary.

In other words, the plan provides for no new functions. In fact, the Reorganization Act does not permit the creation of any new functions.

Proponents of establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing from the President on down have argued that metropolitan areas have been growing and will continue to grow very rapidly, that they are beset with stupendous problems of shelter, transportation, recreational areas, crime—including juvenile delinquency—air and water pollution, open space, and so forth; that municipalities and States find themselves unable to cope with these problems and that, therefore, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing headed by a Secretary who is a member of the President's Cabinet, is urgently required.

This has led many columnists and commentators to foster the opinion, unfortunately too widely accepted by the unthinking part of the American public, that the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing under a Secretary of Cabinet rank as proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 1, will solve pressing metropolitan problems; that a vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vote for helping municipalities, and that a vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vote to injure metropolitan areas.

It is hard to imagine a more preposterous misrepresentation.

The proposed new reorganization would accomplish nothing.

Every power the new Secretary or his Department will possess is already possessed by and vested in a functioning organization, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its Administrator.

A multitude of Federal functions useful to metropolitan areas in meeting many of their problems will remain where they are now and in no way be affected by the reorganization plan. The Bureau of Public Roads administering the Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways through municipalities as well as city streets will stay right in the Department of Commerce where it is now.

Water pollution or sewage disposal programs will remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where they now are.

Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to

schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now.

These and other programs will in no way be affected by the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which at best, will have jurisdiction over only a minor fraction of Federal activities and funds aimed at assisting States and municipalities to solve metropolitan problems.

Only about one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities will be encompassed in the new Department. The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will continue in their autonomous status. They account for approximately 63 percent of the housing financing activities engaged in by, or under the auspices of, the Federal Government.

The creation of a department in the executive branch of Government should be one which is carefully considered by both Houses of Congress and should carry the wholehearted support of a majority of the House of Representatives and of the U.S. Senate. Any such new department, in order to function with the best wishes and closest cooperation of the Congress, should first have been created by a majority vote in each House of the legislative branch of the Government. In my opinion, an effort to create a new department in the executive branch in the face of the opposition of a majority of the Congress would, to say the least, be starting off a new department under very adverse conditions. The calendar of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives indicates that that great committee is very cautious in proceeding to create new departments. The record indicates that during the present and the 2 preceding Congresses more than 20 bills have been introduced to create new departments in the executive branch.

These bills would have created a Department of Mineral Resources, a Department of Public Information, a Department of Public Relations, a Department of Rural and Suburban Government, a Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs, a Department of Transportation and Communications, a Department of Urban Affairs, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, a Department of Urbiculture, a Department of Aeronautics and Space, a Department of Consumers, a Department of Peace, a Department of Science and Technology, a Department of Veterans' Affairs, a Department of Civil Defense, a Department of General Services, and a Department of Science.

The committee has acted favorably on only one of these.

Up until this time I have not seen any persuasive or convincing arguments presented which would indicate that there is any necessity for the creation of this new department at this time.

Until such time as there is both a demonstrated need and a justification for such a new department, I shall oppose the creation of such a department.

When a need is demonstrated and a justification presented I shall naturally reappraise my position; and if there is both a demonstrated need and a justification, then I would gladly lend my support to the creation of a new department to bear this same name or to be known by a slightly different name.

Under the situation which exists today in which no need has been demonstrated and no justification has been presented, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the resolution and therefore oppose plan of Reorganization No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished majority leader spoke a few moments ago and it seemed his feelings were hurt because this proposition is before the House today. He made some reference to the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] had not consulted with him. Well, I can say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] had not served notice he would call up this disapproving resolution, the gentleman from Iowa would have done so. And, I do not know whether I would have consulted with the leadership on either side of the aisle, because I do not find anything in the procedures that stipulates a Member must consult with the leadership in calling up matters of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from Oklahoma feels so badly because this legislation is on the floor of the House today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. May I say to my friend from Iowa that I am not feeling badly about this matter being up. I am not hurt because I was not consulted. I only commented upon the manner in which the Speaker was advised that this matter would be called up, and that it was not done in accordance with the general custom and procedures of the House. I admitted that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] was clearly within his rights. There is no question about that. It is just a question of the common practice of the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I have been quite intrigued with this rather peculiar situation that has arisen here today in connection with the consideration of this measure. I have the highest respect for the majority leader of the House and also for the majority leader of the Senate. Rather peculiarly, we heard some complaint made here today about the House considering this proposition this week. But on Monday and then yesterday the leadership—the majority leadership—in the Senate was doing everything within its power to force the resolution up so the Senate could consider it.

I do not believe the House ever should take second place to any other legislative body in the world.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, also pointed to the fact that the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations that considered this legislation handled it with great expedition. I am pleased to hear him say that because I picked up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning and I read in the RECORD the statement of one of the leading Democrats in the other body who said that the House had "stagnated" this legislation. I wish the Democrats would get together on whether it has been stagnated or handled with expedition. I want to expedite consideration and kill it as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy matter to appear here in support of a Department of Urban Affairs after the very cogent and eloquent exposition of the pros of the matter given by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and our great majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. But I nevertheless feel in a relaxed mood, because I have been informed that the Republicans are going to win this one, they are going to triumph overwhelmingly and knock out the plan; and all I can say is that the Republicans may have the votes, but I believe that we have got the arguments, and I would like to tell you why.

I think the argument is very simple, and it comes down to this. Two-thirds of the people of this great Nation, with their terrible urban problems of slums and urban redevelopment and traffic, of water supply and sewerage, of green spaces and parks, deserve a seat at the governmental table at the Cabinet level. This plan simply gives them that.

I have examined carefully the arguments made here this afternoon by my distinguished colleagues on the Republican side, and as I gather the Republican argument, it boils down to this.

The Urban Affairs Department plan, you say, does not do enough, and it does too much. You say it does not do enough in that it ought to have in it juvenile delinquency and highways and some other things; and then you say that it does too much, that it creates a great sprawling bureaucracy. But I do not see quite how you can have it both ways. In one and the same argument you seem to be saying that this plan sprawls too much, and that it does not sprawl enough. This is what you might call the reverse sprawl argument. I would hope, having read in the papers of some injuries recently suffered by people who have attempted "the twist," that no one practicing the reverse sprawl will suffer any dislocations.

But this is not really the main reason behind the Republican opposition. I think to get that, you should turn to the minority report itself, on page 45, and there you see it set forth. On that page

the minority Members, in discussing the various witnesses at the committee hearings said, putting it in their phrase:

Yet one of the stars on this (Democratic) team, the enterprising young Governor of the State of Indiana, argued for the reorganization plan and the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing on the basis—

Now hear this—

that it would lead to the solution of the malapportionment of seats in the Indiana Legislature by helping to build up public opinion against the Indiana Legislature and induce it to redistrict the State so as to give a greater voice in State councils to urban areas.

The Republican minority then goes on to express what they call a real fear that a Department of Urban Affairs might do what the Governor of Indiana said it would do, namely, focus people's minds on the problems of their cities and may induce the legislature to redistrict, under the principle of one person, one vote, and give the city folks the same rights as people in the towns and in the countryside.

In other words, the Republicans seem to be against the Department of Urban Affairs because it might lead to sane and sound legislative reapportionment.

The overrepresentation of rural areas in this country in the legislatures, and the underrepresentation of urban areas, has become the shame and the scandal of American State government. That is the main reason why so many of our cities are rotting with slums, tangled with traffic, and overburdened with debt and taxes, at the end of their rope, and turning to the Federal Government for help, because the State legislatures deny them fair representation and are insensitive to their problems.

That is the truth of the matter, that is what every student of American Government knows. But I have never heard anyone until today in the House actually favor malapportionment in the State legislatures.

Page 45 of the report contains the minority views on this matter, and is set forth in solid type. The moving finger of the Government Printing Office has written, and all the piety and tears we may hear in the future cannot wipe away a single line of it.

The moment of truth came to the minority when they set forth their views there. I have not studied the Government Operations Committee minority staff roster recently to find out whether there is a psychoanalyst on the staff, but old Dr. Sigmund Freud himself could not have done a better job in digging out from the minority the exact real reason for their views.

I will tell you what this country needs. This country needs in its State legislatures fairly apportioned districts so that the principle of one person—one vote, can govern, and city people and country people are treated alike. What this country needs is a Department of Urban Affairs, so that our Federal Government, honestly apportioned State governments, and vigorous city governments can combine to solve the crying problems of our cities.

If we do not win today, we will be back.

Now, I want to address myself to some important and, in my opinion, overlooked aspects of the argument in favor of the President's proposal in Reorganization Plan No. 1 to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The basic premise underlying the President's proposal is simple and obvious. We are now an urban Nation with well over two-thirds of our people living in urban and suburban areas. Moreover, nearly all of the great increase in population expected during the next several decades will take place in our urban and metropolitan areas. The multiplicity of problems that have resulted from this transition from a substantially rural to an urban Nation have in turn caused changes in the focus, in the emphasis, and in the organization of Government activities dealing with urban areas. This is the basic reason for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It would reorganize and improve upon the changes which have already taken place since 1947 when the present Housing and Home Finance Agency was established.

I would like to emphasize, however, that the urban problem is not merely a problem of the great cities or even of all cities. It is the problem of towns and villages, both large and small. It is the problem of suburbs and of the countryside in the path of urban growth. It is as much the concern of the communities which will be engulfed by the ever widening spread of urbanization in the course of the next 20 or 30 years as it is of our cities.

By the same token, we cannot deal over this problem through Federal action alone, through State action alone, or through local action alone. All are necessary. President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is based solidly on the position that the problem demands cooperative action by all levels of government. In submitting the plan to Congress, the President explicitly stated:

I propose to act now to strengthen and improve the machinery through which, in large part, the Federal Government must act to carry out its proper role of encouragement and assistance to State and local governments, of voluntary efforts and of private enterprise, in the solution of these problems.

I would place some stress on the President's use of the phrase "encouragement and assistance." These are key words in the President's message. This plan would not reduce by one iota the initiative or responsibility of the States and localities for undertaking action on the problems created by urbanization. Rather, the new Department would strengthen the present Federal efforts to encourage and assist the States and localities in doing this.

I wish to point out the steps that have already been taken under the existing programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which would constitute precedents for the new Department in its relationships with State and local governments.

The officials now administering the Housing and Home Finance Agency have

explicitly recognized the importance of the States in securing the objectives of the Agency's programs. Commissioner William Slayton, of the Urban Renewal Administration, noted, for example, in a recent speech that the States have an opportunity to take a much more active role in actually participating in urban planning and development than does the Federal Establishment.

The States have been a major factor in Federal aids for urban planning assistance. One of the basic prerequisites to sound urban development is good planning. In recognition of the serious inadequacies in urban planning, the Congress enacted in 1954 section 701 of the Housing Act to provide Federal grants to State and local governments to assist in planning in small cities and in metropolitan areas. Since that time, the program has been extended to include planning by States for their own activities. The administration of this urban planning assistance program is vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and would be transferred to the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

A salient feature of this program is its heavy reliance on action by the State. The results to date have been strikingly successful in terms of the planning programs initiated and planning agencies established. By the end of 1961, 47 States had set up agencies to do planning or assist localities in doing planning. Sixteen States now have statewide planning projects underway and almost 2,000 small communities are receiving planning assistance through their State governments. There are 134 metropolitan and regional areas with studies and progress, many of which involve heavy participation by the State. These planning projects are directed toward one or more of the dozen facets of planning in the modern community—the coordination of activities between local jurisdictions, transportation, and land-use studies aimed at developing an adequate system of highways, and studies aimed at programs to develop the economic potential of our communities or to provide better public transportation.

Grants for planning assistance for the small cities are aimed at those communities too small to warrant maintaining a permanent planning staff. The effect of the Federal program was to encourage the establishment of many new State planning agencies, as well as the revival of many State agencies long moribund. Not only have nearly 2,000 small cities been assisted by planning financed with such grants, but also the States are now providing needed technical assistance to these small communities in very substantial measure. We have produced at comparatively small cost not merely plans, but a growing interest in participation by State officials in assisting local planning. Some crucial problems of growth and development are being solved, and, in many of the affected towns, there is a real and growing awareness of the problems of development.

In the area of metropolitan planning, leadership by the State plays a particularly important role. The floodtide of

urban and suburban growth has spread over the countryside at about a million acres per year, bringing new subdivisions, schools, and facilities of all kinds to areas that just a short time back were farmland and woods. The urbanized area of greater New York, according to Prof. Robert C. Wood, now includes some 1,400 governments, and in most of our metropolitan areas the number of individual jurisdictions runs in the tens and hundreds. In these areas, there is an urgent and crucial need for metropolitan planning.

As Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver recently stated:

But what is the community with which metropolitan planning is concerned? It is all the people who rely upon a transportation system that laces together hundreds of residential neighborhoods and scores of work centers; it is all the people who make use of the beaches and parks; all who send their waste waters into a single drainage basin; all who live within a common sootfall district. For these arewide needs, autonomous planning and programing by dozens of local governments is bound to be wasteful or ineffectual. For such functions, metropolitan planning is most obviously required, and indeed is gaining increasing acceptance.

If regional and metropolitan planning is to be done, the State must act to authorize the establishment of metropolitan planning agencies or to undertake itself the role of coordinated planning.

It is a mark of some success that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has been able to provide assistance for planning in more than 100 metropolitan areas. I would like to mention two projects which emphasize the important place the State has in this process. In Los Angeles, the State of California, with Federal urban planning assistance, is sponsoring the important five-county Los Angeles regional transportation survey which is intended to provide a basis for the development of both highways and mass transportation in this rapidly expanding metropolitan area. The tristate transportation study of the greater New York area was initiated by the Governors of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, with the promise of Housing Agency assistance under its section 701 planning grant program. In both cases, arrangements were made for participation by the respective State highway departments with funds available from the Department of Commerce under the Federal Highway Act. The planning process itself will thus serve as a basis for coordination of two important Federal programs with planning in the States themselves.

Since 1959 grants have also been available to the States for statewide planning activities. This is a relatively new but particularly important area. The comprehensive State development plan can, as Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, has pointed out, "provide clear guidelines for future growth and develop and provide leadership to encourage more competent planning by local regional governments as well as by quasi-public and private agencies." Milwaukee's Mayor Henry W. Maier and County Executive John Doyna vigorously support these planning activities. I

might just mention, in this connection, the significance of such planning in the treatment of the open country that is in the path of future urbanization; in the preservation of agriculture, water, and other natural resources; and in coordinating the work in many individual local planning agencies. A start is already being made with projects underway in 16 States with Housing Agency assistance under the section 701 planning grant program. For example, Connecticut is undertaking a statewide land use inventory as well as a study of its economic structure and employment which will provide a sound basis for effective planning in the cities and towns of the State. Statewide transportation plans are being developed in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Wisconsin is undertaking a comprehensive approach to statewide planning including an economic analysis of the various regions within the State. The increasing assumption of State responsibility in this area is, in my opinion, one of the most encouraging signs on the scene today.

Much emphasis has been placed on the fact that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will give the cities a home in Washington. Little has been said about its potentially important role as a focus for Federal contact with the States on problems of urban development.

The new Department would help accelerate the present trend toward the establishment of comparable departments in the State government. The lack of an organizational unit in State governments responsible for problems of urban affairs and local governments has been a serious deficiency. Gradually, the States are establishing such units. Favorable action on the President's proposal will undoubtedly advance this movement in the States. I would like to note, in this connection, the great impact of the establishment of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads on the organization of State highway activities. The repercussions of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be no less favorable.

This Republic has survived and prospered for 174 years. This is due, in no small measure, to a form of government which has proved adaptable to the problems of change and growth in the Nation. New departments have been successfully created as new problems emerged. The organization of the executive branch has, within our lifetime, been adapted to fight, successfully, first, a great depression and then a great war. Now, in 1962, with the urban problem emerging as our most pressing domestic concern for the rest of this century, it behooves us to group and organize our resources in the most effective way. This demands, in my view, the early creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I will confess as a Representative from Indiana from the 11th District, a very urban area, I join in the amazement of most of the citizens of Indiana at the testi-

mony of our Governor before the committee. We read it and we frankly just could not believe it. It was most interesting to us because the Democrat mayor of Indianapolis is in stated opposition to this type of legislation and interestingly enough the mayor of Indianapolis appears to be the leading Democrat candidate for the senatorial nomination at the moment in the State of Indiana. He has made extensive speeches in his position as mayor of Indianapolis and prior to that as a city comptroller, about the dangers of centralization of authority in the Federal Government. He is campaigning on a program in the State of Indiana on the Democratic ticket in opposition to Federal aid to education and in opposition to all of the expansion of Federal bureaucracy. So when you are talking about taking a backward split or whatever it was—I am not up on these modern terms, either acrobatically or politically—I think we really have a situation here. The Governor of Indiana comes down and advocates support of this and the mayor of the largest city, and the capital city of Indiana, has clearly indicated he does not want the Federal Government interfering in city affairs. He said they have interfered too much already and one of the biggest problems the cities have is the encroachment of Federal bureaucracy. So I suggest the mayor of the big city of Indianapolis is closer to the problems of the largest urban area in the State than is our newly elected Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief, but there are two facts I think should be brought out rather clearly. All during this debate we have heard reference made that 70 percent of the people live in urban areas, and, therefore, we need a Department of Urban Affairs. It is interesting to know that the Census Bureau in official census of 1960 defines the number of people living in urban areas as only 32.9 percent, and if you take in the suburban areas as well as the urban, you still only get slightly over 50 percent. So somewhere, somehow, a new definition of what is urban and the people who are living there came in, and it must have been the original definition in the bill which said that anybody was living in an urban area if he were in any kind of community, incorporated or unincorporated. Obviously it would include everybody except a hermit.

The other point I want to make is the question of who is and who is not in favor of it. I happen to live in a suburban area next to an urban area. I have a telegram here in my hand from the mayor of the city of Denver, which I will read to you:

We object to creation of a Department of Urban Affairs as providing the wrong solution to a problem not clearly defined. Its creation would be only an appeasement move to apologize for failure of local people and local leaders to recognize and solve their own problems. It would build another level

of bureaucracy between the cities and Federal agencies now assigned responsibility for assisting them. May threaten programs already working well. Department of Urban Affairs would at best be only a temporary palliative. Overall problem definition should come first, then education of population to solve own problems with cooperation that is now available and is being extended effectively by existing agencies.

DICK BATTERTON,
Mayor, City of Denver.

Denver is a city of almost 500,000 people and with the suburban area surrounding it the population is well over 750,000. As you can see, the mayor of Denver is very strongly against this proposal.

I would suggest that the attitude of the big city areas has not been correctly set forth, and the report that 70 percent of the people live in official urban areas is also incorrect as proved by the Government census statement.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the only Republicans against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing are those from predominately rural areas. Judging from this, I must be an exception because my constituency is one of the least rural of any of my State's 21 districts outside New York City. My district is considered to be only 13 percent rural.

It has also been said that Republicans need not fear a loss at the polls next November because of adverse reaction from our Negro citizens, for the simple reason so few of us represent sizable Negro minorities. Again, I must be an exception for at least four cities in my district have very sizable Negro populations.

Under these circumstances perhaps I should follow the line of least resistance and favor a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. However, I was elected by my constituents to do more than merely support the so-called vote-getting issues; I was sent down here to use my personal judgment.

We hear anguished cries from big-city mayors to the effect that they need more representation at the Federal level because they do not get a "fair shake" in the State legislatures. This is curious in that Mr. Weaver himself, in a letter to me dated February 14, admitted that only 18.2 percent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency's allocations in calendar year 1961 were administered by State agencies. In other words, over 4 out of every 5 Federal housing and urban renewal dollars flow directly to urban areas, without any State intervention whatsoever. With respect to urban renewal and community facilities, the big-city mayor need not bother making a trip to his State legislature because over 80 percent of the funds he seeks are presently administered directly from Washington.

In this area, a sound working relationship between the Federal and State Governments has long since ceased to exist. Permit me to quote to you the words of President Kennedy's Solicitor

General before the Supreme Court in the Tennessee malapportionment case—Baker against Carr—when he said, and I quote:

Urban governments now tend to bypass the States and enter directly into cooperative arrangements with the National Government in such areas as housing, urban development, airports and defense community facilities. This multiplication of national-local relationships reinforces the debilitation of State governments by weakening the State's control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions.

Yes, gentlemen, this was said by a member of the present administration against a situation which would become even more chronic under the proposed new Department.

The theory is offered that added prestige resulting from Cabinet-level status would solve our urban problems. Any observer of the lessening policymaking role of the Cabinet would be perplexed by this, the most specious of arguments.

To those who feel our urban areas are underrepresented in the executive branch of our Government, can there be any doubt after the presidential election of 1960 as to the vast electoral power of our urban areas?

Gentlemen, the answer lies in better coordinating the urban programs that are presently scattered in a number of agencies and departments, not in creating what will someday be a superdepartment. The means to coordinate these activities are presently available to the President, if he will only look around and use them.

We have before us today a completely fabricated issue. The spectacle of Members of Congress being threatened, in effect, with reprisals at the polls if they vote their convictions is not an admirable one. The injection of racism into the debate has been sinisterly contrived with a direct political end in sight. Once again, as so often before, our Negro citizens are being used, and I shall go back to my district and do my best to tell them so.

Be that as it may, in good judgment, I have no choice but to stand in support of House Resolution 530 to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962.
Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOOLEY: In accordance with your request, we have made an analysis to show to what extent funds from programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituents go to or flow through State or county instrumentalities.

Of the Agency's programs, those for which such an analysis is most relevant are those of the Urban Renewal Administration and the Community Facilities Administration. There we find that of some \$4.4 billion of grants or loans approved through the end of last year, nearly \$1 billion or better than 21 percent went to or flowed through State or county bodies.

The Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance program and the Federal National Mortgage Association's secondary market and special assistance activities center around the home mortgage

market with the relationships primarily with borrowers, lenders, and investors. As far as the Public Housing Administration is concerned, the funds flow through local housing authorities which have been established under State enabling legislation. A large share of these housing authorities have a jurisdiction confined to a single locality. There are, however, some county housing authorities who administer public housing programs in various communities within

their area of responsibility, although the general nature of the relationship between the Public Housing Administration and the housing authority is essentially the same for both city and county authorities.

A table summarizing the data on funds approved for State instrumentalities is attached.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

HHFA funds approved to State instrumentalities, counties, and other bodies, Dec. 31, 1961

[Dollar amounts in millions.]

Program	Total	State and county			Other bodies	
		Total	State	County	Public ¹	Private
Total.....	\$4,360.6	\$930.5	\$795.4	\$135.1	\$2,590.0	\$840.1
Percent.....	100.0	21.3	18.2	3.1	59.4	19.3
Urban renewal, title I, grant reservations and contracts.....	\$2,500.0	\$125.0	\$3.0	\$122.0	\$2,375.0	0
Urban planning assistance, sec. 701, grant approvals.....	\$22.0	\$20.8	\$19.8	\$1.0	\$1.2	0
Community Facilities Administration:						
College housing loans, net approvals.....	\$1,590.1	\$761.6	\$758.4	\$3.2	\$25.5	\$803.0
Public facility loans, gross approvals.....	\$143.7	\$11.6	\$11.5	\$1.1	\$132.1	0
Advances for public works, gross approvals.....	\$67.7	\$11.5	\$2.7	\$8.8	\$56.2	0
Senior citizens housing loans, reservations approved.....	\$37.1	0	0	0	0	\$37.1

¹ Principally cities and townships, but also includes regional bodies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado raised a question concerning certain statistical figures which we used in the discussion here today. I would like to clarify the record at this point so there will not be any confusion or misunderstanding, especially since he challenged the integrity of the figures used by a committee.

I am quoting from a document called "U.S. Census of Population—1960, Summary," published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. On page 1-4, in table 3, Urban and Rural Population of the United States in 1960, in the last column—percent of urban to total—69.9 percent. Of rural to total—30 percent.

That is where the committee bases its statement that approximately 70 percent of the population of the United States is in urban areas, pursuant to the definition thereof contained on page 13 of the same document. This is the same definition as that used in taking the census of 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the arguments in opposition to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs which we have heard today would lead one to assume that the bill under consideration seeks to create for the first time new and costly relationships between the urban communities and the Federal Government. Of course, the contrary is true. A partnership has existed between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities for many years, not only in the field of housing and municipal affairs, but with respect to many other programs, as well. The point that the States are being deprived of their jurisdiction over municipalities is with-

out foundation. Municipalities are still and will always be creatures of the States and their powers are limited or augmented as the States wish them to be. Programs under which the Federal Government provides matching funds with those of States can come into existence only with the approval of the States and when municipalities apply directly to the Federal Government for assistance, they do so only because the State governments have previously consented. The new Department, therefore, is not a sweeping grant of Federal authority over municipalities nor a device to permit the municipalities to skirt or avoid State control.

This bill is urgently needed for two reasons—the first is the opportunity it would give for providing more efficient and economical operation of the existing agencies through centralization of responsibility in the Secretary of Urban Affairs. It has been pointed out that the Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have direct control over either the Federal Housing Administration or the Public Housing Administration. This bill would give the Secretary the power to coordinate the activities of such agencies with those already within his jurisdiction, such as the urban renewal and community facilities programs.

Second, the Department is needed to provide recognition at the Cabinet level of the problems of our urban communities, and I am referring to smaller urban communities as well as metropolitan ones. At the time our country was established, only 1 out of every 20 of its 4 million inhabitants was living in a city over 2,500 in population. Almost every decade thereafter found the rate of growth of urban population exceeding that of the rural population. When the Department of Agriculture was created in 1869, 7 out of 10 people lived in rural areas. Today the opposite is true. Seven out of 10 persons live in urban areas.

But the population explosion has not yet ended, and its impact upon urban communities has not yet ceased. It is predicted that within the next 20 years this country may expect an additional growth of 80 million population, and every city and hamlet in the country is going to be affected.

Should we not plan now for what must come in the future? Is not thinking ahead—making plans for what is going to be—an American quality? Do not our large business firms concern themselves with future operations?

Certainly the Government should do so, too. It is reasonable and proper that it should be a Department which has responsibility for planning for the future, not the loose federation of agencies which now exist.

May I refer your attention to the testimony of Harold F. Wise, chairman of the legislative committee of the American Institute of Planners, which appears on page 189 of the hearings. Specifically, may I invite your attention to testimony on page 90 which reads as follows:

I want to make this other final point. We would expect the proposed Department to continue to develop such progressive approaches and to continue, in fact, committed to programs and policies that have as their primary objectives the strengthening of local governments by aiding them in the accomplishment of programs that they cannot quite accomplish alone.

Expanding on this last thought we wish to make clear our position that urban problems must be dealt with at local levels, in municipalities, by counties within metropolitan areas, and through State programs, with the assistance, where necessary, of the Federal Government. We believe, however, that it is clear that the national level of government must provide basic leadership and resources in order to make it possible for local governments to do their jobs. We want to emphasize strongly that we feel that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will act to strengthen local government, will permit the cities and metropolitan areas of the Nation to do a better job than they otherwise could, and will not result in undue Federal interference in local affairs, in short, the concept involved here is that the Federal Government will provide the tools that localities can use in meeting their pressing problems of growth, development, and redevelopment, tools the localities can use in their own way.

We in the American Institute of Planners will continue to support legislation to increase appropriations and programs for much needed urban research, and will seek scholarship and grants-in-aid programs to make available larger numbers of professionally trained planners in this field. These are not at issue here. What the President has presented, too, is within his authority and responsibility, a proposed reorganization plan and increased efficiency to provide for better coordination and better administration.

What is at issue is the fact that in the next 40 years, we shall see 100 million more people in the United States. Most of these will live in suburban areas—on the fringes of what are today our large cities in houses that are not built today—using water and sewer lines, streets and schools, that are not yet built, either. Comprehensive planning, open space programs, soundly conceived mass transportation, public facility planning and financing and mortgage insurance are all tools necessary to be applied—tools necessary if our suburban areas are to be soundly conceived, and economic and social assets—

places where local taxes are equitable and healthy living opportunities are present.

As we see it, the action before you will not only give hope and strength to the cities of America but will help vastly in the job of creating the cities and the suburbs yet to be born.

Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Wise points out, this Department will help the States and the local communities in carrying out their responsibilities to their people, responsibilities which they cannot meet fully by themselves because urban problems are not local problems—they are national problems. Metropolitan areas overlap State, county, and municipal lines. States must deal with a sharply limited tax base and States' budgets have increased percentage-wise many times more than the Federal Government in the last decade.

Slums increase service costs upon a shrinking tax base, and the social cost in terms of traffic congestion, crowded housing, pollution, crime, and delinquency is enormous. And the very important point must be remembered that public investment provides the seed money for large-scale private investment.

This is not just a big city problem. It affects every community and as a matter of fact, over 90 percent of the loans made under the public facilities loan program have been made to communities of less than 5,000 population. The major part of the Federal Government's assistance in advances for public works planning, urban renewal planning, and public facilities loan programs go to communities of less than 50,000 population.

We can meet the challenge of the future by preparing for it now. This bill gives us the opportunity to create the framework for dealing with an ever-increasing, complex situation. It will permit a more efficient and economical method of operation for the partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and local communities. A Department of Urban Affairs should be established.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote some very outstanding and experienced authorities in support of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. In a memorandum to President Eisenhower on July 2, 1957, Nelson Rockefeller said, and I quote:

In recent years the problems of planning, building, and conserving our cities and metropolitan areas have become increasingly acute, and demands have multiplied, in and out of Congress, for the establishment of a new executive department to take the lead in those aspects of urban affairs. At the same time, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has come to be charged with programs which go far beyond the encouragement of housing and which involve the Agency in the general physical planning and development of communities.

The responsibility for assisting local governments through advances for the planning of public works and loans for the construction of public facilities was lodged in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Also added were such functions as making loans for college dormitories and related

facilities, administering grants to assist metropolitan area and general community planning, and providing flood insurance. Although the Home Loan Bank Board has been removed from the supervision of the Agency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency's housing finance functions have grown with the greater utilization of mortgage insurance, the acquisition of secondary market responsibilities, and the initiation of a voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Consequently, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has become a serious contender for departmental status.

In the course of administering its existing programs, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has developed close relationships with the officials of cities, towns, and other local authorities. Its staff understands the problems of the explosive metropolitan growth now taking place in this country and is helping in the solution of those problems with the tools now available. It is, therefore, already in important respects the Federal urban affairs agency.

There is more justification for a new department than merely the present size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the cost of the programs which it administers.

Departmental status would carry with it representation in the Cabinet, which has become increasingly important as a council for the consideration and resolution of important issues of national policy.

Mr. Rockefeller concludes his memorandum with an affirmative recommendation for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs through the submission of a Presidential reorganization plan. His conclusion and his reasons for that conclusion are sound. Although he is apparently of a somewhat different mind today, his well-reasoned statement should be carefully considered because it was made during the time he was adviser to President Eisenhower and concerned only with the merits of the subject.

Other well-known authorities also support the Department. One is Albert M. Cole, who is well known to this body. He served for a number of years on the Banking and Currency Committee. For some 6 years he was the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under the previous administration, and he served as Chairman of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs. In writing on a particular bill pending in this body to create a department, Mr. Cole said he did not approve that bill, but continued:

I should not want this to be interpreted, however, as reflecting a negative attitude on my part toward the whole broad question raised by those who have introduced this and similar proposals.

On the contrary, it is my view that we are approaching and may well have reached a point where serious thought ought to be given to the long-range advantages which might be gained by establishing a new Cabinet department to embrace the Government's major responsibilities, functions, and programs in the general area of housing and community development. * * * Certainly, too, great as has become the part played by those problems and the programs associated with them in our national economy and in the fabric of national and local government, the years ahead will see yet further increases in their scope, complexity, and importance to the American community.

Few agencies or departments of the Government exceed the Housing Agency in the

importance and magnitude of their functions, or in the proportion of our population importantly affected by them.

It seems to me equally clear that the problems and actions of this Agency are of major concern to those of virtually every executive department, and that to a large extent the converse is true.

It would seem desirable to provide at the Cabinet level for the full integration of the Government's housing and community development programs with the overall program of the administration, so that the policies and programs of the Federal establishment as they relate to housing and community affairs could more easily be worked out at the highest level and developed in the light of the views of the other departments which closely related vital interests.

Mr. Cole also says in the same letter:

I would not want to foreclose the alternative of accomplishing the desired result through a reorganization plan submitted by the President. I should think that the initiative looking toward establishment of a new department and the fitting of it into the structure of the executive branch and the Cabinet is a matter peculiarly within the province of the Chief Executive, to a degree even greater than more routine matters affecting the organization and management of the executive branch which in the modern practice are most often accomplished by reorganization plan. It has been the general theory of the reorganization acts, I believe, that in recognition of the President's responsibilities as Chief Executive he should be privileged to establish such organizational arrangements as may seem to him best for the discharge of those responsibilities, except to the extent that the Congress may deem it necessary to intervene in specific matters and vacate his proposed action in the manner provided by law.

Another Housing Administrator of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Norman Mason, testified on this same subject. His views are almost identical with Mr. Cole's views. They are expressed in the May 1960 hearings on housing legislation held during the 86th Congress before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

More recently, on March 2, 1961, the executive committee on ACTION, Inc., sent to the President of the United States and key leaders in the Congress the recommendations of its special committee formed to investigate and make recommendations concerning the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Government. That committee was headed by former Administrator Cole. The recommendations were as follows:

1. That the President give highest priority to housing and urban development, assuming strong personal responsibility for exercising the authority of his office in obtaining effective action by all departments and agencies affecting housing and urban development.
2. That Congress give the President authority to reorganize existing agencies in housing and urban development for more effective action.
3. To facilitate the above, that there be established a Cabinet post for housing and urban development.

Mr. Chairman, the statements I have quoted represent the thinking of leaders from both political parties who are experienced in Government. Those views were formed during the time they were

coping with practical problems of their official duties, and should be given great weight. I hope those views will be followed today, and that this body will vote down House Resolution 530.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of arguments here both for and against Reorganization Plan No. 1. As a member of the subcommittee which heard this bill considered originally, I want to say that I think most of what we have heard has been chaff on both sides of the aisle as to reasons for and against the bill, because this bill does not—and nobody will disagree with this—create a single, solitary new power in the Federal Government. All it does is to abolish four agencies and put them under one head.

In 1949 the first Hoover Commission made a report after studying the operations of almost all executive agencies. Among the reforms recommended in the report on the "General Management of the Executive Branch" was recommendation 14 which read:

Under the President, the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their department. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down to every step of the organization and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior.

In its recommendations on business enterprises and housing, the Hoover Commission stated:

We do, however, recommend that all housing activities be placed in one agency under a single administrator who should be given the type of authority which we have recommended for the heads of all agencies.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would go further toward meeting the recommendations of the Hoover Commission than any action that has ever been taken by the Congress or the President since that date. Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 had given the Housing and Home Finance Administrator only responsibility for the general supervision and coordination of the functions of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That plan had placed in the head of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration the functions of those agencies. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator was left without power to direct their activities.

The committee received ample evidence in the testimony of mayors of both large and small cities of the frustrations and delays which have resulted from the lack of centralized authority in the Agency. This is also attested to by the testimony of former officials of the Agency. More efficient operation of the urban renewal program would help local communities save money.

It has been estimated that approximately \$1,300,000 could be saved if each of the urban renewal projects under loan and grants as of December 31, 1961, could be expedited by only 1 month. Interest savings of \$2,600 could be achieved on the average outstanding loan of \$1,725,000 for every month that any one project is expedited. For larger

projects the savings and interest cost could reach over \$7,500 per month.

It is clear that language in the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriations Act which was designed to restate the supervisory and coordinating authority of the HHFA Administrator has not been effective in securing cohesive direction in control of the Agency. Local government officials still must travel around among the subagencies seeking decisions and doing their own coordinating. This is undoubtedly the result of the independent authority now resting by law in the subagency heads.

The reform so badly needed in order to improve efficiency and economy of the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and to relieve the costly frustrations and delays of the local government agencies dealing with it cannot be accomplished without some change in the existing law whether it be brought about by reorganization plan or statute. We have the plan before us. It is an effective measure to secure increased efficiency and better direction of the Agency and there is no good reason for rejecting it.

Legislation similar to that of the present Reorganization Act has been on the books since the early 1930's. A multitude of useful governmental reorganizations have been put into effect through the reorganization plans. The first Hoover Commission recognized the usefulness and, in fact, the absolute necessity of a reorganization power in the President if the executive branch is to be effectively organized. In a letter of January 13, 1949, addressed to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the first Hoover Commission stated:

Some of the recommendations contained in the volumes of our report, which we plan to file from time to time between now and the expiration of the life of the Commission, can be put into effect only by legislation. Others can be accomplished by Executive action. But many of the most important can probably be accomplished only if the Congress reenacts and broadens the power to initiate reorganization plans which it had previously granted to the President under an act which expired on March 31, 1948.

The Commission recommends that such authority should be given to the President and that the powers of the President to prepare and transmit plans of reorganization to the Congress should not be restricted by limitations or exemptions. Once the limiting and exempting process is begun it will end the possibility of achieving really substantial results.

In his message of April 1, 1957, to the Congress President Eisenhower vigorously advocated an extension of the reorganization act. He pointed out:

In December 1954 the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government unanimously recommended further extension of the act.

Thus the First and Second Hoover Commissions, several Presidents, and numerous Congresses have recognized the simple fact that action through reorganization plans is necessary to accomplish effective reorganization in the executive branch. Certainly the history of the recent proposal for a Department

of Urban Affairs and Housing substantiates this conclusion. We in Congress have ourselves acknowledged that reorganization proposals would become involved in interminable delays and complications in the normal legislative processes. For this reason, we adopted the procedure of delegating reorganization power to the President, subject to congressional review. The validity of this approach was affirmed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Sibbach v. Wilson & Co.* (312 U.S. 1).

Certainly our experience with the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has again proven the wisdom of Congress in providing the President with the reorganization plan tool for securing the most effective organization of his branch of the Government.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 530, which provides for disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

In the light of the intensive examination this idea has received over the months and particularly in recent weeks when President Kennedy proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, it is challenging to attempt to shed illumination which is worthy of consideration by this honorable body. I am doubtful that I can meet the challenge. Nevertheless, I should like to present for your deliberation some views I consider worthy of thought.

We are all aware of the arguments pro and con—these have been covered thoroughly by speakers preceding me, by witnesses appearing before the Committee on Government Operations, by written statements directed to the committee, the press editorials throughout the country, and discussions in public and cloakroom debates. After considering all carefully, I am impelled to conclude that the arguments pro outweigh the arguments con.

Approximately 70 percent of our people are now urban dwellers. Soon up to 80 percent of our people will live in cities so that one cannot sensibly say that the proposal is one which discriminates against vast segments of the country and is not one of permanence. Admittedly, the proposed Cabinet post does not concern itself with many of the problems which now plague areas of high population density; however, having a Cabinet department which, by definition, will concern itself with the problems of urban affairs at the Cabinet level, will reach far toward making the Nation aware of these diverse, complex, and seemingly hopeless dilemmas and contribute toward their solution. I am aware of the strong support which those who argue that these problems are matters for the States and local units of government to cope with have in all areas of the country.

My point is that with the advent of an urban civilization in this country and the daily expanding mobility possessed by all of our people through our modern highways and cheaper and faster air travel, primarily, no one State or municipality can assume the position that

they can provide adequately for their people in terms of housing and urban renewal. Colonel Glenn's achievement yesterday certainly did not lessen this mobility. Many of our urban areas spill across State lines; for example, New York-New Jersey, Chicago-Indiana, the Kansas Citys, and there are many more and more to come. There is no assurance that a program commenced on a sound premise will not find itself almost totally ineffectual within a relatively short time because of mass migration either to or from the areas to which attention is given. I do not believe we have reached the position that we will restrict or eliminate interstate travel or migration from one State to another. We are the United States—we are 1 country—we are not 50 countries.

This mobility of our population has altered the traditional concept of Federal and State relations. It has drastically diminished the ability of State and local governments to cope with many problems which were once intrastate but now, because of changed conditions, concern the entire country. The housing and welfare problems of Detroit can quickly and easily become the housing and welfare problems of Los Angeles or Milwaukee or St. Louis or Minot or Macon. Only through Federal action can effective, coordinated effort be achieved. A Cabinet officer would be obliged to guard the interests of 70 percent of our citizens.

To effectively deal with the multiplying problems of urban living, a Cabinet post of Urban Affairs and Housing is mandatory.

I urge the defeat of House Resolution 520.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I urge all the Members of this House to support the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and defeat House Resolution 530.

As my colleagues know, this is not the first time I have spoken for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. Last session I introduced H.R. 6065 which would have accomplished virtually the same purpose. On June 22, 1961, I appeared before the Senate Government Operations Committee in favor of the creation of such a new department. In the House I testified before the House Government Operations Committee twice. Once last session and again this month. I believe that a vast majority of the American people were greatly disappointed by the failure of the Rules Committee to report out a bill to be considered on its merits. The President has acted wisely, in my opinion, by submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1.

The proposed executive department is of such major importance that I am compelled once again to add my voice to the fight to make it a reality. One of the gravest domestic problems faced by the Nation today is the crisis in housing and the obsolescence, deterioration and congestion which pervade so many of the urban areas. If we are to develop

long-range solutions for these conditions, we will need a concerted attack at all levels of Government and coordination of the array of existing Federal aid programs. The establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will make it clear that we are embarking upon a coordinated program committed to the eventual solution of the complex of metropolitan problems. Housing, urban renewal, mass transit are not local or State issues. They are national in scope.

To me, as to many others, the need has long been evident for a department primarily concerned with urban planning and metropolitanwide problems to cope more effectively with the increasingly complex and difficult problems of our cities. The rapid growth which has occurred in our urban areas since the turn of the century has transformed the United States from a predominantly agrarian society to an urban civilization. Two-thirds or more of the American people now live in urban regions which have spilled across city, county, and State lines. It has been predicted that by 1970, 25 million of our 30 million new citizens will settle in cities and suburban areas. Our cities are the centers of industry, commerce, education, and culture, containing more than 75 percent of our wealth and productive capacity and providing a major share of the economic base from which both Federal and State taxes are drawn. The population in our 10 largest metropolitan areas pays over \$13 billion in taxes, 35 percent of the total amount of individual income taxes. These basic sociological, economic, and technological changes have made the fate of the Nation dependent in large measure on that of our cities.

The movement of masses of people from the farms to the city in increasing numbers has caused numerous urgent problems to accumulate in urban areas throughout the United States. Many of these problems have grown in geometric proportion to urban populations. Housing in many of our cities is shockingly inadequate. Urban blight is widespread. A distressing number of commercial and industrial facilities in downtown locations are deteriorating. The problems caused by residential and commercial slums have begun a vicious cycle of erosion which threatens the economic survival and fiscal solvency of our cities.

Other physical problems are challenging urban areas. For example, a paralyzing concentration of passenger cars, trucks, buses, and other common carriers is creating traffic congestion which will stifle the downtown business centers of our cities unless we can find a solution in time. By 1970 the number of automobiles in the United States is expected to increase by 40 percent. Already traffic congestion is estimated to cost some \$5 billion a year. Air pollution, water pollution, the disposal of unbelievable quantities of trash and sewage also call for immediate attention.

The need for a Department of Urban Affairs should be apparent to anyone who has had any experience with urban problems. It was once apparent to Nelson A. Rockefeller, who in a memoran-

dum dated July 2, 1957, stated to President Eisenhower:

It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent * * * the institution of the urban renewal program logically requires that the HHFA be superseded by such an executive department.

He recommended a reorganization plan to create such a department and concluded:

The reorganization plan should be prepared in time to permit its transmittal to the Congress early in 1958.

The problems have not changed, and indeed the need for a Cabinet-level department to deal with city problems has "rapidly become more urgent." Governor Rockefeller's views, however, have changed. With political winds blowing from Iowa, we might speculate on the reason for this about-face, but it is not our task today to make an interesting study in political litmus paper.

In addition to fixing executive responsibility in the Secretary of the Department, the proposal before us will give our urban population a voice in the President's Cabinet which means representation for those who are underrepresented in the State legislatures and in Congress. State legislatures dominated as they are by rural interests consistently fail to provide adequate authority and appropriations to the cities. New York is a classic example. This neglect through malapportionment is a crucial element in the urban problem. In the House of Representatives, according to a study published in the Congressional Quarterly on February 2, 1962, rural districts control 62.8 percent of the seats in the House although they account for only 56.2 percent of the national population. The city and suburban voter, so notoriously underrepresented, should have a spokesman on an equal footing with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Recognizing this need, the 1960 Democratic Party platform declared:

We will give the city dweller a voice at the Cabinet table by bringing together within a single department programs concerned with urban and metropolitan problems.

It is now 1962. Let us redeem this pledge of 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked about the need for this plan to bring the constituent agencies of the HHFA under the direct supervision of an executive department in order to coordinate present programs dealing with urban problems and the need for an urban spokesman in the Cabinet. I fail to understand the reasoning of the opponents of the plan. The opposition generally adopts two avenues of attack.

The first suggests that the creation of the Department would result in a vast and powerful bureaucracy with increased functions and sums at its disposal.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1949 no new function can be created by this plan. That is the responsibility of Congress and will depend upon future action. Last year we initiated programs for the preservation of open space and for assistance to mass transit. We saw the

need and responded. The existence of a new department will not persuade Congress to enact larger programs, but it will assure us that our programs are more effectively and economically carried out.

The second avenue of attack suggests that the new Department would invade States rights. The specter has even been raised of the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing supplanting the elected mayors and city councilmen in several hundred cities.

This plan does not affect or change the relationship between the cities, States, and Federal Government. The extent of home rule is a matter between State and city. Cities exercise whatever power the States grant and participate in Federal urban renewal and housing programs through express authorization.

Since the inception of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs the HHFA has worked directly with the cities. With notable exceptions, such as New York State, the States have not assumed responsibility in the field of housing. In fact, the mayors of our cities are accustomed to dealing directly with the appropriate Federal agencies.

When Mayor P. R. Olgiate of Chattanooga testified before the House Committee on Government Operations on February 6, 1962, he effectively answered those who will raise the cry of States rights. He said at pages 54-55:

I mean we hear a lot of talk over this country about States rights and home rights, and I believe in some local rights. Local rights is where the people live. We do not live in the capital of Nashville or the Capital of Washington. We live back home, and that is where we have the problems, back home where we are trying to raise and educate our children and create jobs and houses and facilities for them.

I think this demonstrates that local officials are not overly concerned with an invasion of States rights or home rule.

I should like to point out, however, that I should think Congress would insist that cities be strictly supervised in their planning and execution of urban renewal projects. For instance, I have fought on the floor of this House for legislation prohibiting the use of Federal funds under title I of the Housing Act for the construction of luxury housing and for legislation requiring humane and proper relocation practices by local bodies.

In any event, this plan has no effect at all on the relationship between the States and the Federal Government.

President Kennedy's announcement that he intends to appoint Robert Weaver as the first Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing was good news in New York. I am particularly proud that Dr. Weaver comes from the West Side of Manhattan which I have the honor to represent. We know him as a neighbor and a distinguished public servant who has served his city, State, and Nation with distinction. Not only is he eminently qualified to head the new Department, but he is the logical choice. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not forget that President Eisenhower announced that he would

appoint Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before that plan became effective.

In closing, let me again urge approval of the plan. As Democrats, let us carry out our platform. As Republicans and Democrats let us give the city resident a voice at the Cabinet table.

The urban centers are here to stay. They will continue to be the centers of commerce, industry, education, and the many other pursuits of progressive citizens. The Nation's economic growth and social progress depend upon their efficient functioning. Rehabilitation and economic development of the urban areas is not a local problem; it is a national problem which must be solved within a national framework.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962—to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs.

It is regrettable that the debate and the decision on this question should hinge on factors unrelated to the central question.

The issue before this House is not the person who the President has designated to fill this important post. It will be for the other body to study his qualifications and determine whether or not he should be confirmed. On this point, I must say, however, that the President's designee appears to be eminently qualified. As one who has carefully studied the work of the Housing and Home Finance Agency over the past 7 years, I must say that I have never seen the administration of the agency in more skilled hands. Dr. Robert Weaver gives every indication of performing up to the expectations which were indicated by his splendid background and preparation for the post.

I would like to make another observation. Last autumn, during the White House Conference in Cleveland, Dr. Weaver gave one of the most stirring discussions of his hopes and aspirations for the American city of the future. Everyone who participated in the Conference was "fired" with the will to make the life of the city better. Dr. Weaver's prescription and plans for city life and its betterment were the vitamins we needed to press forward with our plans and hopes for a revitalized city.

The issue before us is not the cost of urban improvement programs. The outlays of Federal funds for urban renewal, mass rapid transit, housing, and community facilities must be passed upon by this Congress. What Federal funds must be spent, must be spent. It is not the purpose of this reorganization bill to spend more—it is designed to more responsibly orient the administration of law so that what is spent is better spent.

In my city—throughout the Nation—our cities are going through a redesign and redevelopment which will establish patterns of life in cities for at least the rest of this century and beyond. The redevelopment now taking place is designed well beyond the life of the mort-

gages and the mortgage insurance which makes them possible. The new concepts of city planning under urban renewal will live long beyond even the new structures. There is reason to believe that these new plans will look good to the next several succeeding generations—yes, Mr. Chairman, they should look provident and wise in the next century. Those who so violently criticize urban renewal must close their eyes to its real purpose—to plan in urban betterment for every comprehensible future need.

The urban renewal program underway in the city of Cleveland constitutes the one bright hope of successful urban life in our community. My city's relationships with the agencies in the Housing and Home Finance Agency transcend all other interests. We have absolutely no business relationship as a city with the Department of the Interior and practically no business relationship with the Department of Agriculture. And yet we recognize the essential need of these departmental organizations to serve the national good.

Ohio, like most other States, still lives under the influence of a rural dominated legislature. Each county, regardless of population, is entitled to one representative. In the lower house of the Ohio Assembly, the so-called cornstalk brigade of the rural counties has successfully imposed its will on the State affairs. The inequity of this representation is quite obvious. Fifty-five percent of the State's population residing in 8 counties of the State have 54 State representatives, while 45 percent of the State's population in all of the other counties of the State have 85 representatives. Obviously, the population of the highly urbanized counties is disenfranchised by the disproportionate representation of rural communities.

Time and time again, our cities have unsuccessfully appealed to State legislature for authority to establish metropolitan government or for authority to make urban development more feasible. The constant rebuff by the so-called cornstalk brigade in the State legislature has forced my city to abandon hope of any substantial State assistance in its rehabilitation efforts. The hopelessness of State action has driven my community to look to the Federal Government for understanding in the complex urban problems of today.

The establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level will help considerably to offset the disproportionate representation of cities in the State assembly. Cabinet-level status for this phase of public administration will stimulate the State legislatures to better consider the urban needs of city populations which are not provided adequate representation under existing State constitutions, laws, or customs. The States should be primarily concerned with the special problems of urban life. The new Department will prove to be the instrumentality which will assist the States in carrying out their long neglected obligations to the city.

The only other relief for urban dwellers is to press for constitutional reforms in the several States which will result in

proper representation in the State assemblies. The other alternative may be court action to suspend the discrimination against the city dweller.

These alternatives do not present pleasant prospects. They would tend to be divisive and set urban residents against rural resident—a struggle which the rural resident must eventually lose. This is not the time to invoke conflict between the city and the farm—both have problems which are national in their scope—totally American. These are problems which can most effectively and harmoniously be resolved in this Congress by the approval of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support Reorganization Plan No. 1 sent to us by the President of the United States. I am a resident of the city of New York. I am old fashioned enough to believe that this country is one country. When John Glenn orbited the world three times yesterday, it thrilled the cliffdweller and farmer alike. I believe that the urban dweller and the farm person are brothers and that they have problems which can be solved mutually, but I am realistic enough to know that on occasions, we must have a spokesman with status who can present the viewpoints of the respective groups. In the past many of you know that many city and urban dwellers and suburbanites were disenchanted with the farm program, and in their anger they have tried to defeat some of the farm programs which are costly to the taxpayer, but beneficial to the farmer and to the consumer. I have espoused the cause of the farm program because I believe that our interests intertwine and they dovetail. Just as I believe that the farmers have need for a spokesman on a Cabinet level in the form of a Secretary of Agriculture, so do I believe that the cities and the urban dweller have need for a spokesman on a Cabinet level. Consequently, I support Reorganization Plan No. 1.

When the Department of Agriculture was created in 1862, our population consisted mainly of farm residents. Eighty percent of the people of the United States at that time were engaged in farming or living on farms, and the other 20 percent lived in urban areas. Today, 70 percent of the people of the United States, or 130 million, live in cities or in suburban areas. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee of Agriculture, I have seen the effectiveness of an agency guided by a Secretary of Agriculture. Without a Secretary of Agriculture, the myriad and intricate problems of agriculture would be unresolved and our Nation of 184 million could not be fed by a segment of our population which constitutes less than 10 percent working their farms.

The Secretary of Agriculture supervises activities which many would regard as not relating to farming, but on closer analysis would conclude that there is a relationship between the farm and the activities to which the Secretary of Agriculture gives sense and direction.

The major objective of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of

Agriculture is the supervision of the production of food and fiber with the management of its supply. The Agriculture Department deals with research, not only in food but also in the basic sciences which bring about new products, improved quality of the food supply, and variations in the type of food we eat and the clothing we wear.

The Department has jurisdiction over the inspection of meat and poultry. It supervises the conservation of soil and the prevention of floods. It manages a special school milk program and a school lunch program which affects the lives of 13 million of our schoolchildren and aids the pocketbook of families which perhaps could not afford a decent meal for their children.

The Department administers a program of housing for the farmer, a housing program for the farmer under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, not only in the improvement of present housing but in the construction of new shelter.

When crops fail, a program of crop insurance is administered by the Agriculture Department. The rural people find available to them through their cooperatives, electrification of their homes and farms and communication in a Rural Electrification Administration telephone system.

The food supply which the farmers produce in abundance requires the storage of wheat, corn, feed grains, and cotton which the Department supervises and administers. In far-off lands when people are hungry, and, yes, also in our own country, programs to combat famine and to furnish food to those suffering poverty are administered by the Agriculture Department. Without sense and guidance, the farm program in these United States would be chaotic and could not possibly be administered to feed the people of the country or many of the nations throughout the world.

Just as the Secretary of Agriculture in a Cabinet position has given sense and guidance to the myriad problems of agriculture, so will a Secretary of Urban Affairs give sense and direction to the manifold problems of urban affairs.

Since 1949 urban development has been a program which Congress has said was necessary and essential for a better standard of living and for the improvement of urban conditions. Apart from the improvement in housing, the problems of cities are complicated and difficult of solution. Three-fourths of our national population, or approximately 130 million, live in the cities. Over 130 cities have populations of more than 100,000 residents. The experience of other areas and the effectiveness of a Secretary of Cabinet status demonstrate that cities should be represented in the Cabinet with a Secretary of Urban Affairs.

Under the present condition, a mayor of a city cannot go to one agency to obtain information or to process any application. If he is interested in urban renewal, he must first go to the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Urban Renewal Administration Office where he discusses his overall plans. Having pre-

pared a workable program in compliance with the urban renewal regulations, he must then contact the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration; the Sanitary Engineering Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce; the Veterans' Administration; the U.S. Corps of Engineers in the Defense Department and the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization in the Executive Office of the White House. In addition, he must check into several other agencies.

It is our hope that if all the sources of all information are available in one agency that the difficult process of collating information and processing a plan can be brought together without loss of time, energies or courage.

A Cabinet position for cities is not only justified by need but also by urban contributions. Metropolitan areas produce most of our wealth exclusive of food and fiber. They produce enough to enable most communities to build a floor under misery, to provide leisure for the workingman, and to support institutions to advance our way of life called civilization. The manufacturing of clothing, the production of chemicals, the forging of steel ingots, the manufacturing of appliances and farm equipment, the processing of foods and textiles are performed in metropolitan areas. Those who work in cities require decent shelter, pure water and air, effective mass and private transportation, educational facilities, recreational outlets such as theater, television, radio, press and parks, places of worship such as churches and synagogues.

In the furtherance of the attainment of these requirements the "cliffdwellers" need protection at work, on the way home, or at home. These measures consist of housing regulations, factory rules, police supervision and fire protection; correctional institutions, hospital care and preventives of juvenile crime must also be considered. All of these activities must have a sense of direction and guidance. They can find such direction through a Secretary of Urban Affairs, and we, as responsible legislators, must make provision to create a department which will give that advice to do the job.

Cities today face many difficulties. They are the creatures of the State. They have limitations. Financial limitations hamper solutions. Diversified agencies hinder the attainment of goals. Unplanned and sprawling growth require urban renewal and revision to provide better living quarters and functional construction. Proper planning in the form of urban renewal requires direction and commonsense to eliminate the bottlenecks which retard proper growth and which will maximize space for healthy and safe living conditions.

A hue and cry has been raised because our President has suggested the appointment of Robert Weaver as the first Secretary of Urban Affairs. I have known Mr. Weaver for many years, and I am familiar with the work that he has performed in the field of housing, which

is an important factor in any urban program. Mr. Weaver is preeminently fitted by experience and character to hold the position as Secretary of the proposed agency.

In the interest of our country and in the interest of human relations, I urge this committee to approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 submitted by the President of the United States.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, two issues are projected where only one is presented by the President: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which recommends the establishment of a new Department of Urban Affairs. The mention of Dr. Robert C. Weaver is not a part of the President's proposal to this body.

As to the merits of the bill, providing for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, there has been steadily mounting sentiment in its favor in recent years. All research indicates that the compelling demand for this measure is based on a rapid national expansion in housing and suburban development, population growth and mobility, pressing need for solutions to the baffling problems of urban mass transportation, the urgent necessity for the conservation, stabilization and rehabilitation of neighborhoods, and other factors already covered by filed reports.

The Members know that there was special attention and serious thought given to these problems by leaders of the Eisenhower administration. As early as July 2, 1957, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Chairman of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, wrote the President that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that need will rapidly become more urgent.

Consequently, President Kennedy's proposal submitted to this session strikes me as a mere restatement of a vital need in the area of urban affairs left over from the previous administration. I am convinced every Member of this House will agree that there is a problem in urban affairs becoming more complex and acute as the days go by. In the following excerpt from the President's message to the Congress there is hardly anything to quibble over. In fact, the only difference between the Eisenhower and Kennedy proposals is a very thin hair that only the seventh son of a seventh son could detect.

In a few short decades—

The President noted—

we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. * * * The present and future problems of our cities—

He continued—

are as complex as they are manifold. There must be expansion—

He maintains—

but orderly and planned expansion not explosion and sprawl.

Here, however, it may be said that President Kennedy takes the problem one step further requesting congress-

sional approval for a measure designed to bring together in one governmental agency the numerous different programs affecting the lives and welfare of families in our cities and their surrounding areas—programs covering a wide range of diverse but closely interrelated activities all presently impinging in one degree or another on each other.

None—

The President insists—
can or should stand by itself.

Further he added—

The basic purpose of this plan is to establish a department which will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of all of them.

The issue before us then is simply to vote the request for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing up or down on the basis of its merit. Of course, there are those who will argue that the authority to accomplish the objectives desired by the President has already been vested by law in existing agencies of the Government. I, Mr. Chairman, am opposed to this view. I further assert that even if the authority does exist in widely divergent agencies, the lack of planned coordination has created the present confusion and made essential support of the proposal under discussion.

Turning now to the second matter, the race issue, which has been so intemperately and unfortunately injected into the debate, I wish the RECORD to clearly show that among those who here raise the issue of race are some of the voices most vehement in denial of racial prejudice when the representatives of other nations in the past pointed an accusing finger at this country. Mr. Chairman, I further assert that those who accuse the President of injecting the race issue into the urban affairs proposal are refuting positive assertions made on numerous occasions by responsible people in our Government, past and present, to people all over the world that there is no official prejudice of race, creed, or color among us. Moreover, through such tactics they negate the efforts of others by making it possible for the world to read that because a competent, efficient, and dedicated public servant is a Negro citizen of the United States then vital and needed legislation is jeopardized.

Mr. Chairman, I would voice a solemn warning that there are prospective allies of the nonwhite world who remain yet unconvinced by our protestations of belief in freedom and equality and seriously question our intent and motives in spite of oft-repeated declaration by responsible diplomats in their intellectual, social, and diplomatic intercourse with them.

Let there then be no further disfiguration of democracy's image. Let those who accused the President of injecting the racial issue realize that they are toying with the very survival of our Nation. Let the test of what we are be what we do. Let us then close ranks and give unqualified support to the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet rank.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Certainly those who have said that this plan is a "sham," as well as those who would have the States, cities, and towns of this country go it alone, are either completely ignorant of the problems of the 75 percent of the people of this country who live in urban communities and have been unable to cope with the problems which a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would assist them in mastering, or, more probably, they are desperately trying to avoid the consequences of a partisan negative vote against the best interests of the urban dweller.

The Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., brought this whole matter into focus when it said editorially on January 26, 1962, that:

If Congress blocks the new Department, the President has a readymade issue for next fall's elections. Republicans teamed with southern Democrats to halt the bill in the Rules Committee. If Republicans and southern Democrats again team up to block the Executive decree, the Republicans will be thrown up to Negroes in urban areas as being against the Negro. The issue is raised because the man who will fill the Cabinet post is Robert C. Weaver, a Negro.

Does the Federal Government need a Department of Urban Affairs? In the sense that creation of such a department would be recognition of the overwhelming importance of our cities, the answer is "Yes." There are large numbers of Federal programs where aid is given to cities that need such a coordinating agency. However, we're under no illusions that the number of agencies involved in urban affairs will decrease; that rarely happens in government.

But the creation of the Department should serve notice to the cities that they'd better be about setting their own houses in order if they want to avoid having excess Federal interference in their affairs. The example of what has happened in agriculture should be ample warning.

The Department, certainly, is needed. But so is more effort back home in the cities, both in getting their own affairs in order and in working together for their common good.

At a meeting sponsored by the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Delaware metropolitan project on June 19, 1958, Dr. John A. Perkins, president of the University of Delaware referred to the magnitude of some of our urban problems and of the significant resources already existing in the fine institutions of higher learning and in the many civic and research groups of the region.

Dr. Perkins made a statement in his speech which I believe should be adopted by President Kennedy as the motto for his great plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Dr. Perkins said that:

The capacity of the great urban areas of America to meet the challenge of rapid growth and expansion will materially influence the future of America. In the international ideological contest, that capacity, or lack of it, may well influence the outcome of the worldwide struggle.

In 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6538, to provide for the establishment of such a new Federal department; and on June 7, 1961, I submitted testimony in support

of my bill and similar legislation which was in accord with certain recommendations submitted by President Kennedy in his special message on housing.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would, in the long run, save the taxpayers a great deal of money. Such a new department would not, as its opponents declare, provide a bottomless till into which everyone could reach at the expense of the suffering taxpayer. Under present arrangements duplications are unavoidable and costly. Coordination of these programs would achieve greater effectiveness in the use of our existing urban renewal and housing programs and, at the same time, save money.

Today our major cities are decaying at the core. They are faced with heavy burdens in many areas, and as their problems have increased their tax base has narrowed. People have moved to the suburbs, but continue to work in the cities and they require and demand just as many services as before without, in many cases, paying for them.

So the problems that face the cities today, in addition to the narrowed tax base, range from juvenile delinquency to health, sanitation, water, sewerage, and outmoded transit systems.

Our cities have not always been cesspools of crime and delinquency. They can become again, as they have been in the past, places where children can develop properly, not as delinquents but as law-abiding and law-respecting citizens, demanding no more for themselves than they would demand for others.

This will strengthen our country and make it safer in the future.

Nor is this a bill for the big cities at the expense of the small towns in our rural communities.

President Kennedy made this clear in his Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which your Committee on Government Operations is considering today.

The President said:

Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities. Likewise, it should be emphasized that the Department will have important activities of service to the States.

The attack on this bill is based, in part, on its concern with the major cities. As I have indicated, we should all be concerned with the crime problems of our great cities because, as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has said, the rising rate of crime in our cities is matched these days with a rising rate of crime in our smaller towns and suburban communities.

The President has compared this new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing with the Department of Agriculture.

The President has pointed out:

Just as the programs of the Department of Agriculture have strengthened the role of the States in measuring and helping solve

the problems of their farmers, so the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will provide additional opportunities for the States to play a strong role in the development of their urban communities.

A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be of very real and very great assistance to my own State of Delaware which I have the high honor to represent in the Congress.

For instance, at Delaware's Farm and Home Week which was held on February 7, 1962, in Agricultural Hall, Newark, Del., a panel of planning experts raised a specter of chaotic industrial and residential growth if new techniques of planning and zoning are not applied to the rural and urban fringe areas of the State.

Dover Planning Commission Chairman Alvin L. Leisey, Jr., said:

We see industrial development moving down the State's coast and it will probably soon begin to move up the coast. Kent and Sussex Counties have no laws to permit them to plan this growth.

Mr. Leisey went on to say, according to an excellent report in the Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., that the experience of Dover, the Delaware State capital, proves that a city cannot be a planned island in a sea of unplanned chaos. According to Mr. Leisey:

We plan right up to the city line and then our problems begin.

Already the city is surrounded by a hodgepodge of residences, commerce, industry, and shacks with the lack of proper traffic arteries to handle an increase of traffic and new industrial development.

Dr. George M. Worrilow, dean of agriculture at the University of Delaware, cited significant figures showing that 23 percent of the State of Delaware is undeveloped nonfarm woodland and marshland. Another 60 percent, he said, is agricultural. A total of 83 percent of the land area of Delaware is vulnerable to changing uses.

Dr. William M. Crosswhite, agricultural economist at the University of Delaware, said the first step in planning is to state the desired goals. He pointed out that research is essential, and research can lead to a change in goals.

As was pointed out by Harry Thernal in a forceful article in the Wilmington Morning News of Tuesday, February 6, 1962:

Delawareans interested in a favorable future for the State believe there has never been a better time than now to start metropolitan planning.

Reasons for this optimism include:

A State planning agency now exists.

The Federal Government has increased available funds for metropolitan planning and is even considering a Cabinet department to handle the problems.

Wilmington's decay and the country's growth have created a great community awareness of the need for planning.

The city and county governments have given informal approval to coordinated planning for the future.

Half a million dollars has been made available by the Ford Foundation for the urban affairs division at the university just to deal with such a program in all its facets.

Penn.-Jersey Transportation Study, backed by governments of this area with \$3.5 million,

can make available data necessary for the planning if Delaware joins the study.

Regional coordination, through Pen-Jer-Del and similar private agencies, is at an all-time high along the Delaware River.

The planning drive is being spurred by the enthusiastic approval of the Greater Wilmington Development Council, which includes most of the key business and government officials in this area.

For the reasons which I have advanced and on the basis what is clearly the best interests of the people of Delaware, I support the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Planning.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs must be recognized for what it is: a bold bid by the Federal bureaucracy to usurp and ultimately to emasculate the authority and influence of our State and local governments.

America's cities do have troubles. But these problems cannot be solved by removing the power and influence of government from our cities and transferring this authority to a far-removed Federal department in Washington.

Community problems can only be met and mastered by community solutions, not by Federal interference. The Federal Government may aid and cooperate with communities in solving these problems, but the line between Federal and local authority must be maintained.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would represent a large step toward obliterating that line and thereby reducing America's local governments to the status of mere agencies of the Federal Government.

Would this help to solve the problem of the future of our cities? Indeed, it is hard to understand how removing the source of solutions from the cities to Washington could accomplish this purpose. In fact, it is inevitable that a Department of Urban Affairs, once created, would compound our cities' problems by establishing another vast bureaucratic network—at tremendous cost to the American taxpayer.

Let the Federal Government assist our communities toward solving their problems. Let the Federal Government continue to cooperate with local authority toward meeting the challenge of our cities' future. But let us keep in mind the traditional role of local government in maintaining our system—a role envisioned by the framers of the Constitution who wisely provided for checks and balances to preserve our form of government.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 should be rejected by the House, and I shall vote to disapprove it. The plan, if adopted, would accelerate the trend toward eroding the constitutional position of the States. By giving Cabinet voice primarily to the demands of big cities, the plan would provide additional incentives for these big cities to lean more heavily upon the Federal Government for aid, regulation, and—ultimately—control. None of these results is desirable.

To make HHFA a Cabinet post would further centralize political power in Washington to the detriment of the

States. We have already moved too far in that direction, in my opinion. By establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, another step would be taken toward expanding the sphere of Federal influence over local urban affairs and housing at the expense of State functions and powers, and at mounting cost to all taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the only objections I have to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. HHFA does not need to be elevated to Cabinet status in order to furnish aid either for urban affairs or for housing. HHFA now has ample authority to bypass the States and to deal directly with municipalities in extending or withholding billions of dollars in Federal credit and in Federal aid largely by means of back-door financing. Through major legislation enacted in every year except one since 1946, the Congress has authorized generous aid for housing, urban renewal, community facilities, open space, mass transportation, and city planning.

Nor does HHFA need to be elevated to Cabinet status in order to reorganize any of its existing programs. The Administrator was given authority to do this very thing under legislation enacted as long ago as 1955. If that proves insufficient, any necessary internal reorganization could be accomplished either through a special reorganization plan or through appropriate legislation.

A fundamental mistake in the reorganization plan, I believe, is that it would establish a new concept of administration. Up to now, Cabinet level departments have been established primarily on the basis of function and not of geography. A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, organized on the basis of geography, would create administrative confusion. Its powers could ultimately cut across the authority of any existing executive departments or agencies whose present functions may include both urban and rural affairs.

Urban affairs, for example, involve highways, education, public welfare, and air pollution, to mention only a few. Housing comprises programs administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Defense as well as the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Yet all these activities would be excluded from the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing except to the degree they might be part of urban renewal or community facility programs.

The organization plan, indeed, falls to define exactly what the ultimate jurisdiction of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing might include. The proposal completely omits any definition of the term "urban," although it would set up a new Cabinet-level Department to deal with urban affairs. Actually, the word "urban" has no fixed meaning. The Census Bureau, which publishes statistics for urban and rural areas, has varied its definition of "urban" from time to time.

The definition followed by the Census Bureau in the recent census of 1960 was more inclusive than the definition used

in 1950. According to the 1960 definition, some 125 million people resided in 6,041 places classified as urban. If the Census Bureau had continued to use the definition followed in 1950, only 113 million persons and 5,022 places would have been classified as urban in 1960. Thus it is that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would have ultimate dominion over an area of undefined extent.

Mr. Chairman, the reorganization plan should also be rejected for other reasons. It would waste money by requiring higher salaries for the new Department officials who would do essentially the same work now performed by HHFA employees. Demands would soon multiply for a new office building and countless other amenities deemed appropriate for an executive agency with Cabinet status.

This is no time to lay the groundwork for a further expansion of Federal expenditures by establishing a Cabinet-level Department for Urban Affairs and Housing. No such drastic reorganization is needed, either, to give the HHFA Administrator authority to reorganize the internal functions of the HHFA. The provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955 gave the HHFA Administrator "full authority to assign and reassign functions, to reorganize and to make whatever changes, including the reallocation and transfer of administrative expense funds and authority where applicable, necessary to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency." If any additional reorganization powers may be needed, ample recourse exists through legislation or through a reorganization plan designed to provide whatever changes are necessary.

It should be made clear that the reorganization plan now under consideration would drastically downgrade the Federal Housing Administration. At the present time, FHA operates under the general supervision and coordination of the HHFA Administrator. The proposed reorganization plan would relegate the FHA operations to a minor role by transferring the program to the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The Secretary would have future direction of any delegated activities carried out by the FHA Administrator, who would be reduced to a subordinate position.

The proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would unnecessarily encroach upon State constitutional functions and powers. It would encourage greater local dependence upon the Federal Government. It would create a Department with mushrooming expenditures and personnel. From the outset, this Department would discriminate in favor of big cities.

Ultimately, it could expand its jurisdiction over so-called urban affairs almost indefinitely by taking over many functions now performed by other Federal departments and agencies. If an internal reorganization of HHFA is needed, it can be accomplished more simply than by this plan.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the real question before us this afternoon is whether or not we are going to give the President reasonable latitude in organizing the executive functions for which he has constitutional responsibility.

This was the purpose of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and its predecessor acts—to vest in the President authority to set up the most effective and efficient means of carrying out the executive responsibilities of the Government.

Of course, we have retained the right to disapprove plans for executive reorganization submitted under the 1949 act, but I believe that we should exercise this right sparingly, and in full recognition of the seriousness of refusing to allow the President to have what he considers to be the necessary means of executing the laws enacted by the legislative branch.

In submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 to us, the President exercised a prerogative authorized by law and which is essential to his position as Chief Executive.

What President Kennedy said about this particular reorganization plan in his message transmitting it to the Congress is:

I have concluded that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is urgently needed to permit me to discharge most effectively the responsibilities in this area placed upon the President by the Constitution and by the statutes respecting these matters enacted by the Congress.

On what basis can we reasonably refuse this request? Is it because the action the President proposes is arbitrary and capricious? The answer to this is clearly "No." The elevation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to departmental status has been under consideration, by students of public administration, by various committees and commissions, by other chief executives of our Government and by the Congress for many years.

In the last session, extensive hearings on this subject were held by committees of both Houses of the Congress. In each case bills were reported favorably.

Does the plan in anyway take away from the prerogatives of the legislative branch? Again the answer is clearly "No."

This plan is based on authority delegated to the President in the Reorganization Act of 1949. No new programs are authorized. No new expenditures are authorized. The plan does not even transfer to the new Department any of the programs not now lodged in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The plan does, however, permit the President to do a more effective job of carrying out those programs relating to urban affairs and housing which have been—and may in the future be from time to time—authorized by the Congress.

I think that it is inherent in the responsibilities of any executive—whether he be an executive in government or an executive in business—that he should be charged with devising the most effective way of doing his job, and I think that

his views in such matters are entitled to the greatest respect.

The President of the United States has clearly stated his views in this case. He has presented for our concurrence a carefully thought-out and well-supported reorganization plan. We should allow this plan to become effective in the manner prescribed in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my firm endorsement of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

In my mind, it is now high time that the 70 percent of the American people who live in cities be given the attention their numbers require. Recently the San Francisco Chronicle stated in an editorial entitled "A Plan To Help Troubled Cities":

Its prime objectives, the President has said, would be to "prevent the appalling deterioration" of cities and "insure the availability of housing for all segments of the population." It would concern itself with slums and blight, the location of industrial activities, urban mass transportation, transit planning between communities, development of parks and open areas for recreation, and facilities for cultural purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this quotation sums up quite succinctly the role such a department would perform. Its establishment would not only benefit our cities, but would play a vital role in the continued health of our Nation.

At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert this editorial into the RECORD:

A PLAN TO HELP TROUBLED CITIES

"Both equity and commonsense," said President Kennedy in his state of the Union message, "require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table."

With that preamble, he renewed an urgent appeal for legislation to create a new, Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Bills for its creation were reported out by committees of both the Senate and House last year, but did not receive floor consideration.

What the President seeks, his various utterances on the proposal have shown, is a department to provide leadership and assistance in solving the numerous, complex problems of the fast growing urban areas and to coordinate within it the numerous functions now performed by an assortment of departments and agencies. Thus it would absorb or annex the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and some others.

Its prime objectives, the President has said, would be to "prevent the appalling deterioration" of cities and "insure the availability of housing for all segments of the population." It would concern itself with slums and blight, the location of industrial

activities, urban mass transportation, transit planning between communities, development of parks and open areas for recreation, and facilities for cultural purposes.

In a discussion of this proposal, the Population Reference Bureau of Washington notes that urbanization is increasing everywhere and that planning has become urgent "if densely packed cities are to become pleasant places in which to live." (In this shift from country to city, California shares second place among the 50 States—its population is now 86 percent urban.) The bureau says cities must attain "high standards of well-being, freedom, and opportunity" and finds: "The problems are big enough to challenge the best efforts of government and private agencies."

We heartily agree with this estimate of the problems and feel that a Cabinet-rank department would at least end the confusion and jurisdictional uncertainty now confronting local authorities who apply to Washington for help toward their solution.

Mr. Chairman, a short time after the above-noted editorial appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, the other San Francisco morning newspaper, the San Francisco Examiner expressed in an editorial entitled "The Cities' Needs," the position of that newspaper that:

The most convincing argument in behalf of the plan (to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing) is this: The tremendous growth of our vast urban complexes makes them and their people deserving of representation in the Federal Government at Cabinet level.

To deny it would be to disregard a dynamic phenomenon of our time.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert this editorial in order that our colleagues may review these hard-hitting arguments:

THE CITIES' NEEDS

Disregarding the politics now boiling around the issue and considering its probable merits against its potential defects, President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs should be approved by Congress.

In supporting it we are aware that opponents have valid points—the new Department could turn into just another huge bureaucracy and, at its worst, could develop into paternalistic interference in municipal and State affairs.

These are risks, but the probable advantages outweigh them. The gist of the matter, in the words of the President, is this:

"Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of Government."

Ours has become largely an urban county. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association—which by the way endorse the President's plan—estimates that 70 percent of our population lives in and around cities. The percentage is increasing. Mr. Kennedy pointed out that taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan districts contribute 35 percent of the total income tax collections.

As the urban areas have grown, as have the multiplicity and complexity of problems—transportation, housing, educational facilities, racial minorities, slums, traffic, downtown blight, and so on. They are becoming increasingly difficult to solve at local levels; in fact some of them spill over formal city boundaries and across State lines.

The proposed new Department is not actually a radical innovation. It would coordinate the functions of a number of Government agencies. The Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association would be brought into the Department. So would the functions of

the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Association, and the Community Facilities Administration.

The President's belief that such coordination would increase efficiency is soundly based, and his assertion that his plan "does not connote any bypassing or reduction in the powers and responsibilities of the States" is assuring.

But the most convincing argument in behalf of the plan is this: The tremendous growth of our vast urban complexes makes them and their people deserving of representation in the Federal Government at Cabinet level.

To deny it would be to disregard a dynamic phenomenon of our time.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that there will be 160 million urban residents by 1970—more than our total national population in 1950. American communities, with their limited tax revenues already swallowed up by rising service costs and diminishing property values, cannot individually provide the technical assistance and leadership that will be required for economically sound and orderly growth. This is not to say that the complex problems facing our cities will be solved overnight by the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Without question, a coordinated attack by and at all levels of government—city, State, and national—is urgently needed. If our human and economic resources in our country are to be utilized adequately, the Federal Government must respond in assuming a positive role of leadership, stimulation and technical assistance to our cities. The time for assumption of this role is now before the House of Representatives. It is my fervent hope that this body will act with wisdom today in rejecting House Resolution 530, which would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, some of the discussion of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seems to be based on the fear that housing will somehow be subordinated in the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, with major attention going to urban affairs. In the nature of things, this is not possible. The fear is groundless.

Urban affairs and housing are not two separate things, but rather two sides of the same coin. The proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing makes no distinction between the two. On the contrary, use of the two terms together dramatizes the inseparability of our concern for the housing of our people and our concern for the improvement of our towns and cities.

The mission of the new Department would be the same as that of the various programs it would embrace—to support the goal set by Congress in 1949 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." The urban community is the setting of the homes of two-thirds of our families. It is also their living environment. Good housing is not possible without good communities.

Every city is predominantly residential. Many of the suburbs and small communities that lie within urban areas are entirely so.

Here are some facts drawn from a 1955 study by the noted city planner,

well known in Washington as former chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Mr. Harland Bartholomew.

Mr. Bartholomew studied the land uses prevailing in a representative sample of 53 municipalities. He found that, excluding streets, parks and playgrounds, and public and semipublic properties, 73 percent of the remaining area was devoted to residential use, 6 percent to commercial use, and 21 percent to industrial use and railroads.

When it is remembered that parks and playgrounds serve residential areas, as do schools and to a large extent hospitals also, and that streets serve the entire community, including its residential areas, then it is plain that homes and the services and facilities most necessary to them account for well over three-fourths of urban land area.

The point is that urban communities are in the main aggregations of housing, and that there is not and cannot be any real distinction between urban affairs and housing.

The programs that would be transferred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing make no such distinction.

These include, of course, the mortgage insurance operations of the Federal Housing Administration that reach into virtually every community of the country. They include also the special programs of assistance to low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and housing for college students and faculty and for student nurses and interns. They include aids for nursing homes for the elderly and the ill, housing for displaced persons, and special housing to meet a variety of other needs.

But our 30-year experience with housing programs has taught us that housing problems cannot be solved except in the context of the whole community.

Congress has authorized more and more activities that recognize this fact. Programs of slum clearance and the rehousing of low-income families led naturally to programs of urban redevelopment and urban renewal. We found that urban renewal could not be carried on without providing housing for the families it displaces. And also urban renewal has led us to a greater and greater emphasis on the rehabilitation of housing and neighborhoods. The expansion of urban areas into what had been open country pointed up the need for area and regional planning and for assistance to localities in extending public facilities to serve new concentrations of homes. Similarly, the growing congestion of cities and the outward movement of housing brought mass transportation problems to the fore. Again and again, when we take up some aspect of the problem of housing, we find we have grasped the problem of the whole community. This is as it should be, because our primary concern is not with housing as mere physical structures, but with houses as homes for people, and this requires us to look to the entire environment in which people live.

It is a virtue, not a fault, of the plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing that it recognizes the truth

to which we have come—that housing and community are one and inseparable.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the Reorganization Plan No. 1 now under consideration appears to me to be another move toward further concentration of authority and power in Washington and a foot in the door leading toward further undisciplined spending by the Federal Government.

Creation of a separate Department of Urban Affairs purportedly would produce some new measure of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of the programs which affect our urban areas. However, diligent investigation on my part fails to reveal, within the four corners of the reorganization plan, any such solid promise for the future or any proof that this vast new Department could somehow cope more effectively with the problems of urban areas than the agencies now authorized to deal with these problems.

There is the effort to justify this legislation on the basis of the fact that some State and local governments have failed to achieve solutions to all the complex problems which confront our cities. To infer that the creation of this new Department would solve these problems gives rise to the legitimate fear that the Federal Government plans to take over functions which rightfully belong to local governments, despite the protestations of the advocates of this plan to the contrary.

Even if the States and local communities are not doing enough in this field, this does not automatically establish the need for the creation of the new Department now proposed.

If the Congress authorizes a new Federal Department every time a State or local government cannot immediately solve every problem they encounter—even, as in this case, with substantial assistance from the Federal Government—it surely will not be long before our States are relegated to the posture of mere administrative subdivisions of the National Government.

When this occurs, this Nation no longer will have "government by the people."

The repeated assertions by proponents of this legislation that it would create no new Federal programs or alter existing laws relating to housing and urban development cause us to consider: Why is this huge new Department of Urban Affairs necessary?

The people of the urban centers of America are certainly entitled to effective spokesmen in the Federal Government, from the President through the Cabinet down through the executive agencies and to the Congress.

This they already possess in full measure, in President John F. Kennedy, in the members of the Cabinet, in many effective executive agencies and in the Congress.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, even the Secretary of Agriculture, now represent at the Cabinet table the need of our urban dwellers to have adequate housing and hospitals, effective law enforcement, prosperous

commerce, good mail service and the best food on earth.

The Federal Housing Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association—these and countless other agencies already exist for the purpose of serving the needs of urban citizens. They are fully empowered to do the jobs they are designed to do and already have a powerful voice in the conduct of governmental activities.

Amalgamation of these agencies into one department would create another gigantic bureaucracy which doubtless would mushroom over the years. What about those agencies such as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, such bureaus as the Loan Guaranty Service of the Veterans' Administration and many divisions of such Departments as Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and Labor which primarily deal with urban problems and programs? Are these many units eventually to be shanghaied into this new Department?

Creation of this separate Department to deal exclusively with urban affairs would, in my judgment, be a mere exercise in political science and theory and would serve no useful purpose.

The legislation should be rejected on that basis, not on the basis of some of the extraneous considerations which have been mentioned in connection with the plan, such as the appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver to head the Department if it is established.

Here no question of civil rights is involved. If the Congress in its wisdom approves the reorganization plan and if President Kennedy believes Dr. Weaver is the best man to head the Department, then his nomination should be approved by all Americans.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, in discussing pending and anticipated legislation with various groups in my district in recent months, considerable emphasis was placed upon the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I found no sentiment whatsoever in support of this measure. Invariably, the reaction indicated it was an intrusion on the part of the Federal Government in local affairs, with expanding bureaucracy and incidental needless expense.

During my comparatively short experience in the House, our office, like many others, has grown to be sort of a service station where the little fellow comes as a last resort. He comes every day in exasperation following unanswered pleas, involvement in redtape and possibly, renewed disenchantment in all governmental process.

However, there has been a bright and shining exception in the case of Federal housing and urban programs and I have frequently marveled at the expediency and the absence of complaints in connection with municipal contacts back home. I am therefore opposing the proposed new Department in the light of favorable experience and the broad general premise that we should let well enough alone.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Government Operations that considered Reorganization Plan No. 1, I heard testimony pro and con, have studied the plan and its possible effects, and have come to the conclusion that I favor it.

My position, briefly stated and stripped of emotional or political consideration, is as follows:

Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will not establish a bureaucracy. Only a small increase in cost—\$64,000—will result, and no new functions are added to the Cabinet post, but a greatly increased administrative efficiency will be achieved. Testimony from experts with experience in government has emphasized the need for better coordination with other agencies and even among constituent agencies. Other programs, with Cabinet status, have an advantage that should not exist.

It is expected that savings to the municipalities and Federal Government will result because a more effective administration of urban renewal problems, and other departmental functions, will save time and money. Now, it is often necessary for a municipality to deal separately with several agencies, some with overlapping jurisdictions and authorities, to reach agreement on a project or a series of related projects.

There was no testimony presented from mayors or Governors that local or State responsibility or rights would be bypassed, but the evidence was quite to the contrary. The mayors and many Governors supported the plan.

It is my conclusion that the creation of a single agency, which was recommended to President Eisenhower by an Advisory Committee in December 1953, is clearly indicated, and it should have Cabinet prestige and authority.

This method of establishing a Cabinet Department is not unusual. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created by President Eisenhower under similar circumstances and is, in my opinion, consistent with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for efficient and economical government.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, the plan which we are now considering was originally introduced in the House as H.R. 8429, and in the Senate as S. 1633. Upon conclusion of hearings in both Houses, the respective Committees on Government Operations favorably reported the measure, accompanied by strong minority reports. From the testimony elicited at the hearings many different groups were firmly opposed to the idea of creating a new Cabinet-level Department in this area.

This January, H.R. 8429 was considered and rejected by the Rules Committee. Normally, this would be the end to a bill. Those who propose and support it are naturally disappointed at its failure, but they bow to our legislative process. Not so the present administration. Early in the last session we were treated to a "preview of coming attractions" when the Rules Committee itself was enlarged, "packed," I believe, is the term so that it would henceforth reflect not the will of the House but the will of the White House.

This same "packed" Rules Committee—enlarged specifically for the purpose of insuring favorable consideration of legislation such as H.R. 8429—decisively turned down the measure by a vote of 9 to 6.

At this point we see the administration shift into high gear, ignoring now any pretense of regard for the Congress, or the safeguards of the legislative process. By a great coincidence, the final Rules vote was taken just 15 minutes before the President's press conference. In the conference the subject was of course brought up, and three especially interesting and unusual statements were made by the President:

First. He implied that the Rules Committee turned down the proposal because the Republicans blocked it, despite the fact that the Rules Committee is composed of 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans.

Second. He stated that he will transform H.R. 8429 into a reorganization plan, which would become effective unless a majority of either House disappeared it within 60 days.

Third. He announced that if the Department was created, its Secretary would be Robert C. Weaver, the first Negro ever appointed to the Cabinet.

This final statement is the most unfair political maneuver we have seen in a very long time. For a large segment of the population, the issue no longer was one of urban affairs, of centralization versus State control, of the best way to solve our problems.

Now it was civil rights, and a vote for the Department in some totally incongruous fashion equaled a vote for equal opportunity. And a President who had asked for and received fair treatment during his campaign now turned and stood revealed as one who himself had no qualms about exploiting the very racial prejudices which publicly he deplores. And so, as the wheel came full circle, we found Mr. Weaver himself, as reported last Sunday by the New York Times, saying that a large segment of the population would interpret a vote against the Urban Affairs Department as a vote against putting a Negro in the Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been and always will be a firm supporter of all minorities in this country. I personally would have been delighted to see Mr. Weaver or any other well-qualified Negro appointed to Mr. Kennedy's original Cabinet and wonder why this was not done. I would be happy to see a qualified Negro appointed now to head any one of the existing departments.

If rumors materialize there will be two vacancies in the Cabinet—Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Attorney General. Thus, the President will have two opportunities to prove his sincerity and appoint a qualified candidate from the reservoir of Negro professional and legal talent in the Nation.

But I also submit that one's views on civil rights are totally irrelevant to the issue of urban affairs, which no rational person of any race will deny. That is why I feel that it is a dark day indeed when the issue of race is injected as it

has been here. Let us hope it will not happen again.

I do not feel there is a Member present who is unfamiliar with the issue, who has not considered the many arguments in favor of, and in opposition to, the bill. Those of us who oppose this legislation do so because we are convinced that the centralized approach to this problem is simply not the answer. We see its potential dangers as far outweighing the rather indefinite blessings which it is supposed to distribute. We feel it would be another step—and a long one—in the direction of removing the Government still further from the people it is supposed to serve. Let me just mention some of the very considerable dangers which would confront us:

First, what our Federal system needs today is not less but more strength at the State and local level. The gradual but ever-increasing erosion of its power leads us to forget that the framers of the Constitution did not reserve such powers to the States without reason. The only solution which this administration seems able to offer, whether it be in the field of education or medical care or urban affairs, has the effect of reducing or eliminating voluntary participation, weakening States control, gathering all the power in Washington, and eventually bringing every activity under Federal control. The number and variety of urban problems suggested during the hearings on H.R. 8429 for eventual inclusion on 8429 is astounding. And when we stop to consider the history of the last Department created—Health, Education, and Welfare—and the way in which it has grown, both in terms of employees and appropriations, I think we will be doubly wary about believing the initial siren song of economy which inevitably accompanies requests for a new Department.

These are several reasons why the reorganization plan should be voted down.

It is the State, county, town, and village governments which properly possess the primary responsibility for urban growth. It is they who are composed of local citizens, intimately familiar and directly concerned with their own local problems. The fact that the problems are growing, and are becoming more complex is in my opinion a reason for increased Federal assistance, where appropriate. It is not a reason for increased Federal control.

We find that unlike every other department or agency, a Department of Urban Affairs has a geographic rather than a functional basis. Considering the spectrum of functions which proponents wish to include in the Department, we are continually at odds on whether to assign a particular function to urban affairs because a city is involved, or to an existing agency because of the nature of the function. Should the concept of function be bypassed in this area, we may start a trend which could eventually undermine our entire system of government.

The political dangers resulting from a Department of Urban Affairs are obvious. Under the Housing Act of 1961, the Secretary would have the authority to commit \$9 billion of Federal funds,

and thus would be able to exert enormous influence on big city officials. The ability to cut off such funds would result in a tremendously powerful Federal office, and such direct power over city government by the highest level of the executive branch is dangerous and unwise.

Moreover, this danger could be reinforced by the inevitable tendency of city governments to ignore the county governments, which are now their equal, and State governments which are properly their superior. For as large metropolitan cities find they can bypass State and local governments and deal directly with Washington, we will find a new channel of communications being established, in which State government is effectively ignored.

Finally, if we understand the basic distribution of our metropolitan population, we will realize that large numbers ordinarily included in the term "urban"—and thus presumably to be aided by the plan—are not really city dwellers at all. We often hear that 70 percent of our population lives in urban centers. However, as the National Association of County Officials points out, the central city is often equated with its suburbs, and both lumped together under the term "urban." Within the 217 metropolitan centers, approximately 50 percent of our citizens actually live in the suburbs, and present trends indicate that in years ahead this percentage will increase in proportion to the central city population.

The problems of the suburbs, as well as those of towns and villages, may or may not be shared by the central city; and the degree to which they may be shared will vary among different States and geographical areas. Therefore, it is important that these problems be analyzed by local county and State governments, rather than included in a consensus of national needs.

One of the alleged purposes of H.R. 8429, for which this plan is obviously a substitute, is to encourage the solution of urban, suburban, and metropolitan development problems through State, country, town, village or other local and private action. In hearings on this bill, however, as well as on its Senate counterpart, there was a noticeable lack of support from the county and town level. Indeed, in the Senate hearings no witnesses appeared on behalf of smaller towns or counties asking that a new Department be created. On behalf of county government within the 50 States NACO officials vigorously opposed the creation of the Department. Since representatives of the suburbs, counties, and towns do not favor the plan, it is more than likely that the new Department is designed primarily to act for the central cities at the expense of suburban dwellers who now represent 50 percent of the metropolitan centers.

I oppose the plan not at all on the grounds of civil rights. I do so because I do not believe further Federal centralization and control in the area of urban affairs is the answer to the problem.

The fact that we do not concur in the administration's solution, however, does

not mean we deny that problems exist. Problems such as redevelopment, slum clearance, and water pollution are indeed multiplying and new approaches and efforts are called for to solve them. In those areas where the Federal Government is able to be of genuine assistance to the States, such assistance should be forthcoming. But let the control, and the basic decisionmaking machinery, remain close to the people. The same money which we are told can do so much in the hands of a Department of Urban Affairs can accomplish just as much—if not more—in the hands of a concerned citizenry operating directly through their State and local governments.

In order to give these local, State, and Federal Governments the opportunity to work together on this problem, with each performing the functions it is best equipped to handle, I have introduced a bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of State and Urban Affairs. This is not a particularly new idea, but it is one which I think would enable States to make maximum use of the Federal Government and still retain control over their own affairs. The bill contains the following provisions:

First. The Office would coordinate the programs of various agencies of the executive branch which have a major impact on the Nation's urban areas, such as housing, urban development and redevelopment, community facilities, water and air pollution, et cetera.

Second. The Office would compile and make available to State and local officials information concerning appropriate Federal programs, and would help in relating such programs to specific urban needs.

Third. The Office would undertake research and studies with a view toward determining what changes should be made—first, in various programs to achieve a more effective coordination of such programs with State and local programs; second, in the allocation of such programs among the various departments and agencies of the executive branch; and third, in the administration of such programs in order to achieve increased economy and efficiency, and to avoid duplication.

Annual reports of the activities of the Office would be submitted annually to the President and the Congress.

The end result would be to retain the benefits of the reorganization plan without surrendering States' prerogatives to Washington. One central office conducting the coordination, research, and gathering of information, could make known the results to all 50 States. For its part, each State could bring selected problems to such an office and receive the benefit of its experience in dealing with similar problems in other States. This partnership would be in far greater accord with both the spirit and the letter of our Federal-State form of government than the administration's proposal. I urge its consideration by Members of the House, and the defeat of the reorganization plan at hand.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, my district is all within the city of Minneapolis,

Minn.—certainly a large urban area and the center, along with St. Paul, of a much larger metropolitan area. I have worked for 15 years to bring into being a tremendous urban renewal project which will make of downtown Minneapolis one of the three or four largest redevelopment areas in the entire country. Certainly I am as interested in the proper and rapid and adequate development of my city and area as any person can possibly be.

It is precisely because I want the best possible conditions for the people of my city that I am unable to support the creation of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

Since coming to Congress I have always subjected any proposal to increase the power of the Federal Government over the lives and affairs of our people or of smaller units of government to several tests: Is the proposal necessary? Will it actually accomplish the desired objectives? Is action by the Federal Government the only or the best way to handle the problem? Do the probable advantages of the proposal outweigh the probable delays, the increased costs and potential dangers? I do not believe the proposed new Department meets these criteria. Hence, I must vote for the resolution disapproving the proposal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am against the resolution of disapproval now pending before us—in other words, I favor the establishment of the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I made my position clear many times in the past, and I have heard no arguments here which would lead me to change my mind. Quite the contrary. I am just puzzled as to where some of the opposition arguments were invented, because they certainly do not fit the facts as we have been able to determine the facts.

I find it ironically amusing that so many of the real-estate people have been wiring and writing in to us to oppose this proposed new Department on the grounds that it would lessen the importance of the local communities or represent some new kind of Federal meddling in local affairs.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Most of the work of the proposed new Department would involve the administration of laws and programs originated in or recommended by that subcommittee. We are all aware of the fact that the housing programs of the Federal Government are matters of economic life and death to the real estate and construction industries. They come to us for help whenever there is a slowdown in construction or a shortage of mortgage financing. They do not fear Federal meddling in assuring a supply of mortgage financing; nor do they fear the bureaucracy of the Housing and Home Finance Agency when it comes to programs in which private enterprise shares so handsomely.

Obviously, the opposition to the proposal for raising the HHFA to Cabinet status is pure politics—nothing more. Let us not pretend otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I recently called attention in the House to the position of the

St. Louis Board of Aldermen in favor of the proposed Department. In addition, I have received the following letter from the mayor of St. Louis, the Honorable Raymond R. Tucker, on this proposal:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., February 8, 1962.

Mrs. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEONOR: I should like most emphatically to remind you of my strong feeling that the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is of urgent importance.

The urban areas of our Nation, where the overwhelming percentage of the people live, deserve a proper spokesmanship at the national level. The proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would not undertake any new functions but would properly group existing functions of the Federal Government. I think this Department would be a step toward a heightened efficiency in the administration of existing functions because it would provide for better coordination between different policies of the Federal Government which affect urban areas.

I think one of the most democratic developments in Government in recent years has been that of strong interrelationship between local communities, local funds, and local initiative on the one hand, and Federal policies aimed at national problems of urban impact on the other hand.

Consequently, I should like to urge your support of the President's reorganization plan establishing the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing when it comes to a vote in the House.

Kind regards.

Cordially yours,

RAYMOND R. TUCKER,
Mayor.

Mr. Chairman, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which is recognized as one of our greatest American newspapers, had this to say on January 27 about the President's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:

President Kennedy's decision to seek a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs by the reorganization route rather than through Congress is thoroughly justified, because of the way in which the congressional route was blocked.

Five Republicans and four southern Democrats constituted the majority on the House Rules Committee that refused to clear the urban affairs bill for House action. When nine members can, in effect, prevent Congress from considering a major Presidential request, a detour is in order. In this case the detour seems both passable and fair.

Mr. Kennedy's reorganization plan establishing the new Cabinet post will go into effect automatically 60 days after it is submitted, unless it is disapproved by either the House or Senate. Thus opponents of the measure can still block the proposal if they muster a majority vote; they cannot depend on one committee or nine votes to hold it up.

Most Americans, we think, will support the President's plan to elevate urban affairs to the Cabinet, because most Americans live in urban areas—7 out of 10, the Census Bureau says. With the trend toward urbanization have come problems of slums, traffic, transit, city rehabilitation, and galloping suburbanitis. These problems deserve Federal attention today as much as did the farm and labor problems that long ago led to the creation of Cabinet posts for Agriculture and Labor.

Moreover, neither the cities nor their parent States have been able to solve urban problems fully. Outmoded State laws and malapportioned State legislatures have not

been very helpful. The upper chambers of 33 States are controlled by less than 40 percent of the population. The lack of an adequate voice for urban voters spreads from the States even into Congress, because its apportionment is largely in the hands of rural legislatures. For these reasons the cities need an outpost in the executive branch.

Predominant rural interest, however, does not explain the House Rules Committee's objection to the urban affairs legislation. Rural and urban representatives were on both sides of the committee vote. What put all the committee's Republicans and its southern Democrats on the same side there is what usually creates this coalition—a community of conservative interest.

The conservative coalition opposes the very effort to help solve urban problems which the legislation was meant to provide. Action on housing or mass transportation means more spending, they think, and more welfarism. The mere elevation of these tasks to a Cabinet position will not immediately affect spending; President Kennedy's budget for housing, community development and mass transportation planning is already set and amounts only to nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total Federal budget. But the placement of urban responsibility in the Cabinet will emphasize the Federal Government's role, and that is what it is intended to do.

Urban citizens, which means most citizens, have a right to expect as much. The United States already has become a largely urban republic. Urbanization continues, and its attendant problems will grow. President Kennedy's proposal reflects his awareness of this and the Republican Party, or its members in Congress, will avoid a serious political error if they do so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose House Resolution 530 to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

There is no doubt that the present problems of urban renewal, expansion, housing, air and water pollution, and public transportation, to name but a few, will become even more varied and complex in the future. As we all know, there have been in existence for many years various agencies working in one or more of the above-mentioned areas. The President's proposal in no way contemplates establishment of an additional agency, but rather the reorganization of already established agencies into one unified department. Coordination of activities, now so widely scattered, will permit far more effective and efficient operation.

In addition, I wish to remind you that citizens directly interested in agriculture, for example, are represented in the Cabinet by a department which serves to correlate their interests; the same is true of labor. By the same token, why should not the great majority of people who live in urban areas—now 70 percent of our population—have the prestige of representation through a department whose voice will be heard when overall national policy is being considered at the highest level.

Despite the wealth of propaganda to the contrary issued by opponents of the reorganization plan, there is nothing in the plan which commits the Congress or the President to provide increased authority or power for the proposed new

Department over that extant in agencies now functioning in this same field.

Nor will the rights of States or cities be violated by such a reorganization. The hollowness of such arguments is clearly demonstrated by the wide endorsement of the proposal at the community level. I am happy to say that my own county of Los Angeles, the largest urban county in the United States, has endorsed the proposal by vote of its board of supervisors, and the mayor of the city of Los Angeles has issued a statement strongly supporting the creation of the proposed new Department.

This entire subject has been thoroughly studied over a period of years by both the executive and legislative branches. All have reached a similar conclusion—the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is desirable—now.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the creation of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I have been in Congress now close to 10 years. There has not been a year when major legislation concerning housing and urban affairs has not been under consideration by the Congress. The present Housing Agency expends more funds than most of the existing executive departments. The housing and community development programs of the Federal Government have a tremendous impact upon the economy of the country. In times of recession its programs are among the first to be called upon to be used to bolster and stimulate the economy. In times of major national emergencies, such as war and natural disaster, its programs are utilized to assist in meeting the emergencies. The housing and community development programs are available to assist not only large cities but all communities—even the smallest—and particularly the smaller communities. The assistance goes not only to State and local public bodies but also to private lending institutions, builders, and other large segments of our private enterprise system.

Coming as I do from the eastern seaboard, which has practically one urban strip from the southern to the northern ends of the country, I know something about the problems of urban development. Since the war our State and city officials have been hard pressed to provide the services and facilities demanded by the enormous increase in population coupled with the movement of our population to the urban areas from the more rural areas.

Even though our country is young—and probably because it is young and relatively inexperienced—our cities have grown up without proper planning. Parts of them have been allowed to deteriorate into slums and blighted areas. This must be corrected and prevented in the future. We have large problems in the field of mass transportation and community facilities and all other phases of urban affairs.

From year to year the Congress has given the housing agency more and more authority to help the States and localities in meeting these problems. Its programs are many and varied. They include insurance of loans to assist the

construction, purchase, and rehabilitation of dwellings; a secondary market for housing loans; loans and grants to assist in the provision of housing for our low income families, and for the clearance and prevention of slums and the redevelopment of slum cleared areas; loans for housing for the elderly, for essential types of community facilities, and mass transportation facilities; and grants for community planning and the acquisition and preservation of open-space land.

STATES RIGHTS WILL NOT BE WEAKENED

Mr. Chairman, I have heard those who are opposed to the creation of the Department say that it would interfere with States' rights and weaken their powers. This I do not believe. No State or local public body can accept Federal assistance from the Department unless the State has enacted legislation authorizing the carrying out of the program for which the assistance is available, and the acceptance and utilization of the Federal funds. The assistance that would be provided to private lenders and other parts of private business by the Department cannot logically or feasibly be provided in any other manner. Here, too, State laws and regulations play an important part.

I have been a member of the legislature of my State. I know from firsthand experience that our State legislature protects its rights and responsibilities just as earnestly as we do as Members of Congress. They are not going to give up their control over their constitutional share of the Government of our country. Many of the Governors have asked that the Department be approved. Also the mayors and cities want the Department. They are not afraid of losing their powers or rights.

Many of the States are furnishing assistance to housing and urban affairs that supplements the assistance provided by the Federal Government. That is true in my own State of Massachusetts. My State is working with the Federal Government but is not relying entirely upon the Federal Government for the provision of adequate housing and community planning and development. Many of you from less thickly populated sections of the country have not had to face the same needs we have. Your States will do the same when the needs arise. You cannot do all these things alone.

GOVERNOR VOLPE FAVORS DEPARTMENT

The Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable John A. Volpe, has urged the establishment of the Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. He has asked the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to support the proposal. In addition, he has proposed to the Massachusetts Legislature that it establish a counterpart department in the State government—the department of economic development and community renewal. In the words of Governor Volpe, the State department “would mesh effectively with a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing since it would integrate State agencies responsible for urban renewal, housing, mass transportation, economic research, industrial and commercial development

and local, regional, and statewide planning.” Our State has no fear from the creation of the proposed Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. We believe we have much to gain and that the entire country would gain.

The creation of the Department would give its functions and programs their proper place in the Federal executive branch from the standpoint of their importance and effect upon the country. It would assure the most efficient and coordinated administration of these programs. Most of you have served in the military services. You know the importance of a straight line command. Under the reorganization plan the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be responsible for all the functions of the Department. They would be carried out subject to his direction. With this authority he can coordinate the various programs in the Department and prevent duplication and inconsistencies. With the present housing agency organization the Administrator is supposed to do this—but with inadequate authority.

The prestige and status of the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would make it easier than it is for the Housing Administrator to consult with the Secretary of Commerce and other department heads with respect to programs under his direction that may be affected by programs or policy decisions in those departments. He can be sure that his programs will be given adequate consideration in top level decisions with respect to national policies and actions because he will be at the Cabinet table when they are made.

DR. WEAVER, A NEGRO, HIGHLY QUALIFIED FOR CABINET RANK

Mr. Chairman, a side issue, unfortunately, has been injected in this very important proposal because President Kennedy has said that he will appoint to the Cabinet position of Secretary of Urban Affairs, Administrator Robert C. Weaver, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, who is a Negro.

Let me say that in my judgment, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices which decides on the budget requests of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Dr. Weaver is the best informed, the most knowledgeable and has the highest qualifications of any Administrator of this Agency that I have heard testify during my 8 years of service on the Appropriations Committee. President Kennedy's selection of Dr. Weaver for this Cabinet position would be excellent.

Mr. Chairman, in a recent publication that passed over my desk there was a discussion of the assertion that Congress is behind the times. We all know that big bodies move slowly. I never cease to be amazed—and I know you have all shared this feeling—when the end of each session comes at the amount the Congress has accomplished—despite the fact that only a month or two prior to its adjournment it looked as if nothing had been done and in fact everything seemed to be in a hopeless state of confusion. I am the first therefore to deny that the Congress is behind the times

and that it is not doing its job. One task we must accomplish is the creation of this Department of Urban Affairs and Housing because it is needed and it is past due. I ask permission to include with my remarks a list of State and city aid to housing and urban renewal in Massachusetts, and an excellent editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Republican of February 4, 1962, in support of President Kennedy's plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The material follows:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE AND CITY AID TO HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

Municipalities financed a veterans' housing program beginning in 1946 under which the State contributed a 2 percent annual subsidy for construction of homes to be rented to veterans—1,745 units were built by 15 communities. All except 36 units have been sold and are now under private ownership.

In 1948 the State was authorized to guarantee local housing authority bonds or notes up to a total of \$200 million for construction of permanent veterans' housing. The State was also authorized to provide up to 2.5 percent of development cost of the housing in annual contributions. 15,462 units were built by 88 municipalities under this program.

In 1954 a program of construction of housing for the elderly was initiated. Ninety-five projects are either occupied or under construction. They are financed by a State guarantee (up to an aggregate of \$105 million) of housing authority bonds and State annual contributions up to an aggregate of \$2,675,000.

The State guarantees housing authority bonds to provide relocation housing.

The State may make grants to cities and towns up to one-half of the local grant-in-aid contribution to assist urban renewal that is federally assisted.

The State may make up to \$25 million in grants to localities for nonfederally assisted commercial or industrial redevelopment projects.

Municipalities may annually appropriate funds for grants to aid housing authorities in their preparation of plans for housing projects and making surveys.

The Massachusetts State Housing Board approves all housing projects of local housing authorities and the State division of urban and industrial renewal approves urban renewal projects initiated by localities.

FEBRUARY 21, 1962.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, Feb. 4, 1962]

A MAJOR REPUBLICAN BLUNDER

The great personal popularity of President Kennedy, shown by recent public opinion polls, suggests that in 1964 he will be unbeatable for reelection in spite of his razor-thin margin in 1960. That had appeared, even before the polls registered their extraordinary figures of popular approval of President Kennedy, to be the philosophy of former Vice President Nixon in thinking the 1964 Republican nomination to be of little value and that, for him, the part of political wisdom was to fix his long-distance plans on the campaign of 1968.

Before election day in 1964 there now yawn 2½ years. That is an interval in which many things may happen, either to depress Kennedy's rating or even to raise it to a new high. But nothing could have happened in 1 day to make his reelection in 1964 seem more probable than the action on January 24, by the mass votes of all the Republicans on the House Rules Committee combined with those of racist-minded south-

ern Democrats, to defeat Kennedy's proposal for a new Department of Urban Affairs.

As if this were the bell for the next round, the President came out fighting. He shrewdly seized the committee's action as a profitable campaign issue and challenged the GOP to battle on it. He announced that exercising his power under the Reorganization Act, he would himself establish the new Department and name Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the very able Negro whose prospective appointment had caused most of the trouble, as its first Secretary.

This announcement was at once attacked by Representative BYRNES of Wisconsin, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee in the House, on the ground that it introduced the race issue. Of course it introduced the race issue. But it did so properly and wisely. It put the Republicans on the spot, although not all of them will follow the unwise leadership of Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK. This was shown by the prompt announcement by Senator JAVITS, of New York, liberal Republican, that he would vote in favor of the new Department.

Other liberal Republicans in both Senate and House are expected to do what JAVITS does. It is again of more than incidental importance that a private poll of Republicans in both Houses as to whether or not they were satisfied with the "EV" and "CHARLIE" leadership brought only two favorable votes, the two being cast by "EV" and "CHARLIE" themselves. The story is possibly apocryphal but like some other such stories it undoubtedly reflects much truth.

The comment is made in Washington that the Republican leaders were trapped into their predicament by President Kennedy's not using his power under the Reorganization Act in the first place. If so, they were trapped only by their own poor judgment in once more forming a coalition with reactionary elements in the Democratic Party on the House Rules Committee. As a further factor pointing to the poor judgment of "EV" and "CHARLIE," the Republican National Committee recently issued an analysis which emphasized that it was in the big cities that the Republicans lost the last election. This is hardly a reason for letting it be advertised to the country that the congressional leaders of the Republican Party are opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs to help deal with the acute problems which grow more acute as big cities grow bigger.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this privilege of expressing my position on the pending resolution. I am opposed to it. It should be defeated, and soundly defeated. When we analyze the arguments that have been advanced here in favor of the creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it is found that they are lacking in substance. The principal argument in favor of the new agency is that 70 percent of the American people are now classed as urban, and, therefore, we better be careful, or those of us who vote against the agency will lose a lot of those city votes.

But I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the advocates of the new agency who capitalize upon that reasoning overlook the simple fact that people who live in urban centers are also taxpayers. We all know that only the naive and the uninformed seriously believe that the creation of the new agency as proposed will not involve vast new expenditures on the part of the Federal Government. There has indeed been no attempt to conceal the real motive behind this proposal. The purpose is to concentrate the power and authority of a Federal agency to spend more

money, engage in the financing of more programs, stimulate more requests for more spending, and avoid the old-fashioned idea that local people should finance their own local projects.

Aside from the billions of dollars which would be expended because of the approval of this plan, imagine the magnitude of the new, sprawling bureaucracy which would be created. The plan calls for not just a new Secretary of Cabinet rank, but in addition, an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel, and an Administrative Assistant Secretary to perform duties prescribed by the Secretary. But that would be only the beginning. That would hardly get the new agency into orbit. Then would come the second, the third, and many other stages, with untold thousands of new Federal employees on the payroll as the new bureau would expand its functions and its activities.

There is no need to speculate on the question. Any student of government knows the history of newly created agencies, particularly the larger ones. Once created, they expand and enlarge, and before you know it the annual appropriations double, and then quadruple, and the new vehicle for spending the people's money gets into high gear.

Take, for example, the rather recently created Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Expenditures for that Department have increased $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the cost of the agency in its first year, which was 1953.

It has been estimated that if the proposed new agency should follow the course of HEW in growth rate, it would be a \$165 billion department by fiscal year 1973. That is based upon the fact that the Budget estimates that as of June 30 these programs, now in existence, which would be incorporated into the Department of Urban Affairs, will have outstanding direct and insured loans totaling \$52.9 billion.

The issue has been stated very simply: The issue is whether the Federal Government should take over more and more functions and activities which properly are duties and responsibilities of the local and State governments.

One of the strangest arguments in behalf of the new agency is that which has been heard here today, that because there has been a Department of Agriculture serving rural people, it is therefore proper that the city people be given a department. That is, of course, nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves all Americans because it deals with production of food and fiber. The Department of Commerce very properly serves an all-national interest, American business. And the Labor Department likewise serves a nationwide interest, American labor and problems related to it. It happens that both Commerce and Labor relate more to urban affairs and to people who live in the cities than they do to our rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, is there no end to this lust for more bureaucracy in this country? Several new agencies have been set up recently. Some 75,000 new Federal employees were added to the payroll during the past year. Scores of new Federal functions have been authorized.

And we are approaching a \$100 billion annual budget to finance all this. Is there no end to it?

It is said that so long as the people demand these new and expanded Federal services, the people will get what they want. But the fact is that the people are being given more government than they want, and far more than they need. Let us put the blame where it belongs—and that is the fertile-minded politicians who dream up every sort of new spending idea in a frantic appeal for votes, and for more governmental power. That is nothing new. It has been going on for years. Let us face up to it. And here is a good place to begin.

Mr. Chairman, here is a chance to give the taxpayers a break. Here is a chance to hold the line against a gigantic spending project for which there is no sound requirement or justification. Here is a chance for us, the representatives of the American people, to reaffirm our faith in America—and in Americans. The people are quite capable of solving their own problems without this new approach, this new attempt to bypass the courthouses, the city halls and the State capitols, and bring their appeals for funds to finance purely local projects directly to the Great White Father in Washington.

The proposed new Department of Urban Affairs should be defeated.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I know that Members of this House have studied closely the issues posed by creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. And I know that little said during this debate today will change their reasoned opinion on the merits of this proposal.

But I would like to set out clearly and emphatically my thoughts in opposition to creation of such a Department.

First, I doubt if any member of this House doesn't believe that creation of this Department is going to mean a tremendous increase in size and cost of the Federal Government. I predict that if this Department is created, it will surpass in size and cost within a short time two of the giant bureaucracies of the Federal Government—our Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare. I can cite one sentence from the Government Operations Committee report accompanying House Resolution 530 to back up such a prediction:

Today, 70 percent of the people in the United States live on 1 percent of the land.

Mr. Chairman, it is fact, not fiction, that Federal agencies and departments have a penchant for trying to be all things to all men. If the giant Agriculture Department represents only 30 percent of our people—what in the world will be the size and cost of an Urban Affairs Department to solve all the problems of the remainder?

There must be a line drawn on how far the Federal Government will be permitted to grow—and how deep it will be permitted to interject itself into the realm of local and State authority. Certainly, there are problems of urban explosion facing our cities and States today.

But in most instances, such problems can be controlled by local and State authorities when the people demand that such be done. It is unreasonable and unwise for the Federal Government to haul vast sums of tax money from States and municipalities and turn around and send it back to solve local problems—minus the cost of operating a growing Federal system of departments and agencies.

Mr. Chairman, our people are overburdened with taxes to support the Federal Government, and relief must come soon. If you disagree with the fundamental issue of State and local versus Federal control, in the name of common-sense this proposal to create this Department should be defeated on the basis of economy alone.

Mr. Chairman, I noted with deep concern the efforts to interject into consideration of this measure the issue of racial relations, and it is with reluctance that I delve into this matter at all.

The President has seen fit to announce that Mr. Robert Weaver will be nominated to head such a Department, if it is created. And because Mr. Weaver is a member of the Negro race, and would be the first Cabinet member of his race, there have been attempts on the part of some to characterize opposition to creation of this Department on the basis of race alone. In my opinion, nothing could be farther from the truth.

From my personal contacts with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and from all reports I have received, Mr. Weaver is doing a fine job and is a most capable administrator.

There is little doubt in my mind but that Robert Weaver will become a member of the President's Cabinet at some time in the future, even if creation of this Department is vetoed by the House. And there is little doubt in my mind but that he will fulfill his duties and responsibilities with the same ability and dispatch he has shown in the past. That is a decision that only the President can make, and the Senate confirm.

But I strongly feel, Mr. Chairman, that attempts to interject the racial question into an issue as basic and fundamental as this does a great disservice to Mr. Weaver, the President, this Congress, and our people as a whole.

I strongly urge my colleagues to consider this issue closely and to oppose creation of this Department on the sole basis of economy and lack of justification for its creation at this time.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress defeats the President's plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing it will also inflict a crushing defeat upon all the cities of this country—large and small—which are engaged in a losing struggle with the vastly increased problems of housing, transportation, the scourge of blight, maintaining their economy, finding means to support essential local services, to mention a few. It is incomprehensible to me that Members of this House can close their eyes to the needs of our cities, can turn a deaf ear to the pleas of the many mayors and other State and local officials who have begged for the assistance which would be provided by the new Department.

In the late 1880's the Congress created the Department of Agriculture. At that time 80 percent of the U.S. population lived in rural areas and it was recognized that it was necessary to have coordinated plans and action for the benefit of those in the rural areas. Today, 130 million of the 184 million Americans live in urban areas. It should be apparent to clear-thinking lawmakers that now the city people need the same kind of help we gave the farmer so long ago. There is no sound, reasonable, or justifiable argument against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Robert C. Weaver, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has pointed out the necessity for coordinating the greatly expanded Federal activities in the urban and housing fields—such expansion being due to the mushrooming needs of our cities, for our cities have borne the brunt of the population explosion. He stated that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is now an "administrative monstrosity" whose responsibilities have outgrown its capacities. He pointed out that by every test of efficiency, of intelligent management, and of good government, there must be a consolidation and reorganization, and this is one purpose of the reorganization plan proposed by the President.

The additional cost required for the proposed new Department is nominal and is no basis for concern.

I would emphasize that the new agency plan does not, and could not, create any new governmental function. Among other things, it would be engaged in the following activities:

Preparation of comprehensive plans for community development, and redevelopment and the planning and construction of such projects.

Preservation of open space in urban areas for recreation and conservation.

Preservation and development of urban transportation systems.

Financing of residential construction and rehabilitation of home ownership and home improvements.

Maintenance of a stable market for Government-insured mortgages.

It is not sensible that Government activities of such magnitude and importance to our cities should be carried on outside the highest council of Government—that is, at Cabinet level. The widely different Federal programs now in existence in these fields should be carried out under one head and one Department.

The President pointed out to us that the present and future problems of our cities are as complex as they are manifold. He stated that there must be expansion: but orderly and planned expansion—not explosion and sprawl. We recognize the need for extension of basic public facilities into the areas surrounding urban centers, but it is important that they be planned and coordinated so as to improve rather than hamper the sound growth of communities. The scourge of blight must be successfully overcome and prevented. Our cities must have help so that their economic and cultural wealth can be restored to lasting vitality. We must find means to

provide a more efficient local economy and provide revenues to support essential local services. Housing must be conserved and improved and new housing created. I look forward to reaching the goal of a decent home for every American family; it is of great importance that our children have the benefit of growing up in a suitable living environment. I agree with the President that when we neglect our cities we do so at our peril, for in neglecting them we neglect the Nation.

The Department would also have important activities of service to the States; the States would be expected to assume additional leadership in the future in dealing with problems of urban areas, and the Department would maintain close working and consultative relationships with them.

Housing continues to be one of the major problems of the area I represent, the 23d District of New York. The great shortage of housing and the terrible living conditions are shocking. The new plan provides for the transfer of the Federal Housing Administration as an entity to the new Department; therefore, the vital and increasing problems of housing would receive their opportunity for discussion and suitable action at Cabinet level.

I was delighted to learn that the President plans to name Dr. Robert C. Weaver, head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. In his present high office, Dr. Weaver has proved himself to be a brilliant administrator, an expert in his field, a man of integrity who has won great respect and admiration for the fine contributions he has made to his country in the discharge of his duties. He richly deserves the Cabinet post to which the President plans to name him.

I urge my colleagues to approve the President's plan for a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, so that we may have the necessary leadership in coordinating the many Federal programs in the fields of housing and development.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this resolution which disapproves Reorganization Plan No. 1 creating a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

To deny a segment of our society which represents 70 percent of our people a voice at the highest levels of Government would be an injustice. No other major segment of our population is denied such an opportunity. Our business interests are cared for at the Cabinet level by the Secretary of Commerce. Our working people are represented by the Secretary of Labor. For farmers, who now represent less than 20 percent of our people, we have a Secretary of Agriculture.

The problems of our cities are formidable, as has been testified to by countless mayors, city managers, and municipal associations. There is a pressing need for a rebirth and surge in the health and welfare of our urban areas. Old housing must be restored or replaced. Mass transit systems must be revived and made more effective and efficient.

More adequate community facilities must be constructed. Parking facilities are needed in most city centers. Greater efforts are needed to control juvenile delinquency, air pollution, and water pollution. Hospitals, airports, and green areas must be constructed. Projections indicate that these problems will increase as the years go by.

President Kennedy's proposal has had almost unanimous support from all groups who are directly involved in caring for the needs of our cities. The American Municipal Association supports this measure. The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials supports it. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has given it solid backing.

It is interesting that the leading opponents to this measure have been historically opposed to legislation which enables the Nation to meet the responsibilities of the 20th century.

The arguments that this proposal would lead to the Federal control of our cities is a false one. Certainly, representation at the Cabinet table does not mean the control of the interest represented.

Nor would the President's proposal set up a growing bureaucracy with wide and far-reaching powers. The truth of the matter is that under the administration's proposal no new programs or functions would be authorized. No new additional funds would be provided. No Federal control would be extended over the States, counties, or municipal bodies. No powers or prerogatives would be taken away from the Congress.

The reorganization proposal would simply raise the status of existing agencies to the Cabinet level and provide a central body where hard-working local officials could turn when they alone could not completely cope with their growing problems. The plan would also provide the necessary coordination and administering of the Federal housing and urban programs which now exist. In order to better serve the needs of our States, our towns, our cities, and the millions of people whom all of these programs are designed ultimately to serve.

A hundred years ago, one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, called upon the Congress to create a Department of Agriculture to serve the needs of 80 percent of the population who inhabited the Nation's farms. Those of us who are here today would do well to follow this great President's example and insure that all important groups in our society have their place in the highest levels of government.

As far back as 1937 the National Resources Committee made a detailed survey of the problems of our cities, including the areas of proper national responsibility. In its report to the President, the committee said:

It may be questioned, however, whether the National Government has given sufficient attention to some of the specific and common problems of urban dwellers, as it has for farmers through the Department of Agriculture.

In 1955 the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the Kestnbaum Commission—studied in depth the prob-

lems of Federal, State, and local government relations in the areas of housing and urban affairs. The Commission's report again pointed to the need for greater coordination of Federal programs in these areas.

In 1961 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made a special study of this problem, entitled "Governmental Structure, Organization and Planning in Metropolitan Areas." It too emphasized the need for better coordination and interrelationship of the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas.

I trust that the effort to defeat this plan will be voted down.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, in President Kennedy's request for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, his basic purpose of this plan is to establish a department which will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of Federal programs, now in existence, which affect the lives and welfare of families in our cities and their surrounding areas.

The American scene is changing from a predominately rural society to a vast urban complex. More than two-thirds of the American population now lives in metropolitan centers and the figure is increasing. It is because of this expansion that a need exists to bring about the solution of problems of housing, transportation, and education in the great overcrowded urban centers.

In the past the State and local governments have coped with advancement, but the tempo has accelerated and the problems have become more difficult to resolve. Historically, in this Nation, the purpose of the Federal Government is to assist those communities who are experiencing difficulty to approach a national objective.

We live in the birth of a new era. An era so impetuous it needs careful planning for us to keep pace. And it is essential we keep pace if we are to win the race against communism's dream of world domination. For the new nations of the world are window shopping for the system that is best for their prosperity and future, and we best keep our windows trimmed most attractively and most sensibly.

By coordinating the work of presently established Federal agencies—which are designed to assist urban areas—under one Department, we can realize more efficient management and greater results in resolving urban renewal problems. It will benefit all citizens of our Nation and strengthen our world position.

I wholeheartedly endorse the idea of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing available to all local communities and officials, to work for the improvement and in many instances, the salvation of our greatest asset, the cities.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution and in support of the President's request for establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The resolution before us today could prevent establishment of such a department, and I urge my colleagues to vote

against it so that the millions of American people who live in urban areas of America could have more meaningful representation at the Cabinet level in our Federal Government.

If the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is defeated, it will not constitute a setback for the administration, but rather a serious blow to the American people who have a right to expect an orderly solution to the problems which beset cities like Chicago and other municipalities through more effective action at the Federal level.

More than 78 percent of the American population today lives in urban areas. The Congress did not hesitate to establish a Department of Agriculture in 1894, when ours was predominately a rural nation. Congress realized that in order to give the farmers of America, then constituting the majority of our people, a coordinated program of action, one, single Department should deal with all those problems of rural communities which came under Federal jurisdiction. Today, this Congress does not hesitate to appropriate some \$9 billion in various assistance programs for the farmers of America. Is it asking, then, too much that we merge all of the various activities at the Federal level dealing with urban affairs into a single Department, now that the overwhelming majority of the American people live in urban communities? It is my judgment that creation of such a single Department would benefit not only those Americans living in cities but, indirectly, the 22 percent of Americans living on farms and in rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the most compelling argument in support of this legislation was given to the House Government Operations Committee by the distinguished mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, when he testified before that committee. Mayor Daley stated:

It is important to note that the proposed bill in itself adds no new powers or new funds to the new Department. That does assign additional responsibility for leadership in coordination of specific activities of the Federal Government as they affect urban areas.

This is not a bill for the big cities. Of urban renewal project reservations, 28 percent has been made to communities under 25,000 population; of public housing projects under contract, 63 percent are in localities under 10,000 population; of public facility loans, 87 percent have gone to service areas with populations under 3,000.

Over half of the localities with certified workable programs are under 10,000 population. There has been no new evidence presented since the hearings last summer that would basically change any of the testimony given in behalf of the bill. But there have been some issues given prominence which we believe are irrelevant to the merits of the proposal and which cast shadows on the real issues.

It has been said that those who are strongly advocating the creation of this new Cabinet post come from big cities, but the American Municipal Association, which has endorsed this proposal, represents not only big cities but many small cities, towns, and villages.

It is my sincere hope that the merits of this proposal will not get bogged down

in partisan bickering or extraneous issues. We have heard today various arguments in opposition to this proposal, but the one inescapable fact remains that the urban communities of America are today in serious difficulties and rather than giving them "helter-skelter" assistance, as is now the practice at the Federal level, it makes just common sense to me to merge all of these programs into a single, logical approach to the problems before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday, February 21, this body rejected Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which would have created a Department of Urban Affairs. During the floor debate on this subject I stated my opposition to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. At that time I stated that I was very much aware of the problems facing the urban areas. It is my conviction that the solution to these problems is not to be found in devising a new organizational chart. As I pointed out Wednesday, any real solution to this problem is going to be found in the development of a policy or philosophy and in the coordination of activities.

This can best be achieved through the creation of a small organization which might be called the Council of Urban Advisers. Such a council would be a staff agency set up on a continuing basis and composed of experts. It could conduct research, seek a coordination and integration of related activities, and make recommendations. Perhaps most important of all, it could think about and work toward the formulation of a basic policy which we do not now have.

This approach, which has much to commend it, is considered favorably by Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach in their excellent and objective examination of the question of an Urban Affairs Department in their book, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas."

Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach are distinguished scholars of the subject area of Federal Government and metropolitan areas.

Robert H. Connery holds degrees from the University of Minnesota and Columbia University, receiving his Ph. D. from the latter. He has taught at Columbia, Catholic University, Stanford, the University of Illinois, and Duke University.

Over the past 25 years he has served as consultant to numerous Federal, State, and local governments and officials including among others the National Resources Planning Board, the President's Committee on Administrative Management, the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Hoover Commission, and the city administrator of New York. He has been a fellow as well as a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution.

During the Second World War he served for 5 years in the Navy as a commissioned officer. In that capacity he was assigned to Secretary Forrestal's office to write an administrative history which later was published as "The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in

World War II, 1950." He is also author of "Governmental Problems in Wildlife Conservation, 1936," "Administration of an NRA Code, 1936," and other Government reports and articles.

Richard H. Leach is joint author of "The Administration of Interstate Compacts, 1959," of "In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice, 1959," and of numerous articles. He was graduated from Colorado College in 1944 and received a Ph. D. from Princeton in 1951. He taught at Georgia Institute of Technology before joining the Duke faculty. He has had considerable practical experience in government as a member of the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board from 1953 to 1956, and of the Army Security Agency.

Both men are now members of the Department of Political Science at Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert chapter 5 of "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas"—"A Department of Urban Affairs: Pro and Con," into the RECORD. The authors have given me permission to quote this chapter. I commend it to all for thoughtful consideration.

A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS: PRO AND CON

The idea of an executive agency devoted entirely to urban affairs is not a new one. A variety of possibilities have been suggested in recent years, ranging from an interagency committee all the way to a department of urban affairs at the Cabinet level. Some of the proposals have been for a temporary organization, some for a permanent one; none of them have agreed on what form the organization should take.

The simplest suggestion advanced has been for an interagency committee, to be made up of representatives from the several Government agencies whose programs bear upon urban and metropolitan areas. This proposal has been discussed informally but has never been activated. Endless variations have been suggested as to what agencies should be included and as to what its exact terms of reference should be. The proposal ran into the problem encountered so frequently in dealing with Federal programs, that no one knows precisely which agencies and what programs actually do have an impact on metropolitan government. In addition, the proposal ran afoul of the inbuilt weaknesses of all interagency committees. With no permanent secretariat, no provision for regular meetings, no delegation of precise authority, an interagency committee is at best a feeble administrative device for dealing with a problem as explosive as that of metropolitan areas today.

A Cabinet committee has also been suggested as a device to focus attention on the problem. In 1956, for example, President Eisenhower asked seven members of the Cabinet to serve as a Committee on Small Business, and in 1958 he requested five members to constitute a Council on Youth Fitness. He might do the same for metropolitan areas. If he used such a committee, however, a full-time secretariat should be provided, for Cabinet members are fully occupied in their own departments. The President might wish instead to bring in an individual for a short while to study the problem and report to him, as he did recently when he appointed Edward P. Curtis to study aviation facilities planning (1957), and Clarence B. Randall to study international trade (1958).

Another means of focusing public attention on the problem would be to make use of a special Presidential commission to study it. Thus, in 1954 the President appointed a five-man advisory committee for a national highway program, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, on whose report the Highway Act of 1956 came to be based; and in 1956 he directed a 34-member Committee on Education beyond the high school to examine problems in that area, and on the basis of its findings to develop proposals for action. Congress provided funds for that committee's work, a series of studies and conferences was launched, and a final set of recommendations was drawn up. In other areas, President Eisenhower has appointed a Committee on Government Contracts, an Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, a Committee on Government Employment Policy, and a Science Advisory Committee. Such committees of prominent citizens, properly staffed and financed, can do an excellent job of analysis and recommendation.

None of these temporary and short-range devices, however, should be regarded as a good alternative to the creation of a Council on Metropolitan Areas. They are useful in educating the public and the President, but they cannot supply the President with the continuing staff assistance the metropolitan problem demands. Though any of these devices can be very helpful to the President in preparing legislation, what is needed for metropolitan areas is not the passage of a single act, but an agency which will provide the President with a continuous flow of information upon which he can base policy.

Even though the newly created Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is to be permanent, it is not a satisfactory answer for metropolitan areas either. Growing out of the work of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Commission is visualized as a body which will bring together Federal, State and local officials on a continuing basis for discussion of the problems which concern all levels of government.

The bipartisan commission will consist of 26 members: 3 from the executive branch of the Federal Government, 3 Senators, 3 Representatives, 4 Governors, 3 State legislators, 4 mayors, 3 county officials, and 3 private citizens. It is clear from its sponsors' statements that the commission will be mainly concerned with allocation of functions among levels of Government and with Federal grant-in-aid programs. As a means of gathering information the commission has some attraction, but it will have so broad a membership base and be so indirectly involved in metropolitan problems that it will have limited usefulness, so far as the Nation's great urban communities are concerned. The establishment of a commission of this nature, indeed, may lead people to conclude that an agency which will devote its primary attention to the metropolitan area problems has been established, when in fact it has not.

PROPOSALS FOR A DEPARTMENT

The most widely supported idea for an executive agency in the area of urban and metropolitan problems is to create a Cabinet department devoted exclusively to them. The idea dates at least from 1912, when Philip Kates suggested the creation of a National Department of Municipalities. The Kates proposal would have created a research and service department which as its first task would conduct "a comprehensive and authoritative study of the municipal problem in its basic principle . . . an industrial survey of national scope, with . . . attendant investigations into causes of congestion of population, and the remedies by improved communication and transportation and other

means; into sanitary conditions * * * into housing, disposal of municipal waste * * * industrial working conditions * * * the working of other municipal systems than ours, and of other theories and methods of legislation (applicable to the American problem)." The information thus collected, fully and quickly transmitted to the proper local officials, Kates thought, would give municipalities all the information which was "essential to the proper solution of (their) problems." Kates' idea interested Woodrow Wilson very much indeed, and he hoped to have an opportunity to discuss it very seriously with those interested.

The opportunity evidently did not materialize, however, and the proposal was lost in the pursuit of the new freedom and in the preparation of the United States for World War I which immediately followed it. It was revived in 1919 in a slightly altered form by Harlean James, who thought that a department of civic economy in the National Government, rightly conceived and vigorously carried out, would be invaluable in helping cities and towns to meet the challenge of the postwar period. Miss James conceived of her department of civic economy as performing primarily an educational service. Such a department, she wrote, "should conduct research studies and make experiments on a scale possible only for the Federal Government" and should make its findings available to the sleepy crossroads corner in the remote county as well as to the noisy traffic-ridden city.

Miss James' idea did not bear fruit either, and for another decade or so no new proposals toward this end seem to have been made. In 1934, however, Charles E. Merriam, then with the National Resources Board, remarked that it was important that "the voice of our cities be heard in the capital, [and] it is equally important that the U.S. Government have some responsible administrative representation in the cities. * * * there is no urban U.S. representative corresponding to the county agent in the rural districts." Although Merriam went on to profess that he did not know just what form this new development may take or whether a number of Federal agencies may not jointly share Federal responsibility, he was certain that the whole question of the relation of Federal administration * * * to city government * * * looms up larger every day. By 1942, Merriam had become convinced that a separate administrative unit in Washington was necessary in view of the proportion of our people who dwell in cities and the importance generally of cities in our political and economic system, and he recommended that there be set up in the National Government a bureau or department of urbanism.

Since the end of the war, the idea has been advanced quite frequently. Just recently, Nathaniel S. Keith, a former Federal housing official, proposed the creation of a Department of Community Development. Commenting on his idea, Keith declared that "the realities call for the establishment of a Federal department as a focus for the necessary Federal attention and assistance" to community development. The establishment of a Federal Department of Community Development would give needed stature to the Federal interest in this field and would provide Cabinet-level policy coordination for all Federal activities with an impact on community developmental problems. The following operating functions, Keith thought, ought to be consolidated in the new department; research in housing and community development problems; assistance to regional, metropolitan, and urban planning; assistance to housing; assistance to urban renewal; assistance to the planning and financing of local public works; assistance to highway development and metropolitan area transportation. "The admin-

istrative consolidation of these functions in a single Federal department," he concluded, "would provide the necessary fulcrum for consistent application of these programs in the field."

In one form or another, the idea of a department has won a number of outspoken proponents. Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER gave impetus to the idea in an article about it in a Sunday supplement. Since then, it has become a popular subject for newspaper editorials across the country, even in some of the small newspapers, and it has been incorporated into the last three annual policy recommendations of the American Municipal Association. A number of other organizations have accepted the idea, including the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Housing Conference, and the American Society of Planning Officials, and the hard-pressed mayors and local officials of a good many of the Nation's largest cities have pledged their efforts to its establishment.

The idea has also caught the attention of a number of Members of Congress, and several of them have introduced bills into Congress to create such a department. Three such bills were introduced in the 84th Congress, one by Representative J. Arthur Younger, Republican, of the Ninth District of California, one by Representative Irwin D. Davidson, Republican, of the 20th District of New York, and one by nine Senators, some of them from the Nation's most urban areas: Herbert Lehman, Democrat, of New York; Hubert Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; Wayne Morse, Democrat, and Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon; Warren Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington; Thomas C. Hennings, Democrat, of Missouri; Pat McNamara, Democrat, of Michigan; and James E. Murray, Democrat, of Montana. Each of the three bills was referred to the Committee on Government Operations of the appropriate Chamber. Only the Younger bill received a hearing, however, and no further action was taken before the end of that session. No action at all was taken on the other two bills, so that all of them died at the end of the 84th Congress.

Virtually the same bills were submitted to the 85th Congress. In the House, Representative YOUNGER reintroduced his bill, and Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of the 17th District of Michigan offered another. The Senate version was offered by some of the same Senators, but this time under the leadership of Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a former mayor of Philadelphia. Senators Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York, Russell Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey joined Senators Humphrey, Morse, Neuberger, Magnuson, and Representative Murray in sponsoring the bill. All three bills were referred to committee, but no hearings were held, and, as before, all of them died at the end of the session.

In the 86th Congress, four bills were introduced in the House, one by Representative ALBERT RAINS, an influential member from Alabama, another by Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO of New Jersey, and the same bills as before by Representatives GRIFFITHS and YOUNGER. In the upper House, however, Senator CLARK and the other Senators had shifted their support to the metropolitan study commission idea and did not submit again the departmental bill of the preceding Congress. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York introduced a companion bill to Representative YOUNGER'S.

The proposal for a department warrants analysis and discussion if for no other reason than the fact that it has won so much endorsement. One must recognize, of course, that proposals to create new executive de-

partments are made frequently, and some of them have received a great deal of support, both in Congress and outside, without being accepted. In the past decade, proposals for Departments of Civil Defense, Transportation, Water Resources, Public Works, and Science and Technology have all been advanced without success. A Department of Urban Affairs, however, suggests an easy solution to a complex problem, which in many ways is broader in scope and more immediate in its need for action than any of the other problems. Moreover, a discussion of such a concrete proposal can do much to clarify the proper way to deal administratively with a problem of this magnitude. Since proposals for an executive department will doubtless continue to be offered in the future as the solution to the problem, it is time that the merits of the idea be thought through.

ORGANIZATION AND POWERS OF THE DEPARTMENT

All the bills so far presented to Congress have had certain similar features. All call for the creation of a new executive department, variously entitled the Department of Urban Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Department of Urbiculture. All propose the same type of administrative organization, at least in broad terms. A Secretary, an Under Secretary, and a varying number of assistant secretaries heading major departmental divisions are provided for in each bill. Likewise, all the bills set forth the same general goal for the Department, though, as one might expect, they differ considerably in their exact wording. The Younger bills have the most limited scope. As H.R. 1019 (85th Cong.) put it, "Many of the most pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land [thus] there is a corresponding national interest in the development of the science of urbiculture. Therefore:

"Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in promoting increasingly efficient use of farmlands, the Congress enacts this act in order to provide a corresponding executive department to develop methods of dealing with pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of using and developing urban lands, and to make these methods available to the people of the United States through suitable educational programs."

Representative GRIFFITHS' bills note "that the pressing needs of cities and metropolitan areas are such that Federal action should be taken to assist in meeting these needs through education, research, technical services, and such other programs as the Congress may later prescribe." Moreover:

"The Congress finds also that a number of important Federal programs * * * have a vital impact on local communities and metropolitan areas; and that there is need for a central place in the Federal administrative structure to assess the overall results of these programs, to help coordinate these activities, and to represent the needs of urban areas at the national level."

The Senate bill (S. 2159) for the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was very similar. It declared:

"(1) That a large majority of the American people now live in urban and metropolitan areas, and that almost all population growth in the last two decades has occurred in these areas; and (2) that the number of Federal programs which have a vital impact on urban and metropolitan areas are numerous and varied; and (3) that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the living standards of its people require that the Federal Government * * * [assist] * * * the States and local governments in meeting the problems caused by the continuing growth and concentration of population;

and (4) that for these reasons there should be a Federal department * * * to deal with those urban and metropolitan problems in which the Federal Government has a direct or cooperating interest."

Three of the bills would have abolished and transferred the functions of certain existing agencies to the new Department: Representatives GRIFFITHS and YOUNGER, those of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and S. 2159, those of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. All three bills also contained a section which would have permitted the President to "exercise his authority under the Reorganization Act of 1949 with a view to further consolidating within the Department such functions and agencies of the Government as will further the purposes" of the act creating the Department. The Rains and Addonizio bills would leave the transfer of functions, including housing, entirely to the President.

The Younger bill also provided that the Secretary should "establish research and educational programs to accomplish the purposes set forth" in the act, and the Senate bill instructed the Secretary of the Department to "conduct a continuing study of problems peculiar to urban and metropolitan areas, including problems of coordinating Federal-State programs in such areas," to "provide technical assistance to State and local governmental bodies in developing solutions to such problems," and to "make such recommendations to the Congress, as a result of the studies to be undertaken * * * and after consultation with appropriate representatives of State and local governments, as he shall determine to be appropriate."

As a result of the passage of any one of the bills, or of a mixture of them, another executive department, directed generally at urban and metropolitan problems, and combining research, service, and educational functions on the one hand with coordination and program operation functions on the other, would be added to the structure of the Federal Government. Initially, at least, no new functions would be added, but those which are now scattered throughout the Federal Government would be centralized in a single administrative unit.

ARGUMENTS FOR A DEPARTMENT

Supporters of the new Department build their case on a number of grounds. Perhaps the most frequently offered justification is the fact that in a nation which is becoming increasingly urban, special recognition of urban affairs at the Cabinet level is a necessity. Senator CLARK, in a statement explaining the purpose of S. 2159 to the 85th Congress, remarked that "metropolitan growth is posing one of the greatest challenges of the second half of the 20th century. We cannot meet this challenge with government machinery designed for the 19th century." As a matter of necessity, the Federal Government must "adapt its administrative organization" to enable it to meet more effectively the problems of today's urban and metropolitan areas. Just as a Department of Agriculture was created as a farmers' agency in recognition of the primary importance of agriculture in 1889, and a frankly prolabor Department of Labor was established when increased industrialization made it seem important to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States," so is the development of a Department of Urban Affairs important and necessary today. Representative YOUNGER, testifying before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Government Operations in 1955 in behalf of his first bill, remarked that "very much the same argument that was advanced for the establishment of the Department of Agriculture" could be advanced for a Department of Urbiculture.

"In 1862, when the [Office] of Agriculture was established, approximately 80 percent of our population lived on farms or in rural areas, and only 20 percent in urban territory. Now, in 1955, that situation has entirely changed. * * * In 1862 the problems which came to the Federal Government for solution arose from the rural areas because 80 percent of the population lived in rural areas. With 85 percent of the population concentrated in the urban areas, naturally the problems which come to the Federal Government for solution arise from those areas. * * * I think that * * * we should concentrate * * * Federal concern over the problems that originate in the city areas into a department that [has] a head with a Cabinet status. In simple terms that is what this bill was designed to do."

Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee, remarked upon hearing his colleague's testimony: "Here in the Congress I have noticed that the farmers are well represented. They have the Department of Agriculture as well as the legislative committee set up here. They are taken care of and, as you say, the people are no longer on the farms. I think the Congress and our Government should revamp itself to meet the situation because government is for the people."

REPRESENTATION OF URBAN INTERESTS

Creation of a department and the designation of a Cabinet representative for urban affairs, the argument continues, would provide stronger leadership for and better representation of urban interests in national policymaking. At present, there is no focal point for urban affairs in the executive branch of the Federal Government. A great many agency and bureau heads represent one aspect or another of the urban and metropolitan problem, but their efforts are often contradictory and are in no sense all-inclusive. The result is that national policy in this important field can be formed only on the basis of incomplete or inaccurate data about cities and their problems and needs. "It does seem to me," Representative DAWSON noted, "that it is indicated that the problems of cities be given a departmental status, and it so seems to me from my experience as a Congressman here in Washington, and observing the various departments make their needs known to the Congress." Maintaining that farmers have the Department of Agriculture to point out their needs to Congress and to protect their interests and promote their welfare, he argued, "the problems of the cities are not voiced here as such. Because of the great impact of those problems upon not only the cities but upon the country as a whole, I think that there is a crying need to the extent that the country should begin to think about a department to handle this."

This reasoning would seem to be supported by studies in the field of public administration. Arthur Macmahon and John Millett, for example, declare that the "head of a department * * * has an individual consultative relationship to the President, to the administration as a whole, and to Congress," a relationship of such importance that the Secretary of a department becomes "the administration's natural consultant" in regard to the problems of his area. To date, there has been no such consultant available specifically for urban affairs. Schuyler Wallace finds that since the President's Cabinet frequently serves not merely as "an administrative but also an advisory agency on broad questions of public policy * * * representation [thereon is] highly desirable." Both by being available as a consultant on urban affairs to other officials in the Federal Government and by contributing the urban point of view to the determination of national policy, a Secretary of Urban Affairs would fill a need which has already been met

in all other important policy areas. In a nation so predominantly urban, proponents of a department insist to deny representation to urban affairs is no longer tenable.

SIZE OF URBAN PROGRAMS WARRANTS

DEPARTMENTAL STATUS

Aside from the need to have urban interests represented in national policymaking, those who advocate a department point out that by now the Federal Government has many programs which affect urban areas and that together they are important enough in the total picture of the Federal Government's activities to warrant elevation to departmental status. The Federal Government's housing programs alone, to say nothing of its civil defense program and others with distinctly urban aspects, certainly have become important enough and involve large enough expenditures of personnel and money to be raised to departmental status. They should, proponents of a department argue, be recognized as permanent interests of the Government by being given regular Cabinet status—by being, in short, combined into a separate and distinct executive department. Thus Walter B. Mills, Jr., president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, in a letter to Representative DAWSON in connection with H.R. 1864, declared that his organization was "strongly of the opinion that the Federal Government's activities in the field of housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment of urban centers have reached proportions warranting the creation of a department * * * having full Cabinet status." In the same vein, William L. Wheaton of the National Housing Conference maintained before the Dawson subcommittee that the "relative size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as compared with other executive departments" entitled it to departmental status. "If we look at the expenditures, we find that the gross expenditures of the Housing and Home Finance Agency exceed that of five other Cabinet departments * * * [it] has more employees than one department." Certainly, Dr. Wheaton argued, the HHFA ought to be converted to departmental rank, especially when its total financial commitments are compared with those of the other civilian departments. Those commitments, Dr. Wheaton thought, "probably exceeded all of the other departments saving only the Treasury * * * and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Nor did Dr. Wheaton or other proponents of a department have to look far for support of their contention. The first Hoover Commission used the same type of argument to support its proposal for the creation of a Department of Social Security and Education. Having recommended the creation of a United Medical Administration to take care of the Federal Government's health programs the Commission went on to say, there remain, however, certain most important bureaus [and] agencies relating to education which must be organized into a workable department. And as the reasons for that conclusion, it noted: "The size of these agencies * * * is * * * indicated by the fact that they embrace about 20,000 employees. The administration expenditures [of the several agencies combined] would be roughly \$50 million. The grants-in-aid to be distributed would approximate \$800 million." When operations of separate agencies reach such proportions, the Commission seemed to say, they naturally should be combined into one department. More recently, a proposal has been advanced to centralize the Federal Government's science activities in a Department of Science and to transfer to the new Department the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of Standards, and the Patent Office, among others. The proponents of this measure, like those of a Department of Urban Affairs, justify

the action on the ground that in terms of money and manpower involved the time has come to recognize the importance of the Government's scientific interests.

For departmentalization, they assert, is the only really efficient way of handling related program operations of such magnitude in the Federal Government. Scattering of functions among a number of different units means that it is not possible anywhere to get a view of the problem to be solved as a whole. Senator CLARK built much of his case on the advantages that a Department of Urban Affairs would bring in coordinating existing programs concerned with urban affairs and in simplifying the governmental structure by reducing the number of independent agencies reporting directly to the President. The American Municipal Association in its 1956 policy statement likewise stressed the "greater * * * efficiency" which would result from centralizing the various activities affecting cities in one "unified administrative organization at the Federal level." No study which has been made of the executive branch fails to emphasize the evils attending the great proliferation of independent executive agencies that has occurred in recent years and the advantages to be gained by a reduction in their number and a coordination of their efforts. Indeed, the first finding of the Hoover Commission was precisely along this line: "Federal programs * * * must be grouped by related function and divided among a small number of principal assistants who are the heads of departments. * * * Until dispersed units are pulled together, and authority is placed in department heads as chief assistants to the President, there will be conflict, waste, and indecisiveness in administration." To bring even the housing activities together under one department, if not also those relating to civil defense and possibly others, would thus seem to be in direct accord with the principles of efficient Government administration.

FACILITATION OF RESEARCH

The creation of a department would have the added advantage, the argument proceeds, of making it possible more easily and quickly to conduct the great amount of research that needs to be done before actual solution of urban problems is possible. Research needs to be undertaken, for example, on the problems posed for urban mass transportation facilities by the rapid expansion of metropolitan areas in the past quarter century and on the problems growing out of "the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land." Other questions, such as "parking, traffic * * * central business district, port development * * * [and] metropolitan governmental problems * * * Including problems of annexation and metropolitan urban services distribution" offer equally great possibilities for study. All such problems could be much more effectively studied if brought together under an agency which would have the facilities to attract the services of the Nation's outstanding experts on urban problems. Such a program would have the double advantage of avoiding duplication and repetition and at the same time covering all the important questions now facing cities and metropolitan areas. Today such studies are made in bits and pieces, if made at all, and not only are they therefore uneconomical, but their results are not often widely publicized. A Federal department not only would develop information but would have channels available both to distribute it and to assist city and county officials in applying it. The Department might thus become, its proponents argue, an urban planning assistance agency for the Nation.

INFORMATIONAL CENTER

A further justification offered for a Department of Urban Affairs is that it would

provide a central point in the Federal Government where cities could come for help and information. The American Municipal Association originally based its support of a department largely on these grounds: "The Congress should authorize a new Federal Cabinet post for urban affairs. Unlike other segments of our political economy, such as industry, labor, and agriculture, local governments have no place to turn to in their many dealings with the Federal Government." Instead of one place, there are many. A mayor must often make 6 or 8 visits to get a complete picture, and, to make it even worse, the information he gets at one point is likely to be contradicted at the next. The mayor of Seattle, Allan Pomeroy, expressed the feelings of many of his fellows when he pointed out that "above all, such a department would provide a central clearinghouse for all the specialized problems having to do with intergovernmental relations as they affect central cities and their metropolitan areas." And Carl Feiss, former Urban Renewal Administrator, noted the great advantages of effecting through the creation of a single department "a simplification in the lines of communication between the Federal, State, [and] local agencies so that local public officials would have a real opportunity of finding the right person at the right time for the right purposes and the right programs in order to simplify and expedite the very complicated problems that the localities are facing * * * in this tremendous urbanization that is taking place."

PRACTICAL POLITICAL ARGUMENT

Although not advanced so openly as the foregoing arguments on behalf of a Department of Urban Affairs, another argument has been as influential. This is the argument of practical politics. Gerrymandered as most State legislatures are in favor of rural areas, they have not listened with sympathetic ears to the pleas of urban citizens. In some cases, the dominant upstate (rural) areas are of one political persuasion, the downstate (urban) areas of the other, and this has further complicated the relation between the legislatures and the cities. In disgust and desperation, therefore, city officials have increasingly turned toward Washington for help and guidance. In national politics, although the cards are still stacked against urban voters, at least they are not stacked so high. City officials and urban citizens are convinced that with their own department, and even more their own Secretary, who would serve as their advocate, at last they might begin to get the sympathy and assistance they have long asked for. As Representative YOUNGER has put it, "Agencies and commissions are temporary and, what's more, they're also the stepchildren of government. The chairman of a commission * * * is many, many rungs down the ladder from the Secretary of a department who has daily access to the President's ear. The only favorite sons in Washington are the heads of the executive departments." It follows, therefore, that "only a full-time, full-ranked Secretary * * * can effectively serve the cities of this Nation."

Those who favor a new department declare, furthermore, that there is considerable evidence in other fields to demonstrate that the Secretary of a department does in fact serve as a special advocate for his "constituents." To some degree at least, every Secretary of Agriculture, Labor, or Commerce takes care of the interests of his special clientele and tries to present a good record of performance for the party's sake—and for his own—at the next election. He builds such a record by aggressive leadership in programs in the area of his responsibility. Urban matters, however, have not been carried to the political level by such an advocate. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration simply is not

the political figure that a member—any member—of the traditional Cabinet is. Urban officials see the advantages to be gained in exploiting the political possibilities of a Cabinet post, and though the other justifications they offer are offered seriously and honestly, the political aspects of the situation have obviously been considered.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST A DEPARTMENT

However appealing the case for a Department of Urban Affairs may be, the other side of the coin ought to be considered carefully before a decision is made. Indeed, those opposed to a Department have the stronger case. They argue that such a Department would be politically unwise, administratively unsound, and functionally unnecessary. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, or Urbiculture (a Department by that too clever name seems unlikely in any event), is unwise on the ground of semantics alone. Semantics can be overemphasized, of course, but the words so far suggested for the Department's title constitute a real handicap to its adoption. "Urban Affairs" is naturally contrasted with "rural affairs," and all the old stereotypes about "rural" and "urban" would be aroused by its establishment. "Urban" means cities, and cities are still pictured as sinful and unhealthy as opposed to the farm and the country, which are equated with clean living, hard work, and thrift. Cities are thought to be dominated by bosses and political machines, in contrast with the democratic, independent way of life on the farm. It is not enough to say that this is an incorrect, distorted picture, both of urban and of rural living, nor is it sufficient to point out that cities down through the ages have been centers of freedom, that even today they are more progressive than the rural areas, which are traditionally conservative. Whatever the truth of these characterizations, the important fact is that the rural and small-town population in the United States traditionally views cities with suspicion, and these are the groups that dominate legislative bodies in the States as well as in Congress.

Added to this is the fact that urban also will be contrasted with suburban, and the suburbanite is even more anti big city than his country cousin. At least he is anti downtown big city. One of the principal reasons for the existence of metropolitan areas has been the movement of population to the suburbs made possible with the development of the automobile. To the suburbanite, the city means where he works in the daytime. It means crowds, noise, subways, and social groups he does not like. He feels differently about the suburbs. Politically, the suburbanite is becoming increasingly important. His numbers alone make him a political factor to be counted. In alliance with rural voters, he is a formidable power. Representatives from strictly rural areas may be declining in strength as population moves away from the farms, but the small towns and especially the suburban areas are steadily gaining in population, political power, and importance. All three would be against a Department of Urban Affairs. Why, they would argue, should the whole Nation underwrite a segment of the population who are quite able to take care of themselves? Cities are rich; they do not need help from the Federal Government. An executive department devoted to their interests would simply be a means by which big cities would get increased Federal aid, perhaps to their detriment.

Though opponents of a department might admit that urbanism is a national problem, they argue that ours is a Federal system of government, with certain well-defined areas of power given to the Federal Government and others reserved to the States. Problems of local government, they assert, whether in large or in small urban centers, are primarily

a concern of the States and the local communities themselves. The Federal Government has no responsibility for cities as such, and therefore there is no need for a department. These may not be sound arguments, but they have lots of emotional appeal. They have been used in State legislatures for years with great success. They are and will continue to be just as effective in Congress, where smart city slickers are feared almost as much as they are in State legislatures.

POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES

Not only would these emotional factors make the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs politically difficult, but they would subject the operation of the Department to continual friction with Congress. Every time the Department's budget was scrutinized by Congress, every time a hearing was held on its legislative proposals, the tension between them would be aggravated. Could the Secretary of Urban Affairs deal successfully with Congress under these circumstances?

The very speed with which the idea has been developed and pushed also works against its adoption. Not only does Congress not like innovation, it is not apt to act on so radical a proposal without having before it conclusive evidence that the cities have done all they can to help themselves solve their own problems. To date, such evidence is not forthcoming. Congress likes even less to alter the administrative structure of the Federal Government until it is sure of the soundness of the proposal. In the past, periods of 30 to 40 years have elapsed between the creation of one new executive department and the next. Agencies, bureaus, and commissions are not a great affront to congressional sensibilities; but the creation of a department, affecting as it would the very core of the executive branch, is another matter altogether. Any proposal for a new department, however sound, traditionally has rough going in Congress. As one of the witnesses before the Dawson subcommittee in connection with H.R. 1864 pointed out, "A major stumbling block for H.R. 1864 is that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would elevate consideration of urban problems so high and so fast from present levels of consideration that the sudden jump would be unacceptable to some people." Chiefly, it would be unacceptable to Congress, at least in its present state of mind and membership.

As a matter of practical politics, to propose a Department of Urban Affairs is futile at present because the idea has not built up the kind of political support which would make it possible. President Eisenhower and his top administrative officials have shown no interest in it whatsoever. On the contrary, there is some evidence that they would be strongly opposed to such a department. Nor, for that matter, has there been any grassroots support for it, notwithstanding the formal resolutions of a number of national civic organizations. Even as Representative Dawson acknowledged in the 1955 hearings: "You appreciate that there must be a public interest and demand for this legislation. * * * There must be created within this country a desire to have established a department which is concerned with the problems of the urban dwellers. * * * Sentiment for the idea * * * is necessary in this form of government to make it become a law." Until such sentiment is built up, to talk about its adoption is futile.

A Secretary of Urban Affairs, actively looking to the interests of cities in Washington, would, moreover, add greatly to the centralization of governmental power in Federal hands. As Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, who called the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs "appalling," went on to point out, there is need for coordination of Federal programs involving urban and metropolitan areas, but to vest that power in a new department would be

to create an "all-powerful coordinator * * * in Washington." "On reflection," Rockefeller concluded, "it is self-evident that a Federal department with as much power as this would require would be a Frankenstein." If such a department were ever established, "home rule would become a memory."

Finally, the creation of such a department is politically unlikely because of recent actions regarding the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the functions of which were to be transferred to the Department of Urban Affairs. During its debates on recent housing bills, Congress has given every indication that it contemplates the continued existence of HHFA as the administrative unit for housing programs. By Executive order, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has recently been merged with the Office of Defense Mobilization, to form the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The probability that the functions of either agency might be shifted to a new department in the near future is remote.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFLICTS

Not only are there strong political arguments against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, but there is a strong case against it on grounds of administrative soundness. Creation of a department has come to be regarded as a panacea for all administrative ills. Yet a study of the service departments over the years, and of the Department of Defense in particular, since its creation in 1947, produces considerable evidence that departmentalization is not a guaranteed cure for administrative difficulties. Establishment of a department, indeed, may only delay the cure or force it to take place in different surroundings. Back of the proposal is the idea that a simple organizational change will provide the answer for urban and metropolitan problems. This is a false belief. The mere creation of a new administrative unit is not the answer to a problem as complex as that presented by the phenomenon of metropolitanization. Creation of a department would beg the most important question of all, What is the Federal Government's proper role in urban areas? The answer is not merely to assign urban affairs to a single organizational unit. It is a matter of principle and philosophy, not of method. To create a method without first having established a philosophy to base it on is to put the proverbial cart before the horse. Coming as it does at this time, when the basic issues of intergovernmental relations in metropolitan areas are still unresolved, such a proposal is clearly premature.

Moreover, a Department of Urban Affairs as proposed would be based on a geographical concept rather than on a functional one. To admit it would be to introduce a maverick into the administrative corral. The work of such a department, if all the programs carried on by the Federal Government affecting cities were placed under its jurisdiction, would necessarily cut across the functions of a great many existing agencies and departments. Indeed, once the Pandora's box is opened, how is it to be closed? What programs do not have an urban interest, save those pertaining strictly to agriculture? If housing and related activities and civil defense are the first to be included, how can arguments for the inclusion of a host of others be denied? Thus, in the hearings on the first Younger bill, the representative of the American Municipal Association declared that in his opinion the new Department "should include such items as highway and urban transit, airports and airport administration, public health matters * * * water and air pollution, and juvenile delinquency" in addition to housing and urban development and renewal and civil defense. What would be the effect at least on the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare

of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs? It would certainly conflict with their organization and ongoing programs, to say nothing of the complexities it would introduce into the programs of many independent regulatory agencies. To insert an executive department based on a geographical pattern into a system primarily organized functionally would make for more, rather than less, confusion in the administrative structure.

It is argued that the new department would simply parallel the existing Department of Agriculture and serve city dwellers in the same way that Agriculture serves the farmers. But even if it be admitted that Agriculture is principally concerned with farmers, yet its organizational base is strictly functional. A comparable situation would be created if the new department were made simply the Department of Housing. This title, however, would not give it cognizance over the broad area of urban problems which its sponsors desire. What would be done with activities like airports, highways, and water pollution? Is it suggested that these functions too be divided along geographic lines and that urban highways be placed in the new Department but rural highways left where they are now? Would highway matters be divided between two departments? Would the same duplication be repeated for water and air pollution, airport construction and maintenance, water supply, hospital construction, and all the manifold other urban programs of the Federal Government? Indeed, with what department and agency of the Federal establishment would a department conceived upon geographic lines not conflict? To ask the question is to supply the answer. To create such a department would be to create an organizational misfit.

Moreover, it cannot be conclusively demonstrated that merely because certain activities of the Federal Government reach a particular magnitude they should automatically be brought together under a single executive department. The Veterans' Administration would seem to be a case in point. In terms of the number of employees, size of budget, and amounts of money distributed, it would long ago seem to have deserved elevation to departmental status. Yet it has functioned with benefit to the group it serves through the years without Cabinet status. What advantages would have accrued from converting it into an executive department? Proponents of a Department of Urban Affairs claim that one advantage would be better representation in the administrative structure. The heads of HHFA and OCDM now sit with the President's Cabinet when matters pertaining to them are discussed. What would be gained by giving them secretarial status?

But it is argued that instead of occasional participation in the Cabinet, the Urban Affairs Secretary would be a full-time member. This argument is based on the assumption that the Cabinet is in fact a policy-forming body. Actually the President makes policy, and the Cabinet may or may not be consulted. Confusing the British system, with its theory of Cabinet responsibility, and the American system, where it is sometimes said the Cabinet members are the natural enemies of the President, is responsible for this misapprehension. Under the American system access to only one man, the President, is important, because he bears the chief burden for policymaking. Entree at the White House is much more important than Cabinet status. Harry Hopkins, during World War II, was a good example of a man who did not have Cabinet status but who was much more powerful than any Cabinet officer because of his entree to the President. Indeed, entree to the King was what gave Cabinet officers in England their position of power in the first place. One of the

principal prerogatives of an English Secretary of State was "the privilege of the closet," which meant the right of entree to the King and the right of consulting with him alone.

Close ties with congressional committees and well-organized pressure groups also account for the success of an administrative agency. Certainly the Veterans' Administration owes much of its prolonged success to these factors. A seat in the Cabinet for the Veterans' Administrator would not have been nearly so important in making it possible for him to carry out his agency's program. On the same basis, it cannot be maintained that departmental status and Cabinet representation alone would produce the effective "representation" of urban interests that proponents of the idea claim it would. Good entree at the White House, good working relations with Congress, and effective group pressure produce better results in many cases than a seat in the Cabinet.

BETTER MEANS AVAILABLE

Finally, the opponents of a Department of Urban Affairs argue that it is unnecessary now. Attention to metropolitan problems, they say, is not guaranteed merely by the creation of an executive department. It can be secured as well under the existing arrangement of agencies, once they all recognize "that our metropolitan communities provide the environment within which the greatest number of people live and the largest part of the Nation's business is carried out." What is needed more than an organizational reshuffling is a policy within the entire executive branch to guide all Federal agencies in their urban and metropolitan activities. If such a policy existed, "then the * * * Council of Economic Advisers would be devoting a large share of its attention to the economic problems of urban communities within the framework of the national economy. The * * * Bureau of Public Roads would have a finely articulated program for relating the construction of the Interstate Highway System to the needs and requirements of the group of cities within each of the regions of the United States. The agencies concerned with water resources would be at least as much concerned with the river basins within our metropolitan communities as they are with the problems of irrigation in the West."

Establishment of a department would not necessarily be of any assistance in achieving coordination. Coordination in the executive branch results from common understanding and a will to cooperate among the personnel concerned; these can be achieved among diverse agencies as well as in a single department. Such simple devices as the exchange of personnel between one agency and another and the institution of periodic consultation between program officers would go far toward bringing about coordination. Indeed, a department as big as the proposed Department of Urban Affairs would have its own coordination problems which would have to be settled in some way. One important objection to adopting the proposal is based on past experience within the Federal Government. Over the years, it is notorious that the housing and civil defense officials have vociferously disagreed with each other. Would bringing them together eliminate their differences? How would they be reconciled? Which interest would dominate? A solution which would ignore longstanding conflicts of personnel and philosophy is not a solution at all.

Nor can it be demonstrated that the research and educational programs which are so urgently needed with regard to metropolitan problems can be carried out best by a single department. How much research of a general nature is worth while? In regard to mass transportation, for example, must not a solution be fitted to the needs of each individual metropolitan area? Indeed, opponents of a department argue: Is there a

need for the Federal Government to conduct such research at all? Today there is a host of agencies, public and private, carrying on research on these problems. Commenting on Representative Younger's first bill to establish a department, the editors of the *American City* said:

"In the opinion of the *American City*, the need for an overall * * * department * * * is much less than was the case four decades ago. This is owing, in part, * * * to the spread of the council-manager form of municipal government and the establishment of local planning and zoning boards * * * to the excellent aids to municipal efficiency rendered by such national organizations as the '1313' group with headquarters in Chicago and such citizens' associations as the National Municipal League and the Government Research Association and * * * to the effective work of the various foundations, educational institutions, State leagues of municipalities, and other agencies working for municipal improvements and civic advance. In other words, much * * * research and guidance * * * is now available for municipalities from sources other than the Federal Government, and municipal efficiency can thus be achieved with much less reliance on Uncle Sam than seemed to be essential four decades ago.

Others are willing to admit that research on metropolitan area problems is needed, but argue that this is a staff function and would best be handled by a staff agency. They say that there should be an agency in the Federal Government concerned with urban and metropolitan areas and their problems, but that it should be a staff agency whose concern it would be to develop the facts about metropolitan area problems, which the President and his department and agency chiefs would take into account in framing policy. It is worth noting that the American Municipal Association, which advocated a line Department of Urban Affairs at its 1956 congress, had cooled off considerably toward the proposal by 1957. The declaration of policy adopted by the 1957 congress recommended instead creation of a staff agency, a Council of Urban Advisers, to study metropolitan problems and recommend solutions on the one hand, and to suggest a policy for the coordination of all Federal programs affecting urban areas on the other. Sober second thought seems to have led AMA to the conclusion that although there is truth in the argument that research on urban problems is necessary, this does not require the creation of a new executive department.

Finally, say the opponents of the department, the greatest danger of all lies in the possibility that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would be accepted by Government officials and others as settling the whole problem, when in reality it would provide only an organizational detail. Certainly city officials, the lobbyists they employ, and their organizations might welcome an executive department to use as a waste basket into which they could dump all the metropolitan problems referred to them and thus discharge their responsibilities.

A DEPARTMENT REJECTED

One cannot but conclude that the opponents of a department have the better case. Formulation of a philosophy and evolution of a firm policy based thereon should precede designation of the agency to carry it out. Who executes policy is much less important than what the policy is. What is needed is not merely moving chessmen around on the board, but adopting rules for the game. Given the need for focusing the attention of the Federal Government on metropolitan area problems, creation of a Department of Urban Affairs or its equivalent is not the way to accomplish the objective. The proposal does not make political sense, it is not in accord with the

administrative concepts on which the rest of the executive branch is based, and functionally it would add to the difficulties of effective administration.

Perhaps the most that can be said for a Department of Urban Affairs is that discussion of the idea keeps the need for action with regard to urban problems before the public. But such a department is not feasible at the present time. It is not beyond the realm of possibility, however, that, as Federal activities in metropolitan areas continue to grow, as inevitably they will, an executive department may one day be established. If it is, past experience would indicate that it will result from a gradual evolutionary process over a period of years as was the case with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the meantime, there is much greater need for a Presidential staff agency than for a new line department.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the administration has made a sound case for the reorganization plan under consideration today and I support its rejection.

Contrary to the hopes of many sincere people, including those who have written asking me to support this proposal, I do not think it begins to accomplish the things its sponsors claim for it.

After considerable study I have reached the conclusion that this proposal would be of little real value to the people of my congressional district, or to urban dwellers anywhere, and I am convinced that the arguments of those who support it will not stand up under close scrutiny. I should like to examine some of these arguments briefly here today.

On what grounds do the supporters of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seek its approval? They tell us that unlike the farmer, who has the Department of Agriculture, the urban dweller has no voice in the Federal Government and that this plan will give him one. They say it will bring about greater economy and efficiency in Government. They claim that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have sufficient status to represent and promote adequately the great programs under his direction.

Let us look a little more closely at some of these allegations. We are told that the urban dweller has no voice in Washington and is being neglected. I cannot accept this claim, for the Federal Government is literally filled with articulate spokesmen for our cities, both in Congress and in the executive branch. Would the proponents of this reorganization plan argue that the President is not willing and able to speak effectively for urban dwellers? Do they contend that the President's appointees—as, for example, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Goldberg, or Mr. Weaver—are incapable of speaking forcefully on behalf of those who live in the cities? Are they arguing that the great committees of Congress which deal with urban affairs, such as the House Banking and Currency Committee or the House Education and Labor Committee, are not doing a good job for city dwellers? I do not think the proponents of this plan mean any of these things when they charge that there is no voice for the cities in Washington. In fact,

it is difficult to attach any meaning at all to this charge, which has emotional appeal but precious little substance.

But, say the supporters of this proposal, we must have someone in the very highest councils of Government to speak out on the needs of the urban masses. The farmer, they say, has the Secretary of Agriculture; the city dweller must have a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Putting aside the issue of how much good the Secretary of Agriculture is doing our farmers, let us examine this argument for a moment. Would this proposed Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing be the man who could speak out on problems of unemployment, juvenile delinquency, worker retraining, welfare or civil rights, all problems of great concern to the city dweller? Would he be the man who could speak out on such problems as air and water pollution? On the location of highways, expressways, airports, health centers, or hospitals in our cities?

Under the terms of this reorganization plan, the answer in every case is no, he could not, because the sponsors of the plan have done nothing to give the proposed new Secretary of Urban Affairs any authority over any of these problem areas which are so vitally important to urban living. By the admission of its own backers, this proposal does nothing to enlarge the responsibilities of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It adds no new functions. It gives him no authority he does not already have. Yet, somehow, it is supposed to be an unprecedented boon to our cities and the people who live in them.

Another major argument used by the supporters of this proposal is that it will solve the great need to coordinate the various Federal programs bearing on urban problems. In 1957, the Bureau of the Budget listed 21 Federal programs affecting urban areas. More have been added since then, and I definitely agree that there is a serious need for better coordination of these programs. But this proposal offers absolutely nothing in the way of improved coordination.

As I have already pointed out, this plan gives the HHFA Administrator no new responsibilities and no new programs to administer. He would have nothing more to coordinate as a Secretary of Urban Affairs than he now has to coordinate as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Furthermore, the proposal sets up no new mechanism for coordinating in any way the various programs in other Government departments and agencies which deal with urban problems. In short, the contention that this reorganization plan would result in better coordination is false.

As a matter of fact, however, the Administrator of HHFA already has ample authority to reorganize his Agency in the interests of economy and better coordination whenever he wishes to do so. In the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, the Congress gave the HHFA Administrator, and I quote from the act, "full authority to assign and re-

assign functions and to reorganize his Agency to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Furthermore, although this proposed reorganization plan does nothing to promote better coordination, there already exists within the executive branch a coordinating council which at least partially meets this need, the National Housing Council. The Administrator of HHFA serves as permanent Chairman of this Council, which includes the heads, or their designees, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Veterans' Administration, and the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, along with other key HHFA officials. I submit that the Council holds greater promise for adequate coordination than anything contained in this reorganization plan and that, imaginatively used, it might well fill the void which now exists with regard to coordination. At least this prospect bears further examination.

Still another argument which we hear is that the Administrator of HHFA does not have sufficient stature or prestige in the Government to obtain a fair hearing for the programs under his direction. I know this is not true as far as the Congress is concerned. I hope it is not true that the President is unwilling to listen to the HHFA Administrator now or that he would pay more attention to him and give his programs higher priority if only the Administrator were a Cabinet officer.

The fact is that there is nothing magical about Cabinet status, nothing about it which suddenly makes a man more able or more successful in presenting his programs and proposals. It is a further fact that the present HHFA Administrator is a man of great energy, experience and ability and his stature, both among Members of Congress and within the executive branch, is extremely high. I am certain that his recommendations are given the full attention they deserve.

Furthermore, I am convinced that this would be true of any HHFA Administrator of the same caliber. The records of such agencies as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission or, for that matter, HHFA itself, disprove completely the contention that agencies without Cabinet status have a hard time holding their own in Washington. On the contrary, it is common knowledge that each of these agencies holds a highly respected place within the bureaucratic hierarchy and none has experienced difficulty in securing either public acceptance or financial support for its programs—\$13.5 billion, or one-third of the total nondefense budget, is budgeted this year for these four agencies alone.

Finally, it is said that local communities have difficulty knowing where to go or how to get help from the Federal Government and that they are shunted from agency to agency in their efforts to secure assistance. It is implied that the Department of Urban Affairs contemplated by this proposal will, in effect, provide one-stop service for these communities.

I have already pointed out that this proposal does nothing either to consolidate or to coordinate the dozens of programs in various departments and agencies which bear on urban problems. But there is another point which I want to make and it is this: Any community which has a sound and constructive program or proposal and is willing to bear the substantial amount of responsibility necessary to put that program into effect will neither have trouble finding nor obtaining the various forms of financial assistance available from the Federal Government. This has been true of my own home area of Rochester and Monroe County, N.Y., and it is true of other progressive communities. The trouble comes when a community, or a State, wants Washington to do all its thinking, planning and financing for it. This, I am afraid, is what some city and State officials have in mind when they become so enthusiastic about a proposal like the one we are considering today.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one comment about the manner in which the administration has presented this proposal to the Congress and the country. Realizing, apparently, that on its merits alone this reorganization plan was extremely weak, the administration has attempted to avoid consideration on the merits by clouding the facts and by interjecting both racism and partisan politics into the issue.

They have attempted to label those who oppose their proposal as either against the urban dweller or against the Negro race, or both. They refuse to admit that this plan can be opposed in good faith by a person who appreciates the problems of our growing urban communities or by a person who is sincerely interested in the progress of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. Mr. Chairman, this is demagoguery at its worst. I personally resent it and it ought to be repudiated by the House today. On its merits alone, this proposal should be rejected. Neither the reorganization plan itself nor the tactics which have accompanied its presentation are worthy of the support of the Congress.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old, old saying I am sure many of you have heard and remember, that if you do not have a sense of humor you have no place in public office; and that if the public does not have a sense of humor you will not remain in public office very long.

I have sat through a great many committee hearings in recent years, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Organization of the Committee on Government Operations and have heard numerous measures, like this one before us, for a long, long, long time.

So I have listened with a great deal of interest to some of the statements which have been made here today.

Perhaps, the best way I can describe it, when I think of that which has gone on, is to use an old southern Ohio word which some of you from the more erudite east may misinterpret, and that is, it is to say it is all funny.

I recall a good many years ago, I spent a short vacation at a little inn in Maine where, in those days in its dining room they served all of us who stayed at the inn at one large table. One guest there was a professor from one of the great eastern universities, a very distinguished and learned man, a true scholar and gentleman. I shall not mention the name of his university for obvious reasons, but one evening at the dinner table I said something was "funny." He looked at me with astonishment. He said, "Funny? Mr. Brown, funny—funny?—what do you mean by the word 'funny'?" I replied, "I mean both laughable and peculiar." And I think that is the best description I can give when I say to you that that which has gone on here, in connection with this legislation is both laughable and peculiar—in fact it has been downright funny.

Now let us talk about this legislation for a little while. You know, rather peculiarly, the forerunner of this particular plan, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, was the 29th bill which had been presented to the House Committee on Government Operations to create a department like this in the past 10 years alone—believe it or not—29 bills to do the very same thing that is now being requested by the President of the United States through this reorganization plan. During those years, most of the time, and I regret to have to admit this, but it is true, my good friends on the right side of the aisle controlled the House by a heavy majority, and also controlled the Committee on Government Operations which is headed by a very distinguished man, the present chairman, the gentleman from Chicago who I call my friend, and for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, Mr. DAWSON. All of these 28 bills, in the wisdom—the innate wisdom I might add—after the careful and studied consideration of the committee were laid aside as not worth doing, and as something that should not be done. At that time there was no pressure or desire to have this kind of department set up so it was not until late last August when, all of a sudden, legislation has been for this purpose pending in our committee—where it was very quietly asleep by the way—came to life and took wings, so here we have it today in the form of this reorganization plan.

Now I rather imagine I know where the inspiration for all this sudden activity on the part of my committee came from last August, and why there have been so many positions on this issue changed, so far as members of our committee are concerned.

But let me say to you, I have opposed this type of legislation from the very beginning, as a matter of principle. I wish to clarify one thing, by the way, right now in the beginning, because I shall not refer to it further, and I am glad and I am happy that it has never been discussed at any time in my presence, throughout those years, when we were considering these various legislative bills for the purpose of creating this sort of a department of Cabinet rank has there been any racial issue or matter

discussed in any way. Never has there been any personalities discussed as to who might, or who might not, be appointed Secretary, if the new Department was created as the result of the action of the Congress.

I listened with a great deal of interest to my good friend from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], one of the most able Members of this House, certainly of our committee, and who I have said, publicly stated many times, has an excellent legal mind, and is one of the best pleaders at the bar I know. He made a very telling argument in support of this plan for some 50 minutes today. For the first 20 minutes, at the beginning of his dissertation, in explaining this particular reorganization plan, he insisted it would not do anything, did not mean anything, was nothing to worry about, did not convey any real authority, and that nothing would happen under it. Then for the last 20 minutes of his dissertation he told us how badly this new Department was needed in the cities, and what great wonders it could work for the urban areas of this Nation.

So I think his arguments are both laughable and peculiar, much as I respect my good friend from Florida, because the proposed Department cannot be both.

I will not repeat here the old story of the three blind men who examined the elephant, but you know what I mean.

Seemingly, this bill, this plan, whatever you want to call it, is all things to all men, according to what they want it to be. Some say it would not interfere in city affairs, or would not do any good, and so forth. On the other hand, we have some Members, whom I suspect are going to support this plan, who opposed this resolution of disapproval when it came before our committee and insisted it should be the responsibility and the duty of the Federal Government to even remove the snow from the sidewalks and streets of our cities—and I also got in that same snowstorm on the night before inauguration. It also took me 4 hours to get from the Capitol down to a hotel—but some people really think the Federal Government ought to do something about such situations. Then we had witnesses before the committee who constantly talked about how the Federal Government should accept all the responsibilities of the cities, and of the local communities.

We have heard a great deal of talk here about urban communities. I do not know how many of you have read the bill we had before us in the committee, or how many of you know what an urban community is. In discussing this legislation they talk about the percentage variance in population of urban communities; it is all according to what yardstick you use in your definition of an urban community, but under the bill an urban community would have been any community, whether incorporated or unincorporated, which had two or more houses in it—believe that or not. Now, to me that is both laughable and peculiar. So we must also take everything into consideration.

We have heard a great deal of discussion about the Hoover Commission and what the Hoover Commission said and did. Some of the older Members may possibly recall that back in the dark ages I was the legislative father of the two Hoover Commissions, that I originated the idea, introduced the bills, and put them through Congress to create the two Commissions and spent 5 years as a member thereof. Of course we had some quotations here today from one of the recommendations of the Commission. Let us see what the Hoover Commission was to do: It was to—

promote economy, efficiency, and improve service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

That does not say anything about increasing them.

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

I would like to point out this plan does not do that. It just consolidates only a few of the activities relative to housing, many of which are entirely temporary in nature, unless Congress extends them under a new law.

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government;

(5) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;

Well, if this plan would do all that, perhaps we could all be for it, because there are a lot of these Federal activities that are competitive with private enterprise.

(6) defining responsibilities of officials;

(7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

Let me say we ought to look at facts. There is not a single thing that could be done in the field of housing under this plan that is now before us that cannot be done now by persons and agencies, appointed and staffed by the President of the United States—not a single thing. This plan does not include all the Hoover Commission suggested. It leaves out a great many of the housing activities in right field, and leaves some in left field. They are scattered all over the Federal lot.

I wish to talk about one other thing, if I may, to set the record straight. Mr. YATES, and he is my very good friend, expressed a great deal of concern over what is going to happen to his home city of Chicago unless we enact, or approve, this plan.

It is a great city. I love to go there. I get a little tired sometimes of the snow and of the cold winds off the lake. But I also love the cooling winds that come off the lake in the summertime.

Mr. YATES, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will permit me to state, I made no reference to my home city of Chicago, not that I should not have, but I did not use the word "Chicago" once.

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman may not, but knowing he is from Chicago I am absolutely certain, in my own mind, the gentleman could not possibly take the floor and make such a speech if he did not have Chicago in mind.

Mr. YATES. I will permit the gentleman to look at my remarks and he will not find the name "Chicago" there.

This legislation is for the benefit of all cities, Chicago included.

Mr. BROWN. I am certain in my own mind, and I believe most Members of the House are, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who represents Chicago so ably in this body, always has Chicago in mind in whatever he may say, or in whatever he may do, and he is to be congratulated for that.

Let me go ahead because I want to help curb your fears, calm you down a bit, if I may. You do not have to worry. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] also spoke in favor of this plan, has a method that would take care of all of your problems, Mr. YATES, without adopting this reorganization plan.

Back last July the gentleman from Wisconsin made two speeches. He always speaks very ably. He suggested to the House his plan to solve the problem of Washington, by holding down the population growth of the metropolitan area close to 3 million, in order to save our heritage. He went ahead and talked about the best way to do this thing. This is the title of his address, "Saving the Nation's Capital by Orderly Relocation."

So I just want to remind the gentleman from Illinois Mr. [YATES], because he is not too far away from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], geographically speaking, if he does not watch himself Mr. REUSS may relocate Chicago out in the middle of some desert, perhaps some place in Nevada, for instance, then Mr. YATES will have nothing to worry about and we will not need this reorganization plan.

As I said in the beginning in the debate on this issue, the discussion of this problem, while it is a serious matter, for it would create another sprawling bureaucracy in order to satisfy the desires of those who testified before the committee, it may not amount to anything one way or the other. It cannot be halfway in between nothing and everything. So, that is a little funny; it is a little laughable and peculiar, when you stop to consider it.

We had other witnesses before us, and I want to quote now a great Governor of a great State. Because of my respect for the delegation from that State, I will not mention its name, but the Governor said he was for this plan of creating this new Department with Cabinet rank, the Department of Urban Affairs, so its Secretary could bring pressure—and he used the word "pressure" if you check the record, unless he deleted it—and we have to watch for that, you know—pressure

on the legislature, to do what he thinks his State legislature ought to do, in connection with reapportioning the seats in the legislature itself, a power which, of course, belongs to the States themselves, and, under our Constitution, not to the Federal Government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe those who favor this reorganization plan would quarrel with the statement that its major purpose is to provide the means for enlarging the Federal Government's role in dealing with the problems of our urban areas.

Indeed, the gist of all the arguments we hear in favor of creating the new department is that more Federal action is necessary to solve the problems of our cities. That, certainly, was the burden of the President's message on this plan.

The question facing us today, therefore, is not whether our cities have problems, for they have, and it is not whether action is necessary to solve those problems, for it is. The issue involved here is whether a greater Federal role is necessary and whether it will help or hinder in the solution of urban problems.

Will a new Federal department solve these problems? Those who contend that it will should tell us what wisdom resides in Washington which does not reside in our great urban centers. They should inform us how urban problems, which are as diverse as American cities themselves, are more amenable to solutions dreamed up in Washington than they are to solutions which are devised by those who live on the scene.

Is Federal money necessary to solve our urban problem? Those who say it is should tell us where the wealth of this Nation resides. I call your attention to the revealing words in the President's message on this plan which told us:

In 1959 taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan areas paid over \$13 billion in taxes, or 35 percent, of the total amount of individual income tax.

Certainly, this statistic indicates the heavy concentration of wealth and income in our cities. Certainly, it would be a great paradox for the Federal Government, which relies so heavily upon the wealth of our cities for revenue, to maintain that these areas cannot solve their problems without Federal money.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that neither a new Federal department, nor more Federal funds, are needed to solve our urban problems. I contend that the brains and energy to solve those problems resides in our cities—if they are only put to use—and I contend that the financial resources to solve those problems resides in our cities, for, if it does not, then those resources just do not exist.

The hope of American cities lies within their own boundaries. It does not lie in Washington. It does not lie in some

fancy Washington department. It lies in local officials, local laws, local initiative, local brains, and local funds. But, for just as long as these local instrumentalities are deluded into thinking that the solution lies in Washington, for just so long will the local problems mount and multiply. It is a tragic thing, in my opinion, that this administration has deliberately fostered the belief that the salvation of our cities lies in the passage of a Federal law and the grant of Federal money.

Moreover, I would ask you to think about the nature of our urban problems and whether a centralized approach is best fitted to deal with them. Those problems are as numerous and as different as the number of municipalities in the Nation. They are spread across the land. To solve them from a central bureau, attempting to impose centralized conditions and centralized uniformity upon them, is the height of administrative folly. These are problems which call for decentralization; they call for unique local solutions, and, if you have any doubts, I call your attention to the delays, difficulties, disruptions, and discouragements in the centrally directed urban renewal program—a typical example of an attempt to solve local problems from a Washington bureau.

Even, however, were central direction the best way to solve these problems, I ask you to consider carefully the scope of the Federal program which would be required to deal with them. The bureaucracy which would pile up in Washington if every local decision must be ratified here staggers the imagination. No single bureau can efficiently handle the problems of thousands of diverse localities. No single government can do so. If it tries, it only dissipates its energies and I need not tell you that there was never a time when the concerted energy of the National Government could be more wisely used than in the solution of problems which only the National Government can handle.

We have only one President. We have only one Congress. Their time and capacity are limited, as are those of all human beings. Yet if Washington is to be called upon to give detailed consideration to problems which can be handled more efficiently locally, then this National Government is going to be less effective in dealing with those broad world and national problems which it alone can handle, and I refer to its responsibility to provide for our national defense and security in a world divided into two armed camps, to its efforts to avoid a war which will turn our cities and villages into ashes, to its responsibilities in agriculture, transportation, communications, and industry, to those broad steps for the development and conservation of our national resources and to the maintenance of an environment in which our economy can strengthen and grow.

When the day arrives when the Federal Government will enter into every local decision, when it determines when and how our cities will take care of their own sewage and when and how they will pave their own streets or tear down

their own slums, we will not only have ruined local government as we know it, but we will have made it impossible, through the sheer demand upon its time and energy, for the National Government to deal with those problems which mean life or death to us as a nation.

This plan, with its announced purpose of enlarging the Federal role in local problems, is a giant step in that direction. I urge adoption of the resolution rejecting it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, to conclude debate, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in concluding debate on the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, I would like to pick up some of the arguments that have been made during the afternoon and comment upon them.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], who has served with me many years on the committee, said that urban affairs are not a Federal responsibility, and he inferred that they are local only. Of course, from a legal standpoint, no one can doubt that the local counties, cities, and even the States have responsibilities that differ from those of the Federal Government. However, over the years we who have served here in the Congress know that the cities and the counties and the States have come to the Federal Government for assistance in solving their problems. Whether this is right or whether it is wrong is not the point at issue this afternoon. The fact is that they do come to Washington. Each one of us in our own district offices have these responsible officials coming and asking for flood control, for help in housing, for help in water pollution, and for help in many other fields which go beyond the borders of their political subdivisions. Therefore, the Federal programs have developed because of a proven need for help on the Federal level.

There has been some discussion this afternoon about the percentage of people who live in urban areas and those who live in the agricultural areas. Let me go back to 1862 when one of the great leaders of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we all celebrated last week, recommended that more power be given to an independent agency that was then known as the Department of Agriculture. In 1889 that independent agency was made a Cabinet Department. Now, the argument that the people in the urban areas, whatever that percentage be, do not also deserve a spot at the Cabinet level and Cabinet distinction at the governmental table seems like, at least to me, it rests upon a fallacy as to numbers. Now, if we in 1889 could give to the rural population of 40 million people out of a total population of 60 million a Cabinet Department, then I ask you why should we not give a Cabinet Department to the people who live in the urban areas; 30 percent of the people are now in the rural areas and 70 percent are in the urban areas surrounding the cities. The position is reversed and the need for special attention to urban problems now exists.

So I say from the standpoint of the citizens' interest and citizens' problems the urban areas today almost 80 years later deserve the same kind of attention which we gave to that two-thirds of the population back in 1889 when we made a department out of the independent agency of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat amused by the statement of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] that in 10 years we may not need a Department of Urban Affairs because the trend may be reversed.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that time is late, and we are about ready to vote, and I realize that the Members are tired, but I would like to say in the 2 or 3 minutes left me that Mr. MEADER's argument that the problems of the cities and urban areas will be solved in the next 10 years, or may be solved, is completely unfounded based upon the history of the trends of our population. All predicted population trends indicate that more and more of the people will be concentrated in the cities and less and less in the rural areas. More and more problems will stem from the concentration of population in the urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a reorganization plan today because H.R. 8429, a bill that was reported from the House Committee on Government Operations, was refused clearance by the Rules Committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] chided us somewhat because with 10 members on the Rules Committee and five Republicans on the Rules Committee we could not get this bill out of that committee. I would say to the gentleman from New York that 60 percent of the Democrats voted to get the rule out of the committee, and not 1 percent of the Republicans voted to get the rule out of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the Rules Committee on the Republican side that the fact that they are in the minority does not in one degree decrease their responsibility to the 70 percent of the population who live in the cities and urban areas of our Nation. I want to say to the gentlemen, if they are thinking about their political future, as most of us do in an election year, let them look at the record of response in the urban areas of this country in the last election and let them consider well the response which will be given in the coming election, because it is in the urban areas where the people live, and it is there where the needs of people will occur.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman referred to me. Would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would like to say to the gentleman from California, as I stated when I testified before the gentleman's committee, that I am for the reorganization plan, and I will vote for the reorganization plan. But under most parliamentary systems that I know of it is the responsibility of the majority, in order to legislate, and we gave the majority the Rules Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I request that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks during the general debate prior to the remarks by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 20, 1962.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN. I should like the Chair to state whether my understanding of the parliamentary situation is correct, that the adoption of the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida will in no way affect the final vote on the question whether or not the resolution of disapproval shall or shall not be adopted when it is voted on in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be a vote on the resolution in the House.

Mr. BROWN. That is, the resolution of disapproval?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 530, he reported the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 30, 1962.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the form of the resolution now before us, if one is against Reorganization Plan No. 1, his vote should be for the resolution, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly as it exists. Any Member opposed to the Reorganization Plan No. 1, on the question will vote

"aye," and those in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1 will vote "no."

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 150, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—264

Abbitt	Frazier	Murray
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Nelsen
Adair	Fulton	Norblad
Alexander	Garland	Norrell
Alford	Gary	Nygaard
Alger	Gathings	Osmer
Andersen,	Gavin	Ostertag
Minn.	Goodell	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Gooding	Patman
Andrews	Grant	Pelly
Arends	Griffin	Peterson
Ashbrook	Gross	Pfost
Ashmore	Gubser	Pficher
Auchincloss	Hagan, Ga.	Pillion
Avery	Haley	Poage
Ayres	Hall	Poff
Baker	Halleck	Purcell
Baring	Hardy	Quie
Barry	Harris	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Harrison, Va.	Ray
Bates	Harrison, Wyo.	Reece
Battin	Harsha	Reifel
Becker	Harvey, Ind.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beckworth	Harvey, Mich.	Riehlman
Beeremann	Hebert	Rivers, S.C.
Belcher	Hemphill	Roberts, Ala.
Bell	Henderson	Roberts, Tex.
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Robison
Berry	Hiestand	Rogers, Fla.
Betts	Hoeven	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Roudebush
Bolton	Horan	Rousselot
Bonner	Hosmer	Rutherford
Bow	Hull	St. George
Boykin	Ichord, Mo.	Saylor
Bray	Jarman	Schadeberg
Breeding	Jennings	Schenck
Bromwell	Jensen	Schneebell
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Schweiker
Brown	Johnson, Md.	Schwengel
Broyhill	Jonas	Scott
Bruce	Jones, Ala.	Scranton
Burleson	Jones, Mo.	Seely-Brown
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Selden
Cannon	Kastenmeyer	Short
Casey	Kearns	Shriver
Cederberg	Keith	Sibal
Chamberlain	Kilburn	Sikes
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Siler
Chiperfield	King, N.Y.	Slack
Church	King, Utah	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Coilner	Knox	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kornegay	Springer
Conte	Kunkel	Stafford
Cook	Kyl	Steed
Cooley	Laird	Stephens
Corbett	Landrum	Taber
Cramer	Langen	Taylor
Cunningham	Latta	Teague, Tex.
Curtin	Lennon	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Mass.	Lipscomb	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Thomson, Wis.
Dague	McDonough	Thornberry
Davis.	McIntire	Tollefson
James C.	McSween	Trimble
Davis, John W.	McVey	Tuck
Davis, Tenn.	MacGregor	Udall, Morris K.
Derounian	Mahon	Utt
Derwinski	Marshall	Van Pelt
Devine	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Dole	Martin, Nebr.	Waggonner
Dominick	Mason	Weaver
Dooley	Matthews	Weis
Dorn	May	Westland
Dowdy	Meader	Whalley
Downing	Michel	Wharton
Durno	Miller, N.Y.	Whitener
Elliott	Milliken	Whitten
Ellsworth	Mills	Wickersham
Everett	Minshall	Widnall
Evins	Moeller	Williams
Fenton	Moorehead,	Willis
Findley	Ohio	Wilson, Calif.
Fisher	Morris	Wilson, Ind.
Flynt	Morrison	Winstead
Ford	Morse	Wright
Forrester	Mosher	Young
Fountain	Moulder	Younger

NAYS—150

Addonizio	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Ashley	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Balley	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Baldwin	Hagen, Calif.	Olsen
Barrett	Halpern	O'Neill
Blatnik	Hansen	Perkins
Boland	Harding	Philbin
Bolling	Healey	Pike
Brademas	Hechler	Powell
Brewster	Hollfield	Price
Buckley	Holland	Pucinski
Burke, Ky.	Inouye	Randall
Byrne, Pa.	Joelson	Reuss
Cahill	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Carey	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers, Alaska
Celler	Karsten	Rodino
Chelf	Karth	Rogers, Colo.
Clark	Kee	Rooney
Coad	Kelly	Roosevelt
Cohelan	Keogh	Rostenkowski
Corman	King, Calif.	Roush
Daddario	Kirwan	Ryan, Mich.
Daniels	Kluczynski	Ryan, N.Y.
Dawson	Kowalski	St. Germain
Delaney	Lane	Santangelo
Dent	Lankford	Saund
Denton	Lesinski	Shelley
Diggs	Libonati	Sheppard
Dingell	Lindsay	Shipley
Donohue	Losier	Sisk
Doyle	McDowell	Smith, Iowa
Dulski	McFall	Spence
Dwyer	Macdonald	Staggers
Edmondson	Mack	Stratton
Fallon	Madden	Stubblefield
Farbsteln	Mailliard	Sullivan
Fascell	Mathias	Thomas
Feighan	Merrow	Thompson, N.J.
Finnegan	Miller, Clem	Toll
Fino	Miller,	Tupper
Flood	George P.	Vanik
Fogarty	Montoya	Van Zandt
Friedel	Moorhead, Pa.	Wallhauser
Gallagher	Morgan	Walter
Garmatz	Moss	Watts
Gialmo	Multer	Yates
Gilbert	Murphy	Zablocki
Glenn	Natcher	Zelenko
Gonzalez	Nedzi	
Granahan	Nix	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Aspinall

NOT VOTING—20

Addabbo	Hays	O'Konski
Anfuso	Hoffman, Mich.	Pirnie
Bass, Tenn.	Huddleston	Scherer
Bennett, Mich.	McMillan	Teague, Calif.
Boggs	Magnuson	Ullman
Broomfield	Monagan	
Burke, Mass.	Moore	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Huddleston for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Ullman against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Burke of Massachusetts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. GALLAGHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations and warm good wishes of the Congress to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps.

JOINT MEETING IN HONOR OF LT. COL JOHN H. GLENN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Monday, February 26, 1962, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and, if he can tell us at this time, for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Tomorrow, George Washington's birthday, there will be the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address. There will be no legislative business for the balance of the week.

For the next week, on Monday, there will be the joint meeting to receive Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps.

Monday is District Day and we shall consider H.R. 6747, a juvenile court bill.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservations that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, is it the purpose of the gentleman to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over from tomorrow until Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what happened to the legislation we were supposed to have for tomorrow, the manpower training bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we were supposed to have it up today. We shall bring it up on Tuesday next.

Mr. GROSS. It was my understanding that the gentleman the other day, when inquiry was made concerning the legislative program, told the House that this bill was to be called up today, and that there would be a session on Thursday and probably on Friday of this week. I wonder what happened.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe I said that it might be necessary to have a legislative session on George Washington's Birthday; but the legislative situation now is such that we feel this bill may better be taken up on Tuesday next.

Mr. GROSS. That means that the T. & T. Club will be in operation again this weekend; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. I have no official or personal knowledge of the club to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. GROSS. I can explain it to the gentleman. It is the Thursday-to-Tuesday Club, the T. & T. Club. So it will be in operation again this weekend?

Mr. ALBERT. As I have said, I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

There was no objection.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, ROOSEVELT, DENT, SMITH of Iowa, KEARNS, HESTAND, and GOODELL.

REINTRODUCTION OF QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL TODAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House Members that it is with satisfaction I announce that several distinguished colleagues in both the House and Senate are today sponsoring and introducing the quality stabilization bill.

The quality stabilization bill as reintroduced by me today is the same measure, except for minor clarifications in language, as H.R. 116—the Madden bill—introduced by me at the beginning of this session. In my 20 years in Congress, I have never seen developed such a determined ground swell of support. Daily I receive pleas from every segment of the distributive economy, from every section of the country, urging quick enactment of this bill. Fifty national trade associations have endorsed this measure and all agree this is must legislation. This legislation is important to all the small businessman, to labor, to the manufacturer, the consumer, and is to the advantage of the general economy of our Nation.

During the last few years, the manufacturers and retailers, both large and small, have become alarmed over the avalanche of business failures throughout the Nation. The quality stabilization bill proposes remedies that will halt this assault upon our wholesale and retail distribution channels.

The American system of product distribution is in the process of being disintegrated. The most efficient distribution system in the world is being steadily undermined. The Senate Small Business Committee has reported that small business failures—bankruptcies—businessmen giving up the struggle for survival—climbed in 1961 to the highest point since 1933.

There are about 2 million retailers in America. Eighty-eight percent of them operate in only one location from one store. Seventy percent individually own their own businesses. These are not huge outfits—over 75 percent have annual sales under \$100,000.

There are 165,000 merchant wholesalers in the United States. Ninety-one percent of them are active owners of unincorporated businesses. Seventy-one percent operate from only one building. These are not huge outfits either—77 percent have annual sales under \$1 million.

Out of these people—individual owners of one unit businesses—139,000 decided in 1959, according to statistics from the House Small Business Committee, that doing business in today's jungle was just not worth the kicking around they were getting. It is getting worse every day. The Chicago Tribune on February 13 reports that 400,000 small business firms failed last year.

This high rate of business failures, as a matter of statistics, is attributed to a number of factors.

But statistics do not tell the human side of the story, such as giving up the

plans of years, forfeiting the hope of having a business for a son to step in and take over, and so forth. A good part of this frightening rate of failure is due to predatory, unfair, destructive competition.

Forty-one years ago Lenin stated that the United States would crumble to communism from within. He further stated that the millions of American small businessmen were the great barrier. Small business with rights to fair play, Lenin saw as the strength of America. Khrushchev, noting the increase in small business failures in this country, is joyously quoting his predecessor. There is no need for him to lie. Unless the rights to fairplay are restored by the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, Khrushchev's prediction may come true.

Unrestrained price slashing is rapidly disabling labor, industry, resellers and the public. Our entire economy will continue to deteriorate at a time when leading economists and statesmen agree we need, instead, economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation that can be enacted by Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less-skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts the most. Hundreds of smaller manufacturers of trademarked products have been forced to close their factories or downgrade the quality of their products to suit loss-leader operators as a means of staying in business.

I am very much interested in legislation that will protect brand name rights or trademark rights from the standpoint not only of the small merchant, but also from the standpoint of the consumer and employment.

I am not unmindful of the situation that results when a large discounter can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad.

For every dollar spent by the misguided customer that is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends about \$9 for other and generally inferior products at the regular or higher price. Now, what happens? It does not take long until that product loses customers. They will go into another store a month or two later and say, "I bought this product at such and such a store for such and such a price." I think it is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill is trying to outlaw, to protect the customer, the producer and the small retail man.

We need some protection for the small retailer, the consumer, labor, and for the man who invents and produces a new product and maybe spends years and money to advertise its brand name or a trademark.

The question has often been asked—"Will the quality stabilization bill put the discounter out of business?" I see

no reason why it should. There is no doubt that there will be many brands by reputable manufacturers which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. The legislation is optional for the manufacturer, retailer, and consumer.

The quality stabilization bill recognizes that there is a place in the market for merchandise built to suit a temporary need, or a limited budget. The following story illustrates that market:

A mother was visiting stores with her son and his bride—whom she didn't quite like—helping them select furniture and appliances for their new home. A neighbor woman, who noticed the deliveries, dropped in one evening to nose around a bit. Spotting a brand of mattress she knew, she exclaimed to the mother: "Why on earth, Jennie, did you buy such a mattress? I know the brand and it won't last." The mother whispered quietly to the neighbor: "Neither will the marriage."

There are two ideologies among manufacturers of branded products. So, to provide comprehensive competition in values according to price, we must let each bracket compete fairly with the other. That means we must empower the maker of quality products to prevent unfair use of his reputation by others who would use his good name to help destroy him.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill in this session of Congress will help greatly in the restoration of quality manufacturing and quality distribution—while providing the consumer at the same time much needed protection and relief against shady and deceptive practices in the marketplace.

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's triumph of American space technology was heartening to the entire free world. It proves America's abilities in moving with speed in programs to benefit science and our security. It also indicates tremendous acceleration which has taken place in our space program. The expenditures which have been made in this field are being made manifest in achievement. As the NASA spokesman said, we have reached the end of the beginning.

At this point in our technology, we find our space program calling for six additional one-man launchings and a two-man launch within the next 18 months. The projection beyond that point certainly will be even more ambitious and the requirements in terms of astronauts will be even greater.

Yet, as we stand at this point in our space program, America has a total of seven astronauts trained or in training. The accomplishments of these men are a tribute to them personally and to their superb training. But I believe we must begin an accelerated training program to supply the needs of our program. We have committed this Nation to a \$10 billion program to reach the moon before the end of this decade and certainly additional manned space flight projects in this period will require other substantial expenditures. We must not neglect the most important part of these mechanisms which will fly out into space—the human component. Yesterday's flight by Colonel Glenn demonstrated the difference between manned and unmanned vehicles, and the great value in having human control.

Our program is ambitious and our training program for new men in the space field must be equally ambitious.

I wrote yesterday to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. Webb, and asked that he proceed to study the needs of our program in terms of human resources, both quantitatively and qualitatively and urged him to include a program of space training and conditioning in the coming fiscal program. I ask that the text of my letter be inserted at this point.

FEBRUARY 20, 1962.

Mr. JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and
Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: Congratulations to you and your entire agency for the splendid job which culminated today in the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn, Jr.

The successful flight reemphasizes the acceleration which we have achieved in our space program. I know that we have six additional launchings in Project Mercury scheduled in the next 15 months and possibly an initial launching of Project Gemini. As these projects continue to progress in an ever-accelerated schedule, the need for additional astronauts will become acute.

Certainly, one of our most valuable assets within the next years in space will be competent and adequately trained personnel to carry out the vigorous program of manned space exploration. Yet our program of training has been confined to Project Mercury.

I request that you make a determination at a very early date of the number of trained astronauts that will be required over the next 5 to 10 years and a projection of specific type of scientific training which will be required for the missions that are programmed. I urge that you include in your programing for the coming fiscal year the beginnings of a training program which will guarantee our Nation an adequate supply and reserve of personnel trained and conditioned for space flight.

As each of the astronauts steps into the world spotlight in missions like Colonel Glenn's, it becomes more and more obvious that we have selected fine men and trained them superbly. It is important that this great human resource be expanded to give our Nation a team of space pilots adequate for our ambitious program.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter soon.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the human element

in this space program of ours. We must begin to train new men to deepen our reserve of spacemen lest we find ourselves with the vehicles and the missions for great strides in rocketry and fail to have the men to man them. The men we have trained are proving their greatness. We must act now to provide them with sufficient human support to carry out our ambitious space program effectively and efficiently.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CARL D. PERKINS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AN APPALACHIAN HIGHLANDS PROGRAM

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have, for several years, been studying the land and water problems in the district that I am privileged to represent. I have been searching for a means by which land use and resource programs might be developed to better fit the critical and somewhat unusual problems that exist there.

There is a much larger area which has certain significant physical and economic characteristics in common with those in my district that affect land use and economic development. This vast region of breathtaking beauty might be appropriately termed the "Appalachian highlands" and extends from New York to Alabama. It comprises all or parts of 12 States and about 347 counties.

The unusual conditions keep much of the technical and cost-sharing provisions of our national soil and water conservation programs from applying fully in the area. For that reason, many of the farmers and other landowners of the region have been deprived of the kind and amount of help they need in attacking their land and water problems and in achieving a better economic status.

Although this region has a wide diversity of soil, climatic, and farming conditions, it is generally characterized by small farms in narrow valleys with steep slopes and—except in the bottomlands—shallow soils. The terrain in areas is unsuited to mechanized farming and small operators cannot meet today's economic competition nor afford to make the needed changes in land use. Present programs of cost sharing on an annual basis do not enable landowners to make the long-term adjustments required.

This region has abundant precipitation and a generally plentiful surface water supply, but often suffers from poor seasonal distribution of rainfall. Underground water resources are limited in some places.

The soil structure is generally unstable. Runoff is high and much of the original soil has been removed by erosion which is severe throughout much of the region. Deposits of sterile eroded

material on fertile bottomlands are common. Sedimentation of streams and reservoirs has been accelerated by strip mining. Native soil fertility is usually low and many of the surface soils and subsoils are highly acid.

Nearly 60 percent of the land in the region is unsuited to permanent cultivation. Much land formerly cultivated has been abandoned as cropland and it has been estimated in county-by-county surveys that there will be a further significant decrease of cropland in the next 15 years. Some 60 percent of existing cropland needs conservation treatment. More of this land needs to be shifted to improved pastures, woodland and other suitable uses. Some 70 percent of existing pasture land needs improvement.

This region has witnessed the automation of production of mineral resources, such as coal and oil, and a trend of outward migration of people since World War I. With notable exceptions such as the great valley of Virginia and Tennessee, much of the region is currently less productive per acre and per capita than the rest of the Nation.

Because of these severe soil and water conservation problems, and the somewhat unfavorable terrain and soil structure which aggravates them, together with the decline of other resources, this is a region that clearly needs a special resource program, based on the fundamental concept of integrated planning for the best possible use of all existing land, water, and human resources. Yet this is an area of unparalleled beauty and challenging recreational and natural resource development potential.

I am introducing legislation that would authorize a special-purpose regional land use and conservation program, tailored to the particular and critical land and water needs of the people in this region, and directed toward a goal of resource development and economic betterment.

I want to point out that there is a highly successful precedent for the type of approach I am proposing. Such a special-purpose conservation program has been operating since 1956 in the Great Plains, an area covering parts of 10 States extending from Montana to Texas. The Great Plains is likewise characterized by critical climatic and land use problems unique to that area. This popular program has not required the establishment of any new agency of Government, but rather has served to bring into sharp focus for the particular needs of the region all the forms of assistance that are required to achieve more efficient and safe use of land and to stabilize agriculture and improve economic conditions throughout the area. This program was authorized by Public Law 1021, enacted by the 84th Congress.

Similarly, my proposed program for the Appalachian Highlands would create no new agency of Government, but would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture upon request from appropriate local authorities to designate counties within the Appalachian Highlands in which the Department would provide assistance of the following types to local

organizations and individual landowners and operators:

First. Technical assistance to farmers and other landowners and occupiers to develop a long-range plan for land and water use, resource conservation, and development.

Second. Cost sharing, related to that plan, on a guaranteed basis for the duration of the time required to carry out the conservation plan.

Third. Specially adapted credit to aid in farm reorganization, application of conservation measures, and establishment of desirable alternative land uses.

More specifically, the program would provide Federal assistance, as needed, for:

First. Cropland improvement, including erosion control; pasture development, and drainage.

Second. Development of farm water supplies.

Third. Private woodland improvements including tree planting, removal of noxious and undesirable species, and grazing protection.

Fourth. Revegetation of strip mine spoils and similar sediment source areas.

Fifth. Development of private recreation facilities, including water impoundments, wildlife, hunting, fishing, outdoor recreation, boating, and so forth.

Sixth. Streambank improvement for erosion protection and fish and wildlife.

Seventh. Reorganization and enlargement of operating units for livestock farming and woodland enterprises.

Eighth. Further development of specialized crops such as small fruits, berries, nuts, apples, and so forth.

In addition, the program would serve to expedite the application in the region of other existing programs, such as the small watershed program, the rural areas development program, rural electrification, and others, which would serve to build the resources of the region and provide badly needed economic expansion.

To insure a high degree of local initiative and to keep such a program responsive to the needs of local people, I am proposing that assistance under this program will be provided only after duly constituted local organizations or subdivisions of State government, such as soil conservation districts, have properly presented their needs, and requested designation by the Secretary of Agriculture, of those counties within which such aid is deemed necessary and desirable.

THE ARAB REFUGEE QUESTION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in the debate of the Arab refugee question that just took place in the U.N., the plight of the refugees was used by Arab nations for propaganda purposes only. I am

gratified that our representatives to the U.N. saw through these propaganda efforts.

I hope that in the future the United States will not find it necessary to vote against a resolution that was introduced calling for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab countries. It is a matter of pride to me that the United States supports wholeheartedly the principle of peaceful solutions through negotiations of differences among nations. In keeping with our leadership position in world affairs, the U.S. representatives to the U.N. should always go on record in favor of such direct negotiations whenever there is an opportunity to do so.

The other day I received a copy of a communication to our great President, John F. Kennedy, from Murray H. Shusterman, president of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, dealing with this subject. In a few words, this letter sets forth my views on the position our Government should take in the U.N. whenever the subject of the Arab refugees is considered. Therefore, I include the letter, in its entirety, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JEWISH COMMUNITY
RELATIONS COUNCIL
OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA,
February 1, 1962.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia is the coordinating agency for the 32 major Jewish religious and civic organizations listed on the side of this letterhead. We and our member organizations followed with great interest the recent debate in the U.N. on the Arab refugee issue.

We take this opportunity to commend you and the members of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. for opposing the proposals that were made by representatives of Arab nations for the designation of a U.N. custodian of former Arab properties in Israel; for the enlargement of the Palestine Conciliation Commission and a U.N. investigation of the treatment of Arabs in Israel. These proposals were not advanced to aid the unfortunate refugees but to further the anti-Israel campaign of the sponsoring countries. It is heartening that both the United States and the U.N. General Assembly saw through these propaganda maneuvers.

At the same time, we wish to express our disappointment that the United States voted against the Brazzaville resolution that called for direct Arab-Israel negotiations. We are aware that due to the intransigence of Arab nations, such direct negotiations are not likely to take place in the immediate future. However, our Government must never hesitate to reaffirm its commitment to the principle of peaceful negotiation of international controversies. Resolutions that are not possible of implementation, nevertheless serve the important purpose of keeping the aspiration and goal of peace from being forgotten.

The Arab refugee problem will come up again in the U.N. We trust that in this connection or at any other time when a call for peaceful solutions to international problems are called for, that the U.S. delegation may be counted in the forefront of those nations voting affirmatively for the principle of direct negotiations between the parties to particular disputes.

So that they may be kept informed, we are taking the liberty of sending copies of this

communication to Secretary of State Rusk, Ambassador Stevenson and other members of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. and to our Pennsylvania Senators and Congressmen.

Respectfully yours,

MURRAY H. SHUSTERMAN,
President.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10251) to confer jurisdiction in certain cases on the Secretaries of the military departments to authorize payment from appropriated funds of the military departments of the amounts determined to be owed to contractors under Armed Services contracts, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on the Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Secretary of the Air Force that plans exist for the disposal of the major portion of the East Reservation of Barksdale Air Force Base, La. I am in complete disagreement with this proposal and so are the people of the Fourth Congressional District. We are not in agreement for two very specific reasons.

First of all, this land was bought and paid for by the good people of Shreveport and donated to the Government for a specific military purpose. The site of Barksdale Air Force Base cost the people of Shreveport the sum of \$2,250,000, including interest on bonds which were completely paid off barely 3 years ago. This was an unselfish donation made in the interest of the defense of our Nation.

Now it is proposed that this land be sold at a price near the fair market value of \$1,167,500. The profit from this sale would go into the Treasury of the United States.

It is unfair to these people to take their donated land, given for military usage—declare it no longer needed—and sell it for a profit.

My second specific objection to this proposed sale is my belief that there is no one in the Government today who can accurately predict what our defense needs will be tomorrow in these rapidly changing times. To dispose of a bombing range in Louisiana at the time we are searching for one in North Carolina does not make sense.

The Shreveport Journal recently summarized the opposition that exists to this proposal and I would like to include a

copy of it in these remarks for my colleagues to read.

Alternate proposals for the usage of this land are being studied for presentation to the House Armed Services Committee. One of them is outlined in an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times and I would like to include a copy of this editorial as well.

I hope my colleagues will read these two editorials and join with me in protesting this unfair and unreasonable disposal of this property.

[From the Shreveport Journal, Feb. 14, 1962]
SALE OF BARKSDALE LAND COULD ENDANGER U.S. SECURITY

Plans by the Federal Government to sell off more than one-third of the huge 22,000-acre Barksdale Air Force Base tract which it received as a gift from the city of Shreveport in 1930 constitute a breach of faith with the people of north Louisiana.

The Shreveport Journal condemns this unwarranted proposal as an ill-conceived transaction which could have the effect of destroying one of the world's most magnificent military installations.

The U.S. Air Force's contention as described by Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., that it has no "foreseeable use for the land and therefore intends to dispose of it" is silly.

Neither the Air Force nor any other Federal source can say today how greatly this 8,440-acre portion of the reservation will be needed tomorrow—any more than the original planners of Barksdale could have foreseen in 1930 that today there would be busybody bureaucrats in Washington trying to make a "profit" on land given to the Government by the people of Shreveport for defense purposes.

The Air Force has placed a value of \$1,167,500 on this property, exclusive of mineral rights.

If the Government of the United States is so hard up for money that it must jeopardize the future of Barksdale Air Force Base by selling more than a third of its acreage for a paltry \$1,167,500, then we say—as we have said many times before—that the time is long past due when this Nation should stop throwing away billions all over the world.

Representative WAGGONNER and every other member of the Louisiana congressional delegation should tell the Kennedy administration—from the rooftops of the White House, if necessary—that they will never consent to the sale of a single acre of Barksdale. The Government can save plenty of money if it will quit dishing out millions of dollars annually to Marshal Tito, and other Communists.

There can be no plausible excuse for the sale of any Government defense land to obtain revenues as long as we can find no better use for the money than to give it away.

If there were any moral integrity connected with the Government's proposal to sell a part of the Barksdale reservation, the Air Force would first suggest returning the land without cost to the people who bought it and gave it to their country. The people of Shreveport would be glad to reclaim custody of this acreage and hold it in reserve for the day when the Air Force might possibly recognize it had erred as to the need for the land.

The Journal urges Louisiana's Representatives and Senators to fight with all their ability against this proposed mutilation of one of the Nation's finest defense posts. On the future of Barksdale—including the "excess" acreage—could rest the future of America.

[From the Shreveport Times, Feb. 16, 1962]

WHY NOT MAKE A FEDERAL PRESERVE OF SURPLUS BARKSDALE LAND?

The Times believes that all local governmental and civic forces should unite in every possible step to block the planned Federal sale of 8,440 acres of Barksdale Air Force Base which the Air Force has declared surplus as to military needs.

The first step must be political and it must be directed to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House.

The Air Force has certified to those committees that the property is surplus as to Air Force needs. Action within either or both of them can either push the sale forward to quick consummation, block it completely, or bring about a delay during which local forces can be regrouped and longer range plans made.

Certainly the city of Shreveport should lead in this protest to the congressional committees since the people of Shreveport put up the money to purchase the land for Barksdale to begin with—\$2,250,000 in all, including interest on bonds which were completely paid off only 3 years ago.

But the city of Shreveport must have full backing of all other governmental and civic agencies of not only Caddo and Bossier but of other nearby parishes. All have a deep concern in Barksdale as a key base in national security and as an economic asset to this three-State area.

In all steps taken it must be kept constantly in mind that we are faced with these cold, hard, and irrevocable facts:

1. The Federal Government owns the land and can use it as it wishes, regardless of the circumstances under which it acquired the land.

2. The Air Force has declared the land surplus property so far as military needs are concerned.

3. Under prescribed procedures, the Federal Government can dispose of the land as it sees fit and doubtless will do so unless some satisfactory counterplan can be brought forth. We must recognize that there is little hope for success in seeking only to get the Federal Government to reverse its sale plans—and nothing more.

RETAIN FEDERAL OWNERSHIP

In view of the above facts, the Times proposes that along with immediate steps to at least halt plans for the sale through action in the Armed Services Committees of Congress, local area governmental and civic forces should unite in trying to get the Federal Government to declare the Barksdale acreage a permanent Federal preserve available for public use.

The 8,440 acres could be declared a Federal preserve with public access, such as Kisatchie National Forest in central Louisiana, or a managed Federal recreation area, or a restricted game management preserve.

Under any of these procedures, the Federal Government would retain its title to the land.

The 8,440 acres always would be available for any Federal, military, or other use at any time in the future.

The burden of upkeep and operation of land not needed by the military would be removed from the military.

By good Federal forestry practices a profit could be made on disposal of surplus timber rights even as Federal land ownership and public use of the land were maintained.

All of the people of this area thus would benefit from the action of the people of Shreveport who put up the money to buy the Barksdale site and donated it to their Federal Government for the security of their Nation.

The whole deal would be a splendid gesture of cordial and friendly public relations between Federal Government and local areas

instead of another step creating local resentment against the manner in which Federal authority is used.

The Barksdale acreage could be converted into a beautiful open preserve or recreation area of a type that would be valuable not only locally but as a fine tourist attraction. Or, it could also be kept as a restricted game preserve of perhaps equal value to the public.

The steps proposed by the Times cannot be taken quickly. They will require a lot of work in Washington, a lot of action from local governmental and civic agencies, and a lot of support from Senators LONG and ELLENDER, Representative WAGONNER, and others of the Louisiana delegation.

If the Federal Government is not willing to follow the course we propose, steps then could be considered toward actual purchase of the land by the State of Louisiana. But the land was paid for by local people and given to the Federal Government. All obligations and authority—legal and moral—in connection with disposal of it now rest first of all on the Federal Government. And that is where the first moves should be made by our local governmental and civic forces.

INTEGRAL COG IN DEFENSE

The Times proposal for converting the surplus Barksdale acreage into a Federal preserve applies only if the Federal Government insists on removing the acreage from the control of the Air Force. We believe, as we always have believed, that Barksdale is such an integral part of national security that there should be no tampering with it at any time simply because of changes in weapons of war—changes which in these days may come almost overnight.

The Strategic Air Command, known as SAC, has stood between us—the United States and all of its people—and being taken over by Khrushchev and the Russians. We believe firmly that except for existence of SAC the Soviet would have forced itself upon this Nation by this time either in aggressive war or in other forms of aggression which we would not have been in position to resist.

Barksdale is part of SAC and nothing should be done to lessen its physical structure even though portions of that physical structure may not at the moment be part of the essential national security picture.

Much as we respect both SAC and the U.S. Air Force, they are no more endowed now with any special crystal ball with which to examine the national security future than were those who, when Barksdale first was established, looked on a 200-mile-an-hour B-17 plane, moved by propellers, as the ultimate in air might.

All military installations have potential war value—every war in history has proved it. From a simple business point of view, the more land the better. If this Barksdale acreage is sold, it will be surprising indeed if the U.S. Government does not find it necessary to buy back the same land, or equivalent acreage somewhere else, in the future at many times the price it could get now in public sale.

Even in this proposed sale, the Government is stipulating certain restrictions as to use of part of the acreage, lest there be interference with nearby military installations.

If there have to be restrictions of use, why sell?

If restrictions are necessary for some of the acres now, more restrictions may be needed later.

What then? Buy back the land—or buy new land elsewhere?

We recognize that the Barksdale acreage—originally a bombing range for planes when 10,000 feet was way up in the sky and hitting anywhere near a stationary target marked on the ground with a plow was

accurate bombing—is not essential to immediate Barksdale military activity.

But the mere thought of disturbing anything at Barksdale becomes more and more touchy every day as the existence of a tremendous Russian base only 90 miles off our southern border in the form of Cuba is impressed more and more upon us.

For the Communists, Cuba already is a point of distribution for weapons intended to be used in revolutions in various parts of the Western Hemisphere, especially Latin America. Cuba is believed already to be an intermediate range missile base, with Shreveport within range. Cuba is only about 850 miles from Shreveport, something over an hour for a jet bomber.

One way or another, Federal title to the Barksdale acreage should be retained.

And by no way should it simply be sold to anyone for any private purpose.

It is in every way the people's land—and should be kept that way.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill brought to my attention by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, to remedy a chaotic situation in the aircraft industry which exists because of conflicting State law as to the validity of conveyances of aircraft and related equipment.

The bill does not change the substantive law of the various States but simply amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so that there is a uniform rule as to which State's law applies to a given conveyance, lease, or other transfer of title or interests in such equipment.

At least three rules are now in use, and the uncertainty which this creates in an industry where equipment is constantly in rapid movement across State lines is obvious. The bill would create a uniform rule that the substantive law of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered is applicable. Comparable provisions already exist in relation to ships and motor vehicles, and I urge that prompt action be taken now to solve this problem in regard to aircraft.

Under unanimous consent, I include a memorandum explaining the bill in greater detail in my remarks:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 503 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect the title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment. This is accomplished by providing that the substantive validity of such an instrument, i.e., a conveyance, lease, mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, other instrument executed for security purposes, or assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto, is to be determined by the substantive law of the jurisdiction

within the United States or its territories or possessions in which such instrument is delivered. Thus, the Federal law would look to the substantive laws (as distinguished from the adjective laws, including recording and filing provisions) of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered and if such instrument is valid under that law and is in turn recorded under the applicable provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the instrument would be deemed valid in all jurisdictions in the United States in respect of the property covered by the instrument.

There is an urgent need for the proposed legislation so as to bring order to the chaotic situation with respect to conveyances by and to domestic air carriers.

The laws of the various States differ as to the requirements governing the validity of mortgages, conditional sale agreements, leases, equipment trust agreements and the like. Furthermore, there are at least three theories considered applicable in attempting to resolve the question as to which jurisdiction's laws should be taken into account in determining the validity of many such instruments; namely, (1) the jurisdiction in which the particular property is located at the time the instrument is executed and/or delivered, (2) the jurisdiction within which the instrument is executed and/or delivered, and (3) the residence of the parties to the transaction, particularly the conveyor. Which theory or theories should be adopted regarding a proposed financing of an air carrier incorporated under the laws of one State, maintaining airport facilities and aircraft and related equipment in many States, flying scheduled routes over many more States and seeking the financing from banks located in other States? At the time a chattel mortgage, for example, is given to the banking institution by the air carrier, its airplanes may be located in or over any number of States. Were the parties to such a transaction to follow only the first theory referred to above, at the moment the chattel mortgage on the air carrier's fleet of aircraft (many of which would be in the air) is executed the laws of many States would come into play, and a moment later the laws of different States would apply, notwithstanding any contradiction between the laws of such States. Moreover, there is no real logic in considering the law of State X paramount as to the validity of a chattel mortgage on a specific aircraft when the aircraft is at that moment traveling over the State at a speed in excess of 500 miles an hour and at a height in excess of 40,000 feet.

The proposed legislation would serve to preempt the field as to the substantive validity of such conveyances just as present section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 has, since 1938, preempted the field as to the recording of such conveyances. A provision comparable to the proposed legislation has been applicable to conveyances of U.S.-flag vessels since the enactment of the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920. Similarly, a 1958 amendment to the Motor Carrier Act now provides comparable legislation as to motor vehicles.

The proposed legislation has been drafted within the framework of section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It applies only to those conveyances enumerated in said section and does not conflict with or impinge upon the other provisions of said section or the act.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S TRIP

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote the Secretary of State in order to inquire about the purpose of the Attorney General's around-the-world trip. At that time I read into the RECORD a copy of the letter which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 2041 on February 7, 1962.

Under date of February 9, I received a reply from the Secretary of State which I should like to insert in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent so to do at this point.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 9, 1962.

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I can assure you that you need have no concern about the visit abroad now being taken by the Attorney General, as expressed in your letter to me of February 5.

The Attorney General undertook this visit at my personal request and urging. He had received insistent invitations from high legal authorities of certain other governments which, from my point of view, I was most anxious for him to be able to accept.

Each of our great departments of government, as well as a number of independent agencies, are concerned with matters which reach across national frontiers. We receive in Washington a steady stream of high officials of other governments other than foreign ministers. It has been a great assistance to me to be able to call on most of my colleagues in the Cabinet to undertake one or more missions for us outside the United States. Apart from particular points which Cabinet officers can take up with other governments at the request of the President and myself, the return in good will from such visits is very high.

There can be no doubt about the Attorney General's eminent qualifications for the mission on which he is now embarked nor about the full coordination of his visit with the Secretary and Department of State.

It has already been stated publicly that the Attorney General's trip does not include a visit to Moscow.

Since Mr. Edward Kennedy is traveling as a private citizen and is not on an official mission, I think there is no need for me to comment upon it.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary's letter does not answer the question as to the purpose of this trip. The Secretary makes no comment whatever on the question I raised in respect of the proposed trip to the Soviet Union and any plans in this regard for the future. If there have been "particular points" which the Attorney General has been asked to take up with other governments, we have a right to know the areas in which they lie.

If the purpose of the trip was good will, we should know it. And we should also, I think, have the Secretary's opinion as to whether this kind of Madison Avenue approach is the stuff of which foreign policy is made. Hopefully it is not a substitute for policy. In any event, even assuring such behavior is entirely harmless, the time involved could be far better spent attending to the unfinished work of the Department of Justice here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be extremely sensitive to the importance of bipartisanship in foreign policy. I have supported this administration on matters concerning foreign policy in the past, and I will do so again when I believe it to be right, even when my position may be contrary to the general minority view. However, by the same token, those of us on the minority side who are concerned about foreign affairs have an equal obligation to criticize when it is necessary in the interests of full knowledge and the better administration of government and policy.

AMENDMENT OF THE JUVENILE COURT ACT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the District of Columbia in presenting to this body H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, desires that the Members of the House be fully and completely informed as to the nature of this legislation, the nature of the problem, and the need for the provisions carried in this bill.

The curbing of crime in Washington is not an academic question.

So many crimes of violence have been committed, such as rape, robbery, yoking, mugging, purse snatching, assaults on the person, and the like, that the Metropolitan Police Department deemed it necessary to issue a set of instructions to those Washingtonians who must use the streets after dark to take certain suggested safety precautions. I quote 5 of these suggestions from the list of 26:

Always travel with a companion if possible. Stick to well-traveled, well-lighted streets, wherever possible, whether on foot or in a car.

If you must enter a poorly lighted street, take a good look first to see if anyone is loitering * * *.

Carry your purse hugged close to you.

Keep your car door locked.

Always keep the car in gear. If anyone suspicious approaches you, "take off." This is true, even if it means running a red light.

In mid-1961, five women were forcibly raped in 4 days. Four of the rapes were committed within 13 hours.

Rapes and assaults to rape have been committed in the daytime and at night, on the streets and in homes; even in business establishments. One woman who testified before our subcommittee representing one of the women's clubs said:

Many women have for sometime hesitated to go out at night, regardless of their need, because they fear bodily harm. This is especially true when they have to rely upon public transportation.

She also told the subcommittee that women are not only afraid to go out at night; but they are afraid also to remain in their own homes alone. She said:

Now more and more women are apprehensive about being alone in their homes. This fear is due to the increased number of outrages occurring in so many sections of Washington.

One deplorable circumstance in the District crime picture has been the greater number of violent and brutal crimes committed by teenagers, especially between 16 and 18 years of age. The table on page 14 of the committee report shows that in 1960 the felonies committed by 16- and 17-year-olds were 708, as compared to 671 committed by 18-, 19- and 20-year-olds. That table follows.

Comparison of felony offenses by age groups for the period July 1, 1959, to Apr. 1, 1960

Crime	Age 16 to 17	Age 18, 19, and 20
Rape.....	22	26
Robbery.....	257	200
Attempted robbery.....	17	13
Housebreaking.....	203	272
Auto theft.....	209	160
Total.....	708	671

Part I offenses which include all of the crimes of violence from murder to aggravated assault increased each year since 1957, and were 41 percent higher in 1961 than the 1957 figure.

The Metropolitan Police, under the effective leadership of Chief Robert V. Murray, have been doing a splendid job under very difficult circumstances. They have been handicapped by having too few policemen on the beats and in the prowl cars. Our subcommittee reported to the full committee a bill to increase the strength of the force from 2,500 to 3,000. The full District of Columbia Committee reported the bill out and the Congress passed it.

The Department finished recruiting new personnel sufficient to bring the force to 2,828 strength on February 19, 1962. Fifty police dogs were also secured and trained and are now on the streets.

In the last several months, for the first time since 1957, the constant increase of crime in the District has changed to a slight decrease.

The certainty of apprehension is a powerful factor in restraining the criminal and would-be criminal from the commission of crime. The redoubled efforts of the police are bearing fruit.

The results confirm the judgment of the District Committee and the Congress in providing the Police Department these increased personnel and facilities.

A speedy trial, coupled with adequate punishment when the trial is held, constitute two more powerful factors in the prevention of crime.

This subcommittee, interested as we are in protecting the law-abiding people of Washington and visitors to the National Capital from attacks by rapists, yokers, muggers and other thugs, set up hearings upon a Senate passed bill to

amend the juvenile court law. We believed it important that the subcommittee should make a comprehensive study of the activities of the juvenile court, its methods, and its approach to the serious problem of crime prevention, and rehabilitation of juvenile lawbreakers. We instructed our staff members to secure for the subcommittee all available information, records and statistics relating to these matters.

Looking at the overall crime picture, it is obvious that something has been wrong and seriously wrong in the District of Columbia Juvenile Court.

Our subcommittee staff devoted several months to collecting information, compiling statistics taken from juvenile court records, preparing tables, and correlating the information gathered to be considered by the subcommittee.

Much of the information so prepared may be found in a progress report submitted by the subcommittee to the chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee on August 30, 1960.

That progress report was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 14, pages 18406-18409. It also appears on pages 146-151 of the printed hearings accompanying H.R. 6747, the juvenile court bill which will be considered on Monday, February 26.

This subcommittee continued its study of the juvenile court in the first session of the 87th Congress, and held public hearings on the pending legislation on May 25, June 2 and 3, and August 15, 1961.

The subcommittee then held a number of executive sessions. At the conclusion of the executive sessions, H.R. 6747, was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, and by the full committee to the House.

Senate Bill, S. 1456, the bill upon which the hearings were originally scheduled, provided merely for two additional judges. It makes no provision for change of any kind in the existing juvenile court law. Sponsors of the Senate bill contend that the backlog of cases in the court makes two more judges necessary, but that the present law should be left as is, and not changed in any respect.

The study we have made of the court and its operation impels us to strongly disagree with these contentions. We believe that the changes provided in H.R. 6747 will do much to halt vicious crimes of violence by a very considerable segment of criminal hoodlums who have been preying upon helpless law-abiding people, knowing that they are practically immune from any substantial punishment under existing law and practices.

Present law defines a juvenile as anyone under the age of 18. H.R. 6747 defines a juvenile as anyone under the age of 16.

The pending bill, H.R. 6747, has a background of hearings in the House committee covering nearly 300 pages. Therein is found the testimony of witnesses representing the courts, the Federal and District Governments, the bar association, numerous agencies and organizations, citizens' associations and private individuals. These hearings also carry the results of statistical studies

and findings resulting from the committee study of the juvenile court. The committee study of the court, if not the most complete since the court was established is certainly the most detailed study since reorganization of the court in 1938.

Some of the major provisions of H.R. 6747 are the following:

First. It creates a juvenile court branch within the municipal court of the District of Columbia to provide efficient use of judicial manpower, efficiency in management and administration, and flexibility within the court.

Second. It provides one additional judge.

Third. It retains complete jurisdiction of juveniles within the juvenile court branch.

Fourth. It provides for flexibility in the handling of adult cases—paternity, support, and so forth—either in the juvenile court branch or within the municipal court. Adult cases are now handled in the juvenile court, and make up nearly two-thirds of the backlog of cases in that court.

Fifth. It provides an age limit of 16 years which is realistically related to the local high rate of vicious offenses among 16- to 18-year-old offenders, thus balancing public safety and rehabilitation.

Sixth. It disposes of jury trials for juveniles.

Seventh. It provides for prompt determination of legal sufficiency of complaints against juveniles.

Eighth. It prevents the contradiction of concurrent charges against the same offender in both juvenile and adult courts.

Ninth. It relaxes the mandatory secrecy of the court.

Tenth. It provides for a system of uniform crime reporting in the District of Columbia.

Eleventh. It fixes the juvenile age at 16 years which will automatically take traffic cases from the juvenile court and place them in the traffic court—16-year-olds may obtain driver's license.

Our study shows that the court in the years prior to 1958 handled a heavy intake of cases, operated efficiently, accumulated no backlog, and reduced public costs by increasing court collections from fathers for the support of children.

In contrast, beginning in 1958, the cost per case reached a figure more than double the previous high; court collections dropped by \$450,000; the rate of case intake declined substantially; yet a large backlog developed at the rate of about 25 percent of the annual intake, which at most would justify the need of one-fourth the time of another judge. Additionally, our study shows that substantive changes are needed in the Juvenile Court Act.

One needed substantive change is a relaxation of the mandatory secrecy requirement in the present law. Presently, the law prohibits any member of the general public obtaining information regarding any juvenile court trial or lawbreaker. The judge has no discretion in the matter.

At present any person who has not reached his 18th birthday may commit any crime, however brutal or horrible,

secure in the knowledge that if he is caught, the general public may not witness his trial in the juvenile court, or obtain his name from the court, or obtain any other information regarding him, although he may be a habitual offender, and a many times repeater. His potential victim on the street has no means of knowing his record so as to steer clear of him. He may not be fingerprinted for future identification.

H.R. 6747 would modify the law to this extent: the judge, in his discretion if he saw fit to do so, would have authority to relax this secrecy provision in the case of a felony committed by a juvenile 14 years of age or older at the time of the crime. This authority would be discretionary—not mandatory. In every other case, the secrecy provision of the present law would remain in force.

On this subject matter J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the law-enforcement bulletin for October 1, 1959, had this to say:

The problem of youthful crime—truly a monster of frightening proportions—exists not only in the densely populated metropolitan centers, but in each and every community in the land. Violent crime sprees and the bizarre escapades of young hoodlums, wily and hardened beyond their years, fire the imagination of other young punks across the Nation. Unfortunately, any escape from justice by youthful lawbreakers—through weak court systems, public indifference, soft-headed sentimentality, senseless preference for the rights of the criminal instead of for his victim—can only give encouragement to other young thugs.

It is my firm conviction that the all-out campaign against these flagrant young criminals who commit serious crimes must include publishing their names and crimes for public information, the ready availability of past records for the information of appropriate law-enforcement officers, and fingerprinting of these young lawbreakers for future identification.

At this time, when the increase in youthful crimes constitutes the bulk of the shameful rise in our national crime, serious consideration should be given to lowering the age distinction between a juvenile and an adult violator. We are dealing with vicious young criminals, and they should be treated as such.

Mr. L. Clark Schilder, with many years of experience as a Federal reformatory warden, having handled thousands of boys at Chillicothe, Ohio, and El Reno, Okla., told the subcommittee this—hearings, pages 139-140:

I do not like to feel we should expose a kid's name in the paper. However, regardless of my own feelings, I think that I should let my mind rule my heart and say that we have a bad trend. We might as well face up to the problem that a lot of our kids are out of hand. If we do not face up to it squarely and if we let our hearts rule our minds, I think we are headed for even more serious trouble in the next decade.

How would publicity react? Would it serve to alert neighbors? I would say "Yes." Would it prompt the parents to supervise better? Perhaps some of them just do not give a doggone, but I think it would keep them on their toes in many respects. If their child's name were in the papers, they would be a bit more interested in knowing what he was doing and what he was up to.

On the same subject, Inspector John E. Winters, commanding officer, Youth

Aid Division, Metropolitan Police Department, told the subcommittee—hearings, page 60:

As I stated previously, Mr. Garber, the 16- and 17-year-olds are, in our opinion, fully aware of what they are doing. I do not think there is any doubt at all that some of them are hiding behind the protection that the law throws them behind as juveniles.

Again, this is not speculation on my part, because I might point out to you that although last year was a little different, the 2 previous years the 16- and 17-year-olds were responsible for more part I offenses than the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old groups put together. That was particularly true 3 years ago. The difference between the two the year before last was very little. The older age group was a little more. Last year it was different. The older group, 18 through 20, did account for more offenses.

I have broken it down this way: Since 1954 through 1959, of all the arrests made for part I offenses, the 16- and 17-year-old group accounted for 46 percent of those arrests as compared to the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old group. Maybe that will clear it up. It is out of proportion to the total number involved.

Illustrating the propriety of fixing the maximum juvenile court age at 16 years, Inspector Winters said this—hearings, page 47:

Why do we say this, and what would we base this on? I would like to call the committee's attention to several acts of Congress which in our opinion have established the age of 16 to be the age of responsibility. First of all, by an act of Congress, a person 16 years of age can legally operate a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia, and I do not think anyone would say that that is not a serious responsibility.

Secondly, it is the age that was established for the provision of waiver of jurisdiction. It is the age at which compulsory school attendance is no longer required. It is the age under which the rape statute is invoked, regardless of consent. It is the age under which in the Miller Sex Act penalties are doubled for the commission of certain acts against children, such as sodomy, indecent acts, prostitution, and so forth. In other words, the 16-year-old is regarded the same as far as his actions are concerned as any other adult. It is the age at which tobacco can be sold in any of its form to a person.

In our efforts to reach a proper conclusion as to the appropriate maximum age for juvenile court jurisdiction, we questioned the judge of the district juvenile court as to his reasons for insisting upon 18 years. The questions and answers are as follows—hearings, page 34:

Mr. DAVIS. Why should the statute place it at 18 years?

Judge KETCHAM. I suppose it is a question of where you draw the line. Some parts draw the line at 21. The military draws it at 17. Schools draw it at 16 for completion of school. I do not know the background sufficiently to know why 18 was picked exactly, but it is the most common and the most universal throughout the country.

Mr. DAVIS. In Baltimore I believe it is 16.

Judge KETCHAM. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. My recollection is that it is 16 in the State of Georgia. I have not checked many of the jurisdictions, but I am wondering if you could give us any reason why the age should be 18 instead of 16?

Judge KETCHAM. I am afraid I could not give anything other than examples of precedent and tradition.

Whether anyone agrees with the uncertainty expressed by Judge Ketcham, there is, or should be, some reason for establishing an age limit for juveniles. The committee believes that the local circumstances should guide in setting the juvenile age limit. These local factors include the incidence of juvenile crime, the age at which the preponderance of crimes of violence are committed, and the percentage of repeat offenders in the age group.

Evidence given the committee shows that the maximum juvenile court age in the city of Baltimore is 16; that it is 16 in New York City, and that the mayor of New York City submitted a program to combat juvenile delinquency in which he advocated a reduction of age from 16 to 15 for violent offenses such as murder, rape, and so forth (hearings, p. 141).

The committee believes that within the philosophy of the juvenile court, equal importance is and should be attached to the protection of the public and to the rehabilitation and restoration of juveniles to society. When the preponderance of repeat offenders falls within an age group and the heavy preponderance of the offenses in the age group is committed by those repeat offenders, the balance swings to the need for the safety of the community. People of the community are entitled to reasonable protection of their property from arson, housebreaking, vandalism, and theft and protection of their persons from murder, rape, robbery, yokings, and assaults with weapons.

The committee finds that under the rules of law applying in the District of Columbia, the age limit of 18 for juveniles no longer provides the necessary protection to the residents of the District or for the millions of people visiting the Nation's Capital each year.

Those who oppose the 16-year maximum age contend that the power of the judge to waive cases to the U.S. district court is ample protection against violent crimes committed by lawbreakers up to 18 years of age. An actual case of rape and robbery which occurred while the committee's investigation was being conducted demonstrates the need for reduction of the age to 16 years.

A rapist between 16 and 17 years of age, at gunpoint raped a young girl who was a student in a university here. He then robbed her of \$2. The police caught him, and because he was under 18, he had to go to the juvenile court. There was no doubt of his guilt. The juvenile court had full authority to transfer the case to the Federal court, where the perpetrator of the two serious and outrageous crimes of rape and robbery could have been adequately punished.

The case was not transferred. The name of the rapist and robber was kept secret.

After a secret trial, the juvenile court ordered him to the National Training School here in Washington until he reaches his 18th birthday. If he remains

in the training school until he is 18, his term will be about 18 months.

The judge could have fixed his term to run until 21 years. He could have waived the case to the U.S. district court where adequate punishment could have been meted out for his crimes against this helpless girl.

The representative of the juvenile court testifying before our subcommittee undertook to justify the court's action on the ground that the defendant appeared to be making a good adjustment in school. A portion of the testimony about the case was as follows:

Mr. DAVIS. How many times did he rape this girl?

Mr. LEVATHES. I do not know. I believe it was once.

Mr. DAVIS. Was it not twice?

Mr. LEVATHES. I do not know.

Mr. DAVIS. How much did he rob her of?

Mr. LEVATHES. \$2.

Mr. DAVIS. So at least he committed one rape and one robbery?

Mr. LEVATHES. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. And that is the sort of case you say, because he was doing well in school, you thought it should not be waived?

Mr. LEVATHES. I did not think so. The judge studied that case very carefully.

The committee does not believe that the general public can be afforded a proper measure of protection, with rape and robbery cases receiving this kind of disposition.

REHABILITATION OF JUVENILES

The reason for the establishment of juvenile courts was to achieve the rehabilitation of young offenders. The job of the juvenile court is to diagnose delinquency and to prescribe the rehabilitation deemed necessary for each juvenile. The success of the court will be shown in the rehabilitation it accomplishes.

The success of a court in its rehabilitation efforts will be indicated by the percentage of repeat offenders returning to the court. If the percentage declines, this means the court is effective. If the percentage remains about the same, the court is holding its own. If the percentage of repeat offenders increases, the court's rehabilitation is deficient. What does the record show regarding the juvenile court of the District?

Table 18 of the annual statistical report of the juvenile court for 1959 shows the percentage of repeat offenders among individual juveniles. This table reports that 49.2 percent of the juveniles of all ages before the court were repeat offenders that year. Table 7 of the statistical report for the court for 1961 shows an increase in repeat offenders by 4.7 percent to 53.9 percent of all juveniles.

Such an increase in the percentage of repeat offenders is a cause for concern when the practices and procedures of the court are such as to explain the increase. Several of the court's operations may produce this undesirable result.

First, today the juvenile delinquent is not brought promptly before the judge to determine his involvement in the offense charged. The executive assistant to the judge testified that a complete

social study and investigation is conducted before a juvenile case is petitioned to the court. He stated that this study took at least 4 to 6 weeks. As a result, the rehabilitative value of prompt court action is lost to the juvenile, because the intervening time blurs the relationship between the court action and his offense. Prior to 1958, the judge then sitting determined the question of delinquency promptly, and made the final disposition of the case after the investigation and social study.

Second, the court by its own rule will make no commitment of a juvenile to the National Training School for more than 18 months or beyond the 18th birthday, whichever is longer. This is true for the most serious offenses not waived to the adult court. Existing law permits commitments of juveniles to the age of 21.

Third, the court follows no uniform policy of waiving violent and vicious crimes to the adult court. Hardened young criminals thus may be sent to training school or rehabilitation centers where they associate with and are a detrimental influence on other juveniles who do have some potential for rehabilitation.

Fourth, the court in the case of "In Re Four Youths" ruled that the statements of juveniles are unreliable, and therefore the court may exclude testimony regarding confessions or statements made by a juvenile to the police. Regardless of effective police work, this can place the juvenile beyond the reach of the court's rehabilitation because of dismissal of the case.

Fifth, many juveniles referred to the court on serious charges may never see the judge or the inside of the courtroom. Table 12 of the juvenile court statistical report for 1961 notes the following "cases disposed of by Director of Social Work without judicial action": Arson, 2 cases; aggravated assault, 52 cases; house-breaking, residence and nonresidence, 190 cases; robbery, 37 cases; rape, 2 cases; carnal knowledge, 10 cases. These are samples which serve to illustrate the point.

CORPORATION COUNSEL APPROVES H.R. 6747

The Office of the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia is the agency most closely associated with the juvenile court. Outside of the court itself, no other office is so fully informed of the work of the court, its handling of juvenile and adult cases, its caseload, its organization, procedures and problems. Consequently, testimony from this Office is most expert, informative, and valuable in character.

During the hearings before the committee, the Corporation Counsel and two of his assistants, proved to be the most knowledgeable among the witnesses who testified. The Corporation Counsel presented the recommendations and views of the Board of Commissioners and thereafter his own personal views concerning the provisions of H.R. 6747.

As to his preference regarding the pending bills relating to the juvenile

court, Mr. Gray, the Corporation Counsel, stated:

I am in favor of the principles set forth in the committee bill. I think it is in the interest of efficient administration of justice to have an overall administrative direction provided. I think it would be beneficial to the court for consultation and advice. I think probably the procedures would be vastly improved, particularly those relating to the adults.

I think the committee's proposition of transferring those adult cases to the criminal courts is definitely a step in the right direction.

So far as transferring the juvenile jurisdiction to a juvenile court branch, and changing the juvenile court from an autonomous court to simply another branch of another court, the principal function of the juvenile court is to apply those rehabilitative processes and procedures to the juveniles who are worthy or capable of being rehabilitated. But that can be done just as well as a branch of the municipal court as in an autonomous court. As I say, the benefits of the additional wisdom and experience of the chief judge of the municipal court, I think, would be very beneficial if applied to the juvenile court.

In discussing the caseload of the juvenile court, Mr. Gray was questioned concerning the separation of the adult jurisdiction from the juvenile court as recommended by the Commissioners. He supported this separation of juvenile and adult cases. Mr. Gray verified the fact that about two-thirds of the court's backlog was adult cases. When asked if two judges would be necessary to handle juvenile cases, if the adult jurisdiction were removed from the juvenile court, Mr. Gray responded:

Well, I do not see why, after approximately 60 percent of the jurisdiction is transferred to another court, one judge should not be able to handle the remaining 40 percent.

This is essentially in harmony with the position taken by the committee in the pending bill. If one judge can handle the adult jurisdiction recommended for transfer to the adult court by the Commissioners and the present single judge could handle the remaining juvenile cases left in the juvenile court, it is obvious that the one additional judge provided in this bill is all the additional judge power needed.

Testifying before the House District Committee regarding pending legislation were representatives of ordinary citizens asking that the Congress give a realistic recognition of the crime hazards to the law-abiding citizen in his daily pursuits, and urging that crime be called crime, and that vicious offenders be dealt with and removed from society as a matter of public protection.

Mrs. Ernest W. Howard, vice chairman of the Legislative Committee of the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, which has more than 4,000 members, testified that the federation had for the third successive time affirmed its position on the lowering of age limit of juveniles from 18 to 16, and recommended passage of H.R. 6747. Mrs. Howard stated:

We are here primarily interested in the recent crime wave. The District Federation of Women's Clubs has been represented here

on the Hill for the past 29 years, coming over here for appropriations for the police, for the welfare of citizens of the District.

We have been interested in and studying the juvenile court since 1932, but more especially since 1938, when they had the reorganization.

We believe the juvenile court has entirely too much under its jurisdiction. It should stick to juveniles and nothing else * * * so we are very much in favor of H.R. 6747 and we do hope particularly that the age limit will be lowered.

Mrs. Howard similarly testified at the hearings on crime in the District of Columbia in May 1961 as follows:

We in the Federation of Women's Clubs in 1955 endorsed the lowering of the age from 18 to 16. We believe that after 16 you are no longer a juvenile. We think that a 6-footer or 5-footer at 16 who is old enough to rape a woman is old enough to be tried as an adult.

On April 24, 1961, we reaffirmed our stand on the lowering of the age limit.

The women in the District—and even the men now—are afraid to go in the street at night. Women's organizations have had to change their meeting times to daytime. Women will not walk two blocks after the sun is down.

Now we are even afraid to meet two girls on the street together. It used to be just the boys.

We believe there should be punishment commensurate with the crime and we think that there is no juvenile capable of raping a woman. Juvenile facilities are for rehabilitation and not for punishment.

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, who has had a long and active life in the District of Columbia, having been the president and leader of at least 12 organizations, a member of the Washington Association for Criminal Justice, and the Citizens' Crime Commission, appeared representing the Kalorama Citizens' Association. She advised the committee that on June 13, 1961, the citizens' association endorsed H.R. 6747 at a special board of directors meeting. She also advised that similar action was taken by a special board of directors meeting of the Women's City Club on July 10, 1961.

Mrs. Margaret A. Fisher testified representing the Washington Council of Citizens Associations. The council is composed of 10 individual citizens' associations. Mrs. Fisher advised the committee of the council's approval of H.R. 6747 at their June 14, 1961, meeting.

Mrs. Fisher stated that the 10 associations approved the bill, "because they feel that this bill would correct many existing evils, one of which would be to treat the so-called juvenile as an adult and make him responsible when adult crimes are committed." Mrs. Fisher questioned the committee, "Is it too much to expect that our homes and streets should be safe not only for our citizens and taxpayers, but for our visitors from other States and for people from foreign countries?"

Mr. Grover M. Koockogey, president of the Kalorama Citizens' Association, supported passage of H.R. 6747, and told the subcommittee:

Our association has been on record in favor of the principles of this bill, H.R. 6747, for sometime past. Three years ago

we passed a resolution to have the maximum age for juveniles accused of felonies reduced to 16.

Suppose we do add two judges, with staffs, to clean up the backlog. What will the three judges do to keep busy after the backlog is cleared up? Once these judges and their staffs get on the payroll, they will stay there—and every member of their staffs.

This bill is an intelligent effort to solve the problem in the best possible way—transfer judges from the other court to help out until the docket is current. While not lacking in compassion for juvenile delinquents, it is gratifying to note that it also shows some compassion for the forgotten men and women, the District of Columbia taxpayers.

At the hearings on the crime situation in the District of Columbia in May 1961, Mrs. Phyllis J. Gruverman, president of

the Altrusa Club of Washington, which is a classified service club, composed of executive and professional women, testified to express the concern of the members of her organization. At that time, Mrs. Gruverman stated:

Juvenile delinquents apparently are aware of that fact that their cases cannot be promptly heard that in all probability they will be placed on parole or released to the custody of parents who apparently are unable to cope with them.

As is shown by the following table, prior to 1958 under the previous judge, there was no backlog of cases. This table also shows cost of operation, number of positions, number of cases filed, and amount of money collected by the court, under the former judge and the present judge:

Consolidated table on juvenile court of the District of Columbia, showing appropriations, personnel, petitions filed, petitions disposed of, backlog, collections, and unit costs per case disposed of

[Extracts from Appropriations Committee hearings, juvenile court statistics, and District of Columbia annual reports]

Fiscal year	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Appropriation.....	\$327,000	\$347,000	\$407,000	\$428,000	\$490,900	\$573,000	\$620,000	\$689,700
Positions authorized.....	72	74	80	81	86	95	97	103
New juvenile petitions filed.....	2,057	1,757	1,877	1,846	1,870	1,593	1,725	-----
New adult petitions filed.....	1,407	1,516	1,797	1,578	1,027	993	1,485	-----
Total new petitions filed.....	3,464	3,273	3,674	3,424	2,897	2,586	3,210	-----
Backlog of juvenile petitions.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	270	235	502	-----
Backlog of adult petitions.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	522	510	1,165	-----
Total backlog.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	822	745	1,667	-----
Cost per petition disposed of.....	\$94.40	\$106.01	\$110.77	\$123.29	\$236.57	\$215.17	\$270.98	-----
Court collections.....	\$484,393	\$399,717	\$785,000	\$945,677	\$626,415	\$511,931	\$506,040	-----

¹ Present judge took office at this point.

Reasonable conclusions which may be drawn from the subcommittee hearings and the committee report are the following:

First. No backlog of cases existed in the court prior to the change in judges and the reorganization of the court during fiscal year 1958. Only about one-third of that backlog are juvenile cases, nearly two-thirds are adult cases.

Second. The court intake of new juvenile petitions and new adult informations has averaged 400 less per year beginning in 1958 than the average number received by the court in the years preceding 1958.

Third. No supportable statistics or facts were presented which demonstrate that two additional judges are necessary to dispose of the present intake of cases by the court, or to dispose of the existing backlog.

Fourth. Changes in procedures for handling juvenile cases in 1958 were followed by the accumulation of a backlog in juvenile case for the first time.

Fifth. The court discontinued hearing adult case for a period of weeks in 1958. This created the first significant backlog of adult cases.

Sixth. In the last year under the previous judge, court collections were \$945,677 in 1957. These collections dropped to \$506,040 in 1961, under the present judge.

Seventh. Changes in handling of adult cases in 1958 resulted in a loss of more

than \$300,000 in court collections in that year.

Eighth. Court collections have declined every year since 1957 and are now more than \$400,000 less than in 1957.

Ninth. The cost per case handled by the court increased from \$123 in 1957 to \$270 in 1960.

Tenth. Present law brings juveniles into the court as delinquents on matters involving no element of delinquent conduct.

Eleventh. Present law results in juvenile cases being before the court for weeks or even months without any determination that the complaint is legally sufficient to give the court jurisdiction.

Twelfth. Under present law, the same offender may be charged in the juvenile court as a juvenile and in the U.S. district court as an adult at the same time.

Thirteenth. The District of Columbia Juvenile Court Act is inconsistent with the Federal Juvenile Act and is one of the very few, if not the only law providing for a trial by jury for juveniles.

In summary, the court prior to 1958 handled a heavy intake of cases, operated efficiently, accumulated no backlog, and reduced public costs by increasing court collections. In contrast, beginning in 1958, the cost per case reached more than double the previous high; court collections dropped by \$450,000; the rate of case intake declined substantially yet a backlog developed at the rate of about 25 percent of the annual intake justify-

ing at most the need of one-fourth the time of another judge. Additionally, substantive changes are needed in the Juvenile Court Act.

These and other findings are some of the reasons why the committee was asked to amend the present Juvenile Court Act in addition to providing the needed judicial manpower.

Various recommendations for changes in the law were presented to the committee by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners of the District, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Youth Aid Division of the Metropolitan Police Department, other organizations, citizens' groups, and individuals.

The House District Committee might easily have yielded to pressure by prescribing the "two judge" anesthetic to hide the ills of the court. Such action by the committee and the Congress may quiet the urgings of the "two more judges and nothing else" pressure groups. This would but make certain that within 3 to 5 years a public cry would swell up within the District pleading with the Congress to do something with an inefficient, confused, inadequate juvenile court which achieved neither rehabilitation of juveniles nor gave any reasonable protection to the public. We feel the House District Committee and the House would shirk a public duty to follow such a course.

In addition to judges, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia needs urgently efficient supervision and administration. It needs good management. It needs changes in law for more efficient operation. It needs to be oriented to a better balance between rehabilitation and public safety. The taxpayers of the District have a right to expect Congress to lift from them the burden of the near half million dollar loss in collections each year. The pending bill, H.R. 6747, is designed to accomplish these things.

The bill is designed to bring the court to a current operation basis free from backlog. It is designed to keep the court free from backlog. It is designed to provide a flexibility of operation impossible under present law. It keeps the court in the same building, with the same noncriminal atmosphere in juvenile cases, with the same court personnel. The committee found this court deep in trouble. The bill is designed to get it out of trouble and keep it out of trouble.

PRESSURE CAMPAIGN

During the past 3 years, there has been a pressure group campaign for two more judges and nothing else for the juvenile court. This campaign is still going on. It may flower again as this bill comes before the House for action.

These activities have deteriorated into a drive to save face rather than save the court. The initial mistake of these pressure people was the acceptance and use of a mass of incorrect statistical material, warped comparisons, and faulty conclusions without any real investigation or study of the court or its operations.

Some major contentions have been used in this campaign. The first contention related to the hearing load of the court. Inflated figures were used indicating that the hearings in the court in 1959 would be as high as 13,000. This argument exploded after committee examination of and the flow charting of the court's operations. Thereafter, the court's own statistics for 1959 showed 5,200 hearings, not 13,000 or even 10,000.

The second argument was based on a comparison of the District with other cities as to population and the number of juvenile court judges. This comparison purported to prove that three judges were needed in the District juvenile court. This contention became transparently faulty when a committee study showed that if the three judge court formula for the District were applied to the cities used in the comparison, every one of the other cities would have to appoint more judges.

The providing of judges for the juvenile court should be on a similar showing of need to get the business done and not on the basis of irrelevant comparisons.

Since 1906, the juvenile age limit has been increased from 17 to 18, the jurisdiction of the court has been increased, appropriations and personnel of the court have been increased at least tenfold; and an effective youth aid division established in the police department, which is active in delinquency prevention and juvenile screening, substantially reduces the number of juveniles which otherwise would reach the court. The need for judges in a court depends upon the caseload of the court and the facilities for disposing of those cases.

JURISDICTION AND OPERATION OF THE COURT

The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia was established as, and is, an autonomous court. It is housed in its own court building where one courtroom is equipped and used. A second and possibly a third courtroom could be provided within the building if necessary. The judge of the court has complete control of its operations and is subject to no other agency or authority in the District as to its activities and management. The staff of the single judge court exceeds 100 persons, compared with a staff of 195 employees in the 16 judge municipal court.

The Congress has been responsive to the needs of the court for increased staff and funds, and both have been increased from year to year. The consolidated table on page 11 of the committee report accompanying H.R. 6747 shows approximately a 50-percent increase in appropriations and a 25-percent increase in personnel during the 4 years ending in 1961.

This consolidated table reveals clearly what has happened in the juvenile court. During the 3 years ending with 1957, the court had an average case intake 15 percent heavier than in the succeeding 3 years. The judge during those 3 years, though burdened, operated the court efficiently, accumulated no backlog, and increased court collections by \$350,000 with smaller appropriations and less personnel. The successor judge, during the years 1958 through 1960, has had an

average case intake of 400 fewer cases, disposed of an average of more than 40 percent less cases, built a backlog of more than 1,600 cases, allowed collections to drop by more than \$400,000 even though Congress each year approved more funds and additional personnel. During this time the cost per case handled increased from \$123 to \$270. This presents the picture of a court in real trouble—trouble that requires a remedy beyond mere addition of judicial manpower.

While studying the needs of the court, the committee discovered other basic problems requiring attention if this court were to be restored to and kept on an efficient basis.

Contrary to the impression of many people, the juvenile court is not limited to juvenile matters. Nor are all its proceedings noncriminal in nature. The jurisdiction of the court brings before its judge both juveniles and adults. According to testimony before the committee, about 60 percent of the court's work involves adult matters and the remaining 40 percent are juvenile problems. The backlog of the court is predominantly adult cases. The latest statistical report of the court for the quarter ending December 31, 1961, shows that 60 percent of the backlog of cases are adult cases.

The criminal jurisdiction of the court involves only adult cases, such as criminal nonsupport, contributing to delinquency, violation of education and child labor laws. During the last quarter of 1961, nearly 40 percent of the adult cases disposed of by the court involved the use of the criminal jurisdiction of the court.

The judge of the juvenile court in a statement to the committee said he "chafed" under the burden of the adult cases. Other witnesses raised the suggestion of separation of the adult and juvenile jurisdiction of the court. The committee has sought to provide some modification to meet this issue.

The committee likewise found urgent need for amendment of the Juvenile Court Act to improve court procedures. I mention these examples by way of illustration.

An example of a needed amendment relates to traffic violations by licensed operators of juvenile age. At present, all traffic violations of juveniles up to 18 years of age must be referred to the juvenile court. Minor offenses such as overtime parking, improper signals, and wrong turns, which do not involve any element of delinquent conduct, must be added to the caseload of the court.

At age 16, a vehicle operator's license may be issued and the operator assumes the same responsibilities as an adult. For such violations, an adult may post and forfeit collateral. It is an imposition on the juvenile and a waste of court time to be compelled to handle such cases. The bill amends the law permitting minor traffic offenses by juveniles to be handled in the traffic court, but retains serious juvenile traffic offenses within the juvenile court.

Another example of need for amendment to the Juvenile Court Act is the practice now current under which a ju-

venile may be placed under restraint for an indefinite period of time, possibly weeks, without any determination of the legal sufficiency of the charge placed against him. This happens to many juveniles every year in the District of Columbia.

At present, when a complaint is filed against a juvenile, it is transmitted to the Juvenile Court Director of Social Work. A social worker investigation is then conducted. Testimony received by the committee was that these investigations required 4 to 6 weeks to complete. After this report is received, the Director may decide that the case should go to court. At this point, the complaint is referred to the Corporation Counsel to determine whether there is a legal basis for the court to take jurisdiction.

Yet, under present court practices, the Director may decide against sending the case to court. He may, without any determination of the legal sufficiency of the complaint, place the child under restraint as an unofficial probationer for an indefinite period.

Deputy Chief of Police Winters, head of the Youth Aid Division, testified concerning this procedure as follows:

We believe that whenever a juvenile is charged with a criminal or quasi-criminal offense that we should bring our complaint to the Assistant Corporation Counsel in juvenile court as a lawyer for the purpose of legal sufficiency and prosecutive merit of the case and he should authorize the petition. We believe that the involvement of the juvenile in the offense should be adjudicated first, and we do not believe that a social investigation should be made prior to adjudication. And, then, if the case is dismissed, the social investigation has been meaningless and a waste of time. We think the court should act as a court of law and that the first thing that should happen is an adjudication of involvement of the juvenile, and then the social investigation to assist the judge in disposition of the case.

The members of the Committee on the District of Columbia felt so deeply that this provision of present law and the procedures used under it are so contrary to the most elementary concepts of freedom and justice that it could not report a juvenile court bill to the House without proposing an amendment on this point. The bill provides that the Assistant Corporation Counsel shall determine the legal sufficiency of a complaint immediately at intake.

The opponents of this bill would have you believe that there is nothing good in it unless a three judge court is provided and all else is stricken out. The fact is that the committee favors some suggestions made by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia some by the Commissioners of the District, by the Office of the Corporation Counsel, and by the Youth Aid Division of the Police Department. These suggestions and other provisions are combined in no other proposal which has been introduced before Congress.

The Judicial Conference recommends that the adult jurisdiction be continued solely within the juvenile court. The Commissioners recommended to the contrary. H.R. 6747 places the juvenile

court within the framework of the municipal court as a separate branch. The juvenile branch retains exclusive jurisdiction of all juvenile matters. Jurisdiction over adult matters is transferred to the municipal court, and such matters may be heard either in the juvenile court branch or in the adult side of the municipal court. This leaves determination of assignment of adult cases within the determination of the municipal court whose members also belong to the Judicial Conference.

The Judicial Conference recommends that the present provisions for jury trials for juveniles be repealed. The bill reported by the committee does this. It may be noted that, under the provisions of the Federal Juvenile Act, a juvenile is brought before the district attorney as an adult and must waive his rights to a jury trial if he desires his case heard in a juvenile forum.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have recommended that the adult jurisdiction of the court be transferred to the municipal court. This would result in the separation of jurisdiction opposed by the Judicial Conference. The bill, H.R. 6747, supports the Commissioners' view to the extent that such transfer of adult matters to the adult court is found desirable in practical application by the municipal court.

The Commissioners also recommend that the law be amended to provide that juveniles charged with minor traffic offenses, not involving any element of delinquency, be handled under adult procedures. The pending bill so provides.

The Corporation Counsel recommended that the law be changed to provide for the early determination of the legal sufficiency of a complaint, so that a juvenile would not be unnecessarily held before the court for several weeks pending decision as to whether the complaint has prosecutive merit. This is done in the pending bill.

The Youth Aid Division of the Metropolitan Police Department concurred in the recommendations regarding minor juvenile traffic offenses and the determination of legal sufficiency of a complaint. Deputy Chief John E. Winters, head of the Youth Aid Division, also proposed that the present law regarding the waiver of cases to the adult court be changed so that the same offender would be subject to the jurisdiction on only one court, either the adult or the juvenile court. At present the same person may be subject to actions before both courts at the same time. The pending bill corrects this.

It may be observed at this point that the Youth Aid Division, under the capable leadership of Deputy Chief Winters, operates the most extensive delinquency prevention effort in the capital. The Youth Aid Division is to identify potential young juvenile offenders, and orient and redirect the juvenile toward constructive objectives. This Division screens all juvenile cases coming to the attention of the police. First-time offenders facing only minor complaints are screened out, processed through a Youth Aid hearing, and referred to community facilities. Experience shows

that about 85 percent of those screened out do not become repeat offenders requiring juvenile court attention. The effective operation of this Division is largely responsible for the reduced caseload reaching the Juvenile Court following the inauguration of the new service.

A major problem facing the committee was whether rehabilitation of juveniles should be paramount; whether public safety should be given first consideration; or whether a balance be sought in the light of actual local conditions. Any answer to this question required examination of the frequency and character of crimes in various age groups, the incidence of crime by repeat offenders, and the relative hazards to the safety of the public as such study revealed.

The committee might easily have ignored this problem, continued the present age limits, approved existing waiver provisions, and won the applause of the press and possibly the support of some vocal groups opposing this bill. The committee believes that conditions in the District of Columbia and the needs locally should determine these issues and not the provisions of law in other States where local laws may or may not be adequately serving juvenile needs and the public safety.

In 1938, Congress increased the juvenile age limit from 17 to 18 years of age. There is nothing in the record to indicate that this change resulted in either more effective rehabilitation of juveniles or in greater safety to the citizens of the District. In fact, there are definite indications that the opposite is the case.

A study of the occurrence of repeat offenders before juvenile court, the statistical reports indicated that at age 16, repeat offenders averaged in excess of 50 percent; at age 17, repeat offenders averaged about 65 percent; at age 18, repeat offenders, whose violations were committed before age 18, ranged as high as almost 75 percent. The percentage of offenses ran higher than the percentage of the repeat offenders.

In testifying concerning repeat offenders, Deputy Chief Winters of the Youth Aid Division of the Metropolitan Police Department stated to the committee:

I do not think there is any doubt at all that some of them are hiding behind the protection that the law throws them behind as juveniles (hearings, p. 60).

We have on a number of occasions in the Juvenile Bureau had juveniles tell the officers or make statements to the effect that they were juveniles and therefore they cannot do anything with them. We have had that statement made to us.

Demonstration of the truth of this testimony is found in the analysis of offenses by the 16-17-year age group as compared to the 18-19-20-year age group. The following table indicates that the juveniles are inclined to be contemptuous and the deterrent effect of the law begins when these juveniles graduate, by age, to adult status. The juvenile group committed more felonies for the same period than the adult group with 50 percent greater age range.

Comparison—felonies of 16- and 17-year-olds and young adults—fiscal 1960:

Crime	16 to 17	18 to 20
Rape.....	22	26
Robbery.....	257	200
Attempted robbery.....	17	13
Housebreaking.....	203	272
Auto theft.....	209	160
Total.....	708	671

Along with the trend toward more serious crimes, the records show that the percent of juveniles who are repeat offenders is increasing. In 1959, 49.2 percent of juveniles before the court were repeat offenders. In 1961, 53.9 percent were repeat offenders.

This review of the committee study of the juvenile court, the findings of the committee, and the substance of the committee bill, H.R. 6747 has been presented to afford the Members of the House the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the juvenile court problem and the needs of this court in the District of Columbia. The committee believes that the Members of the House are genuinely interested in legislation which will meet the real problems of this court rather than proposals which provide mere palliatives.

The provisions of H.R. 6747 are designed to meet the specific needs of the juvenile court in the National Capital. It is the product of the only real study of the juvenile court in many years. It will provide an efficient, flexible court. It will expedite disposition of the court backlog and give best assurance that the caseload will be kept current in the future. It will relieve the taxpayers of the District of needless costs and provide a better balance for rehabilitation of juveniles and for the public safety.

THE RUSSIAN NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all recall the story of the monstrous horse filled with Greeks, which the Trojans were induced to take into their city by the wily lies of Sinon, a pretender of the Greek Army. Now we find Mrs. Khrushchev piously appealing via the American airways that we should forget about nuclear testing and concentrate on disarmament because the Soviet Union would never attack us first. I use the analogy of the Trojan horse not because of any similarity of the subjects but because of the similarity of deception and trickery employed.

Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1961, our Government detected nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, beginning a series of 40 or more tests conducted by the Soviet

Union, completely disregarding what propaganda losses might be suffered among the so-called neutrals, who up to that point had always raised a hue and cry about the adverse effect of fallout. The boys in the Kremlin obviously felt that it was to their advantage to resume testing and that the plus factors in this regard far outweighed the temporary losses in adverse reaction among the neutral powers and smaller nations. Unfortunately, our Government within the past year has failed to assert our own position, and, in my judgment, we have given undue consideration to what reactions might ensue among the so-called uncommitted countries.

The Russian tests were for a variety of purposes being conducted not only in the high atmosphere, but just above the surface and also under water. Now what have we done since then? We have arranged 16 announced tests, with low yield, all in underground caverns. Admittedly the knowledge obtained from our tests was insignificant compared to what the Soviet Union gained from her tests.

During the Russian testing, the Soviet superbomb was exploded and many said the weapon had no real military significance. Some administration officials stated that it was built and detonated simply for "terror" and "blackmail" purposes. It is true that five 10-megaton bombs can do more damage—total damage—than one of 50 megatons. You can destroy five cities with five bombs and destroy only one city with one bomb, whether it is 50 or 100 megatons.

There does not appear to be any likelihood, at least at this time, that we will follow the Soviet lead and build superbombs of 50 or more megatons although Gen. Nathan F. Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently revealed that he had unsuccessfully advocated that the United States build such weapons. Our strategic targeting problem is different from the one the Soviet faces.

We have decided to put a large part of our retaliatory missile power in so-called hardened bases—in deep underground silos additionally protected by steel and concrete cover. Several Atlas ICBM squadrons will be above ground in soft sites, however. Despite the talk about instantaneous retaliation, it is believed unlikely that we would push the button the moment the first incoming missiles were picked up on the radar screen. Indeed, Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander of the Strategic Air Command, has asserted that—

Our ICBM's probably would have to ride out the initial attack by an enemy.

Hardening a missile base is difficult, expensive and uncertain. It is a good deal easier for an enemy to build more accurate and more powerful rockets than it is to increase the hardening of bases. This was pointed out more than 2 years ago by a committee of the other body which warned that reliance on hardening bases was risky because of the increased accuracy that might be expected from ICBM's. Later in 1959, our own Atlases were scoring hits within 2 miles of the target.

Nevertheless, high-ranking land-based missilemen have repeatedly told the public that it would take anywhere from 10 to 30 Soviet missiles to destroy a single U.S. rocket in a hardened base. These officers did not define the degree of accuracy or size warhead they were crediting to the enemy. It is obvious, however, that they could not have been talking about a 50-megaton or larger warhead or an accuracy of 1 mile or less circular error probability—CEP. We know that Russia has detonated a 50-megaton bomb and has claimed a 1-mile CEP.

But even without the 1-mile CEP, the Soviet could make up for a shortcoming on accuracy with its giant warhead. With 50 or more megatons, and the accuracy equal to Atlas, they could destroy or put out of commission each of our hardened missiles with every one of theirs which landed on target in the United States. Fifty percent reliability, of course, would require the firing of two missiles against each target. This means it would take only 540 missiles to destroy our 270 programed Atlases and Titans and not 7,100—30 times 270—as suggested by some officials.

Thus, it may be seen that the 50-megaton warhead has a military significance of a substantial order.

Second, although it is by no means apparent that the Soviets have perfected an antimissile missile, they do seem to be working very rapidly toward it. If the Russians were able to spring another test series after stealthy preparation, and then still another, while the United States stood still, eventually the Soviets might indeed score a breakthrough on the antimissile missile front. Such a development, if unmatched by the United States, would mean that the Soviets could strike this country a full nuclear blow but that the United States would be prevented, by antimissile defenses, from striking a potent retaliatory blow. The nation which first produces such a weapon will tip the nuclear balance of terror to their own advantage. Any shift in the balance to the Soviets, once it becomes evident, could lead the Kremlin into all sorts of dangerous adventures.

Third, the longer President Kennedy stalls the more concerned our NATO and SEATO allies become. The hesitancy is keeping our nuclear scientists from proving or disproving the effectiveness of several new weapons and is making the United States look like a prime sucker in the eyes of our friends. It is hardly to be wondered that a lot of nations feel with ever-growing alarm that the Kennedy administration either lacks the courage to strike back at communism anywhere or just doesn't know how to go about doing so. Moreover, the Soviets are aware that they can use the delay in reaching a decision on nuclear air tests to build up world and U.S. public opinion against any sharing of our nuclear weapons with our allies. They knew, in the summer of 1958, that we were moving in this direction, even though slowly. To sabotage this movement, they used their vast propaganda machine to raise public fears of fallout and to mobilize this fear into an emotional force against any such distribu-

tion of nuclear weapons. They were thus able to exploit Britain's traditional fears of a resurgent Germany and to give credence to the longstanding propaganda line that Europeans can only hope to escape nuclear disaster by refusing to permit any nuclear installations on their soil. Should this line succeed, the next step undoubtedly would be to demand that U.S. troops in Europe return home since their very presence there requires them to be backed up by nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, where does President Kennedy stand on nuclear testing? No one seems to know. This responsibility is the President's by his own admission. He stated:

The Soviet Union tested while we were at the table negotiating with them. If they fooled us once it is their fault, and if they fool us twice it is our fault.

Candidate Kennedy said on October 10, 1960:

If the present nuclear weapons test conference is still in progress when I am elected I will direct vigorous negotiation, in accordance with my personal instructions on policy. * * * I intend to prescribe a reasonable but definite time limit within which to determine whether significant progress is being made.

Despite this campaign pledge and the aforementioned Soviet achievements, President Kennedy has decided to continue what seems to be a unilateral ban by this Nation on nuclear air tests. It has been almost one-half year since the Russians exploded their first bomb in the atmosphere and President Kennedy is still trying to determine if air tests would be in the national interests. Even if the President should decide to resume air tests sometime in the future, the delay which we have experienced already may be disastrous. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I should like to include with my remarks an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of February 12, 1961, by Charles L. Dancy:

NEW NUCLEAR TESTS COMING

The Russians are either going to "get off the dime" on a sound nuclear test ban program, or we are going to start some tests in the atmosphere. We are betting on the tests.

This is the real meaning of the British-United States deal on using Christmas Island as a test site.

We are not kidding. We did not go through these painful negotiations which cause the British Government some strain in its local political wars merely for show.

Unquestionably President Kennedy intends to proceed at a fairly early date with U.S. tests in the atmosphere.

The reason he has been taking his sweet time about it is to pacify organizations like the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy which are against testing by going through the motions of agreeing with them, of deep soul searching, and of just having to do it. (Among the sponsors of Sane are Steve Allen, Harry Belafonte, Illinois' own Arnold Maremont, and Walter Reuther. Victor Reuther is on the board of directors. They prefer to use the name of Albert Schweitzer—actually an honorary sponsor.)

The President apparently is willing to go this far with them. He is willing to surrender to the Soviets the gains they made by stalling us 3 years with a phony test ban and then betraying it in their recent tests. He will say, "OK, take the gains from your

dirty trick and we'll still not test if you make a real test ban deal."

And he dangles over their heads the Christmas Island arrangement as pressure that if they won't settle for the advantage they have gained by their doublecross, we will soon begin testing ourselves and regain or extend our lead.

Thus the Christmas Island deal is designed to produce a quick showdown on Soviet "intentions," and if they don't move quickly, we will say they have no intention of anything but a further stall on our progress, and we will test.

Meanwhile, we offer them a "Christmas" present of not using the island if they quickly agree to a genuine test ban.

This constant testing of Soviet intentions is mystifying to us. Is there any slightest grounds for doubting what their intention is, on the basis of their actions, consistently, for four decades? On the basis of their doctrine? On the basis of their own public declarations and recent international congress of Soviets?

Whom are we kidding? Only ourselves.

Their intentions on nuclear testing were probed by us for three years at the end of which time they proved what those intentions were. They were to keep us from testing while they made scientific progress and prepared their own tests.

When that was done, they laughed at us and shot off about 50 nuclear bombs in the atmosphere.

And now we are testing their intentions again, while we still delay our own nuclear tests.

The tests will come eventually—but only after long, needless, pointless, and dangerous delay.

Just remember that when the first mushroom cloud goes up over Christmas Island. It will stand as a monument to years and months of absolutely useless delays that served no purpose but to let the Soviet Union gain time—and perhaps some political appeasement of the fear left in this country.

Mr. Speaker, and so we find that this country remains under the wraps of a self-imposed moratorium with none of the safeguards that the Eisenhower Administration first insisted on as a condition for prolonged suspension. When the Eisenhower administration took office it steadily concentrated the weight of U.S. military power behind the nuclear deterrent. The reorganized Army with its pentomic divisions and its new nuclear-firing battlefield weapons, is generally designed to fight nuclear actions, except in the simplest kind of holding situation. So is the Navy, with its costly new carriers armed with nuclear bombers and its Polaris-firing submarines. And the Air Force is predominantly a nuclear force. Obviously, the reasons for Eisenhower's concern were profound and went to the heart of the American strategic problem. Therefore, as far back as December 29, 1959, President Eisenhower put the Soviet Union and the rest of the world on notice that the United States, having found it impossible to reach a "safe-guarded" agreement for mutual inspection and control with the Russians, would consider itself "free" to resume nuclear tests. Evidently President Kennedy did not see fit to continue this policy, even though there were good grounds for suspicion that the Russians had already begun preparatory tests while Arthur Dean was at Geneva.

I charge that as Commander in Chief it was not militarily justifiable for Presi-

dent Kennedy to delay, at least the preparations, for the resumption of American nuclear tests. It seems incredible with all the industrial and organizational capacity of the United States that we should not have been prepared in anticipation of the Soviet Union's action. Why does the President continue to simply tread water on this important issue? Why does he fail to come to grips with the problem and give the green light to our own resumption of testing, which I personally believe to be essential to the future security of our country.

Nuclear scientists, such as Dr. Edward Teller, had insisted for months that Russia never had halted its nuclear testing and that President Kennedy should order a resumption of the experiments. President Kennedy did not even see fit to prepare. On September 5, 1961, under public pressure, the President ordered a resumption of testing, but it was a full 10 days before even a small underground test was detonated. One wonders how vigorously he meant to push the resumption, leading to atmospheric tests, since he has not set a reasonable but definite time limit as he said he was going to do. It is obvious, the President has not been completely frank with the American people on this point.

The President stated in his state of the Union message this year:

We have rejected any all-or-nothing posture which would leave no choice but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation.

This statement is misleading but be that as it may, the nuclear deterrent should be extended across the likely range of military challenges by making it possible for the infantry, with its close-in air support, to deal summarily with other infantry. Here is the real gap in our general power to deter war: the absence of light, "clean" weapons that could be employed on a wide scale, if necessary, in peripheral actions, without laying villages and countryside to waste. It stands to reason that if the low side of the nuclear gap can be closed by invention, it should be closed. The strong possibility that it can thus be closed is one of the principal reasons why the United States should not delay its atmospheric testing.

This issue is not a partisan one; influential men in both parties have arrayed themselves on the side of resumption of atmospheric tests.

Distinguished Members of the other body of the President's own party along with former President Truman have spoken up unequivocally for an end to the hesitation. Our atmospheric tests can be controlled to limit the fallout to negligible amounts which should, I am sure, be insignificant compared to the fallout of the Russian tests.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, in a special story to the New York Herald Tribune, made some very telling points in a recent article which I should like to have included in my remarks at this point:

ROCKEFELLER TELLS WHY WE MUST TEST

MIAMI BEACH.—Underscoring the danger before us and the freedom-guarding role of nuclear power, Governor Rockefeller yesterday urged the Nation to resume atmospheric

testing regardless of world opinion. It was his first major speech on a national issue since President Kennedy's election—and it was billed by aids as nonpolitical. Here is an excerpt:

"The facts that measure the danger before us are few, and simple, and serious.

"The Soviet Union—with massive disdain for world opinion—is finishing, in these days, a series of more than 20 nuclear tests in the atmosphere. The series has already included the greatest blast of destructive power the world has ever witnessed. And upon the completion of their tests, we must be prepared for the Soviet Union to turn its face from the scene of the blast, with an air of virtue and innocence, and say to us: 'Now, shouldn't we all stop testing these awful weapons?'

"We can prepare ourselves for the stern answer to that question by looking at a few hard facts.

"Let me summarize them briefly.

"First. While honest and expert judgments on relative Soviet and American nuclear strength have varied considerably, there is one fact on which all responsible sources agree. It is the fact that since the voluntary moratorium on nuclear testing in 1958, we have stood relatively still for the past 3 years in the development and improvement of nuclear weapons.

"Second. We know from the very nature of the recent Soviet tests that the period of the so-called moratorium after 1958 must have been used by Soviet science for intensive and major research in nuclear weapons development. There is also every technical possibility and likelihood that the Soviets engaged in underground testing not subject to detection by the outside world. The hidden preparations for the current Soviet atmospheric tests must have extended over a period of many months, perhaps a full year. And all this was done while the Soviet negotiators, conveniently dragging their feet, were ostensibly seeking agreement on a test-ban treaty.

"Third. We simply do not know the extent of the technical advances scored by the Soviet Union throughout the moratorium and in their current tests in the atmosphere. We thus confront, today, a Soviet nuclear power whose exact extent, nature, and ingenuity lie beyond our power to measure.

"Fourth. The people who most obviously do know these facts—the Soviet leaders themselves—have plainly shown the value and importance they have attached to these tests. For the very undertaking of these tests defied not only world opinion but also all the years of Soviet propaganda invested in the pretense of seeking a ban on nuclear testing. So defiant a stroke must have been well worth it—in terms of raw military power.

"These few facts tersely measure the peril that growing Soviet nuclear power now thrusts before us.

"Our response to this peril is a most urgent and important issue before the American people today.

"For what is at stake is nothing less than our having the power that is essential to serve the cause of freedom to which we stand committed:

"Power to defend ourselves against all-out enemy nuclear attack;

"Power to survive an all-out nuclear attack and strike back with a decisive counter-attack;

"Power to defend freedom in any corner of the globe in which it is challenged.

"This essential power critically depends upon our nuclear weapons of defense and retaliation. And to assure the sufficiency of our weapons, in the face of the recent Soviet tests, we are now clearly compelled to conduct our own nuclear tests."

Then Governor Rockefeller turned to specifics, listing these points essential to the Nation's future security and world peace:

- "1. We must reduce the weight of nuclear warheads.
- "2. We must develop antimissile defenses.
- "3. We must improve our tactical weapons.
- "4. We must develop new weapons.
- "5. We must improve methods of controlling nuclear weapons and detecting nuclear tests.
- "6. We must build for peace with nuclear energy."

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion the scientific-military judgment which has generally been accepted by Republicans and Democrats alike is that the security of the United States will not permit further deferral of atmospheric tests. Therefore, I think it is time for President Kennedy to putt or get off the green.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have purposely delayed discussing before this House the provisions of the bill I introduced yesterday until the House acted on Reorganization Plan No. 1, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Although this bill, which would establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs, has no direct relationship to the reorganization plan, I considered it preferable not to risk confusing the two proposals.

The House has now worked its will on the question of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I want to emphasize, however, that whatever the result of this vote had been—it is now—essential to approve legislation of this kind, to provide a means whereby effective coordination and overall policy direction can be achieved among the large number of Federal programs which affect urban and metropolitan areas.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the legislation would establish a small staff operation within the Executive Office of the President for the purpose of achieving this needed coordination and policy direction. It would be headed by a Director and Deputy Director appointed by and responsible to the President. The proposed Office of Urban Affairs would be authorized to obtain appropriate information from executive agencies and departments, to maintain liaison with such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the States engaged in activities related to urban areas, and, at the direction of the President, to take other appropriate action so as to eliminate duplication, reduce conflicts, and increase the efficiency with which Federal programs are administered at State and local levels.

The need for such coordination, Mr. Speaker, has become universally recognized by students and practitioners of government at all levels. One of the indirect benefits of the lengthy public de-

bate over the proposal to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has been to create a much greater public awareness of the extent to which coordination of existing programs is required and to point up the obstacles which presently exist to the effective and efficient administration of Federal programs in this area.

One of the most concise statements of this need was written by Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach and appeared in their book, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," which was published in 1960. Professors Connery and Leach stated, and I quote:

There is reason to believe that Federal programs are piling up on each other faster than metropolitan areas can digest them. Each is planned separately, and there is no correlation among them. Programs are launched in isolation, without reference to their impact on the areas to which they are directed. As a consequence, Federal programs are badly coordinated so far as metropolitan areas are concerned, both among themselves and in terms of State and local programs in the same areas. Federal programs having a bearing on metropolitan problems should be reexamined in order to assure better coordination and to provide the maximum flexibility and a minimum of standardization as to detail and procedure.

As a matter of fact, their excellent study of this subject can be understood as an extensive collection of case studies. These studies demonstrate, in the case of almost every individual urban area program, that the failure of adequate Federal coordination has grossly handicapped the proper administration of the program.

The extent of the problem is often minimized as a result of the failure to appreciate just how many of these programs are involved at the metropolitan or urban area level. We tend to think of the problem as being limited to such programs as highways, housing, and urban renewal. This limited view of the problem may explain, in part, why so many of the proponents of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing appeared to place such great hopes on the capacity of a Cabinet-level department to achieve the desired coordination. Although I voted for the reorganization plan, I believe a careful study will show that the Department could only coordinate the programs that it was authorized to administer—the very same programs now being administered and coordinated, though to a less effective degree, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Although these programs are, indeed, among the more significant with impact upon urban areas, they are by no means the only ones. In 1957, the Bureau of the Budget prepared a list of 21 programs operated by the Federal Government which affected metropolitan areas. These are—

- First. Highway construction.
- Second. Flood control and prevention.
- Third. Improvement of rivers, harbors, and waterways.
- Fourth. Water pollution control.
- Fifth. Control of communicable diseases, including tuberculosis and venereal diseases.

- Sixth. Services to crippled children.
- Seventh. Health centers and clinics.
- Eighth. Disaster relief.
- Ninth. Civil defense.
- Tenth. Housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment.
- Eleventh. School lunch program.
- Twelfth. Special problems of federally impacted areas.
- Thirteenth. Airports and air terminals.
- Fourteenth. Old-age and survivors' insurance for local government employees.
- Fifteenth. Hospital planning and construction.
- Sixteenth. Suppression of crime.
- Seventeenth. General welfare assistance.

- Eighteenth. Social security.
- Nineteenth. Vocational rehabilitation.
- Twentieth. Vocational education.
- Twenty-first. Employment security.

Since 1957, of course, a number of other Federal programs have been established, including the mass transportation and open spaces programs of last year. While many of the programs I have listed are concerned with services to people, they all nevertheless result in the expenditure of money in metropolitan areas and thus directly affect the economies of these local areas.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, the idea of a coordinating group within the Executive Office of the President is not a new one. Unfortunately, however, the need has been obscured by what I believe has been the exaggerated attention paid to the more dramatic proposal to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The basis on which the present legislation has been prepared is one of the principal recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission, at my request, undertook in 1960-61 a detailed study of governmental structure, organization, and planning in metropolitan areas. Its recommendations included suggestions for action by local, State, and National Governments. It urged, among other things:

That steps be taken within both the executive and legislative branches of the National Government to bring together in better coordination and interrelationship the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas.

The Commission, which represents all levels of government and includes among its members Senators, Representatives, Governors, mayors, State legislators and county officials, as well as representatives of the general public, emphasized unanimously that intergovernmental relations with respect to urban affairs are being unnecessarily impaired because of inadequate coordination of Federal programs. The Commission's report pointed out that the Federal Government has tended to bypass the States in responding to metropolitan area problems and has operated on a single-purpose functional basis, with insufficient attention paid to the need for planning or coordination of the various functions on a comprehensive basis at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of individual examples could be cited to demonstrate

how the failure of coordination has produced waste, duplication and inefficiency in the operation of many Federal programs. The same inefficiency has tended to obstruct the efforts of State and local governments to solve their urban problems. All levels of government, therefore, have a deep and immediate interest in devising mechanisms which will assure proper coordination.

As I have pointed out, the legislation I have introduced would be essential with or without a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. By virtue of the Advisory Commission's recommendation, my proposal has in effect been endorsed by responsible officials at all levels of government, of both political parties, and from all areas of the Nation. It will not involve the expenditure of huge sums of money. It will not create new levels of bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Everyone, Mr. Speaker, seems to want to help the areas of our country in which the largest concentrations of our people have settled, whether we call them cities, metropolitan areas, or urban areas. In terms of money, personnel, and prestige, my proposal is a modest one. But I maintain that it could be the most effective single action which the Congress could take to bring order, efficiency, and effectiveness into the administration of programs designed to help these urban areas. As a bipartisan proposal, I hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in sponsoring this legislation and in working for its enactment into law.

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, during the last several days I have had an opportunity to read the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 recommended by President Kennedy and avidly supported by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

This is an interesting, if not fantastic, approach. It deals with many phases of agricultural production, marketing, and rural life. I understand that the House Committee on Agriculture is holding hearings this week and that the Secretary of Agriculture would have an opportunity to explain the administration's proposal.

It is for this reason that I would like to discuss two specific parts of the proposed dairy program. I do this in order that the members of the committee will seek answers to several areas in the dairy proposal that perplex me.

The dairy proposal of the President's farm message recommends the establishment of a national dairy-control program. As a part of this program there would be individual dairy producer marketing allotments. By this, apparently, is meant that each individual dairy farmer would be given an allotment as to the amount of milk that he could market. If he produced in excess

of his allotment he would have to pay a penalty on that milk.

In discussing the so-called producer marketing allotments the bill contains this language:

That the Secretary may, if he deems that it will not impair effective administration of this subtitle, prescribe a minimum marketing allotment for any producer holding a marketing basis.

What, in effect, this says, if I understand it correctly, is that the Secretary can, if in his wisdom he determines it advisable, establish minimum dairy allotments.

I am puzzled as to the exact meaning of this particular section in the bill, and I hope that the members of the House Committee on Agriculture will thoroughly explore this question with Mr. Freeman.

Does the Secretary of Agriculture believe that any farmer with 1 cow, 2 cows, 5 cows, or 50 cows should be exempt from this dairy-control program? What number of cows is he thinking that should be exempt?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important that Members of Congress and dairy farmers have some specific comments from the Secretary as to the number of cows or number of pounds of milk that would be exempt from this particular program. Personally, I am opposed to this legislation with its exemptions; however, I believe it is important that we know the exact thinking of the USDA people as it relates to minimum dairy allotments. I frankly am opposed to giving the Secretary of Agriculture this kind of discretionary authority. I think the Congress should assume the responsibilities for determining what, if any, the minimum allotment should be.

To leave this question to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture will mean that if he determines it advisable, he will exempt a group of the small producers who might vote against his program. As far as I am concerned I do not believe there should be any exemptions. I believe all dairy farmers, regardless of size, should be a part of the program.

The second area in the dairy proposal that fascinates me is a section which reads as follows:

The Secretary shall make such adjustments in a marketing basis established hereunder as he deems necessary for abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing, for relief of shortages in deficit production areas, and for such other factors as he determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable marketing basis.

The particular part of this section that I hope will be thoroughly explored by the House Agriculture Committee has to do with the phrase "for relief of shortages in deficit production areas." Does this mean that those areas that do not now produce enough milk to meet their needs that their marketing bases would not be cut? Could they continue to expand their milk production while others, such as my own, would have their production cut? What is a deficit production area in this year 1962 with our modern transportation? What part of the country does the Secretary of Agriculture con-

template would fall in this category? Why does he want this broad authority? Why does he want to exempt all fluid milk used in bottled sales?

Are the milk producers in the South and Southwest which import milk to be exempted from the dairy control program and allowed to continue their expansion and growth? I, of course, would like to see continued growth of the dairy industry in all areas; but I don't believe it is fair for one area to be exempt and other areas to have to take a substantial cutback in production.

These three questions need answers; namely, first, the question of what will be the minimum allotment as far as the number of cows or pounds of milk is concerned; second, what are the deficit dairy production areas; and, third, what is the basis for exempting fluid milk in the market order areas. I hope these areas will be explored thoroughly by the committee because they are important questions in the consideration of this legislation.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS OF THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the 86th Congress and the first half of the 87th, it was my honor and pleasure to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was with considerable regret that I resigned from the committee on January 17, 1962. I want the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to know that I fully enjoyed our fine working relationship, and as chairman of the subcommittee, I am fully appreciative of their splendid cooperation and support.

In relinquishing my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, it occurred to me that my fellow Members in the House would like to know about the progress which our subcommittee made in this work. I am pleased, therefore, to give you a brief summary of our major accomplishments and also to point out those matters which require continuing attention.

NO CHEESECAKE IN STATISTICS

I should like to preface my report by stating that there is no "cheesecake" in statistics—we all want facts and figures and we all use facts and figures, but somehow when a speaker gets up to discuss statistics, especially the cost of collecting and compiling them, the audience heads for the nearest exits. At our recent subcommittee hearings in Chicago on the proposed mid-decade census,

H.R. 1100, Mr. Robert J. Eggert, of the Ford Motor Co., expressed these thoughts better than I can:

I would like to express our appreciation for your subcommittee's willingness to take time to review this important subject. The area of statistics is never a glamorous one and so it is with real appreciation that we express our feelings for your willingness to show an interest in this subject.

I should like to point out that the mid-decade census hearings were held in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City in October and November last. All but two of our subcommittee members attended at least one of the hearings at considerable personal inconvenience. Our distinguished ranking minority member, Mr. ROBERT J. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, contributed significantly to the success of our Los Angeles hearing.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

The Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics was first created by House Resolution 78 of the 86th Congress, with jurisdiction over matters relating to the census and the collection of statistics generally. In addition to studying and investigating the census and current statistics programs of the Census Bureau, the subcommittee undertook a broad, continuing study of all Federal Government activities pertaining to the collection of statistical information from the public, the processing and end use of such information, and the effectiveness of such programs as indicated by their impact upon the public.

CENSUS

The subcommittee accorded special attention to the 1960 Census of Population and Housing. Hearings were held in April 1959 and March 1960 on the advance planning for the census. After the enumeration, the subcommittee reviewed the census results with Bureau officials in a hearing held in May 1961.

Our subcommittee concluded that the Census Bureau had done a good job in enumerating 180 million people in 55 million households—I do not say that the job was perfect, but given the complexities of the task, especially in the large cities, it was well done and I compliment the Bureau on this performance. The role of the Census Bureau in congressional apportionment was also examined and made the subject of a special subcommittee report—House Report No. 2223.

The proposed middecade census to be held in 1965, as put forth in H.R. 1100, a bill submitted by Hon. Stewart Udall, of Arizona, has been placed under study by the subcommittee. The far-reaching implications of this bill, especially as it affects our State and local governments were impressed upon our Members in hearings held in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City in October and November 1961. These hearings have been printed and I urge Members to read them. After listening to the State and local government officials tell about the problems brought about by our population explosion, I am rapidly coming to the conclusion that the "forgotten man" of this generation is the local govern-

ment—our counties, cities, towns, school districts, and the rest.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The reporting burden placed upon business and industry by the Federal Government has been the object of continuing study by our subcommittee. Special attention was accorded the small businessman who often finds that Federal reporting requirements are particularly costly and onerous. In December 1959 the subcommittee issued its first report on this subject, "Business Reporting Requirements of the Federal Government." Some of the recommendations contained in this report have already resulted in specific corrective actions by the agencies. I was glad to note that Secretary Ribicoff, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has recently announced that he has taken steps to reduce paperwork in his Department.

In analyzing reporting requirements, the subcommittee discovered that the regulatory agencies were responsible for generating an unusually large amount of paperwork; some of this was felt to be unnecessary. The Interstate Commerce Commission was singled out for the first subcommittee study, principally because of complaints received from carriers and their associations about ICC reports, some of which were never tabulated. The subcommittee's experience with the ICC is detailed in "Reducing the Reporting Requirements of Transportation Industries—An Interim Report"—House Report No. 552. Our subcommittee activity has already resulted in eliminating some unnecessary reports and reducing the scope or frequency of others. I need hardly say that the carriers are grateful for our subcommittee's efforts on their behalf.

TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS—"A CAN OF WORMS"

As the subcommittee's review of the ICC reporting system progressed, it became apparent that linked with the problem of burdensome reports in some segments of the transportation industry was the equally serious problem of large statistical voids or gaps in other segments. Transportation experts were almost unanimous in recommending to the subcommittee that steps be taken to improve the basic statistical information relating to the Nation's transportation services—one expert described our current transportation information as a "can of worms." Important as it is in peacetime to communities attempting to cope with traffic stagnation, accidents, and deaths, this situation could paralyze our defense effort in the event of war.

With the above problems in mind, our subcommittee held hearings in July 1961 on the need for improving our information about the Nation's transportation equipment and services. Our hearings were directed specifically toward the need for a census of transportation, as authorized by Congress in 1947—United States Code, title 13, section 131—but never held. At the hearings, representatives of 10 Federal agencies and private carriers and their associations urged the subcommittee to implement the existing

legislation. Accordingly, in September 1961 I wrote to the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce requesting them to take steps to carry out the law and even accelerate their planning in view of the current international situation. I understand that funds to begin work on this census are included in the President's budget for 1963. I hope Congress will give ready approval to this urgently needed program.

ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

Our subcommittee has had a continuing interest in the use of electronic data processing equipment—EDP—in the Federal Government. Our interest has been centered principally around two matters: First, the more efficient use of electronic data processing equipment through improved management practices; and, second, the effect of electronic data processing acquisition and use on the Federal worker and his job.

In hearings held in June 1959, and March 1960, our subcommittee reviewed the above matters with the key Federal agencies concerned with electronic data processing. Our conclusions were contained in the committee print, "Report on the Use of EDP Equipment in the Federal Government," issued in August 1960. I am glad to report that a number of the recommendations made in our report relating to improved management practices have already been put to work. I am glad also to say that the Bureau of the Budget is giving fine leadership in resolving problems related to the acquisition and use of electronic data processing equipment by the Federal agencies. Much still remains to be done, but I feel that now we are moving in the right direction.

So far, there has been no wide-scale displacement of Federal workers because of electronic data processing automation. On the other hand, this picture could change radically later in the 1960's as some of the newer sensing devices become operational. This conversion to automation in Government agencies will require constant vigilance in order that any net reductions in employment can be accomplished by normal attrition without recourse to reduction-in-force procedures. This can be done without creating unnecessary hardship if conversions are carefully planned in advance on a broad agency-wide basis. In this connection, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the Federal Aviation Agency, which is planning its electronic data processing automation conversion 2 years in advance and keeping its employees fully informed of the changes which may affect their jobs. This is the kind of forward thinking which pays real dividends in improved employee morale and performance.

STATISTICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Our subcommittee has surveyed all executive departments and major independent agencies to ascertain personnel, payrolls, and equipment costs for data collection and compilation. The first of these surveys, "Data Compilation Activities of the Federal Government"—House Report No. 1357, 86th Congress—showed

that in 1959 some \$79 million in personnel and contract costs were spent by Federal agencies in collecting and compiling information gathered from the public. A second report to be released shortly, which covers the year 1961, will show that employment in these activities increased some 8 percent over 1959, and payrolls were up some 16 percent. Contracts awarded by the Federal agencies for statistical studies and surveys are also covered in these reports. In some cases, questions have been raised concerning the public need for the information collected and the desirability of Federal sponsorship. This area, also, will require careful attention.

In closing this brief report I want to take this opportunity to repeat what I have often said before: That this Government can be proud of the generally high caliber of product which emanates from its fact-gathering agencies. I make this statement with full knowledge that some official statistics have been severely criticized lately. The technical competence, for instance, of the professional staff of the Census Bureau is widely recognized both at home and abroad. I know for a fact that many of them can readily double their earnings, if they should decide to leave the Federal service and go into private work. This is only one more reason why the Federal salary scales should be raised and quickly; the Government cannot afford to lose these people and others like them.

I would be remiss if I did not also mention the fine support given to me by the staff of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Their excellent staffwork, in no small measure, contributed to the effectiveness of our subcommittee's program.

ADMINISTRATION CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST IN DAIRY PRICE DILEMMA

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal, in House Joint Resolution 613, to continue the present support prices of \$3.40 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk and 60.46 per pound of butterfat for an additional 9 months is a demonstration of the fact that the chickens the administration hatched in its farm legislation have come home to roost.

Stripped to its essentials, this resolution asks the Congress to shoulder the blame for untimely and unwise increases in dairy price support levels that were made by the administration in 1961.

In his message of January 31, 1962, the President informed the Congress that—

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture is not authorized to set the price support rate for milk above 75 percent of

parity unless such action would be necessary in order to assure an adequate supply.

On the basis of present price-cost relationships, dairy price supports at 75 percent of parity would mean about \$3.11 per hundred pounds of manufacturing milk of national average test.

On March 10, 1961, the administration raised the support price for manufacturing milk by 18 cents, from \$3.22 to \$3.40 per hundred pounds. What was the situation with respect to an adequate supply when that change was made?

National production of milk had been increasing as follows:

Month and year:	Increase over same month of previous year (percent)
1960—September.....	0.4
October.....	1.4
November.....	2.2
December.....	1.3
1961—January.....	.4
February.....	1.4

¹ Adjusted to compensate for extra day in February 1960.

Price-support purchases also were up. In the 6-month period of September 1960 through February 1961, price-support purchases of butter rose nearly 50 percent—from less than 33 million pounds to over 45 million pounds—above the level of the comparable period a year earlier.

In both periods, purchases of cheese were negligible or nonexistent, but purchases of nonfat dry milk were up 25 percent from 239 million to 300 million pounds. As was well known, however, industry stocks of nonfat dry milk were unusually large in early 1961, because many concerns anticipated an increase in Government purchase prices. As was to be expected, these stocks were unloaded onto the Government in March 1961 after the increases. They amounted to 345 million pounds—substantially more than the Government had acquired in the 6 months prior to March 1961.

Thus, it should have been readily apparent to everyone concerned that both the national supply and the national surplus of milk were growing in early 1961. If the criterion of adequate supply had been adhered to by the administration in March 1961, there could not have been an increase in the dairy price-support level at that time.

Either the administration was incredibly naive or it was guilty of callously disregarding the economic welfare of dairy farmers when it deliberately took action that has seriously aggravated the dairy surplus situation.

It is my belief that the diehards in the Department of Agriculture who were more determined on controlling than they were on really helping the dairy farmers, considered that dairymen would be more likely to accept supply management controls if the surplus situation worsened. Thus, the trap was baited and set.

Regardless of whether it was incredible naive or unconscionable cunning that motivated the administration's decision, there is no reason for the Congress to assume the responsibility for this costly mistake.

The law providing for a dairy price-support program delegates to the administration adequate authority—as well as a burden of responsibility—for working out a practical solution in 1962 to the problem situation largely arising from actions taken by this administration in 1961.

Postponing the day of reckoning will not help the dairy farmers who hope to stay in business, least of all those in my State of Connecticut.

PENALIZING THE WHEAT FARMER UNLESS HE VOTES "YES"

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it has become a common belief in some quarters around the Nation's Capitol and elsewhere that the wheat farmer is solely to blame for the huge stocks of wheat piled up in Government bins and for the tremendous cost to the taxpayer of the Government wheat program mess. The talk even implies that the farmer is now something akin to being a rascal for doing what he knows how to do best, and for taking advantage of the private enterprise principle of producing for a profit. Nothing is mentioned about the great incentives that the Government program has provided to the farmer to produce at his maximum rate of efficiency; to use all of his know-how, experience, and up-to-date equipment to make his land yield its best.

Early last year these same people were pouring out great praise for the wheat farmer for his skill, his knowledge, and efficiency, and for the great blessing of "abundance" he had created. He was then a very fine fellow. Great talk was made then that this "abundance" would be used to upgrade the diets of all of the people of the world, and no one—absolutely no one—would ever again go to bed hungry. To implement this noble idea, the experts were set to work to figure out just how much wheat would be needed in 1962 through 1966, by countries. The idea was advanced that if we did not have enough in stock, we would set up a program to produce it. Here again, the wheat farmer would be the hero.

The experts rendered their report which indicated that, if all the people were to have a minimum adequate diet, the wheat requirement alone would be more than the world could supply. Currently, there seems to be a difference of opinion as to this proposal because the Secretary of Agriculture said in his address at the conference on food and people that we were moving about the maximum amount of wheat into foreign areas, while at the same conference the President's Food for Peace Administrator said we have to get on with the program to expand our shipments in order to raise the diets of millions of hungry people.

Now, we have the administration's new farm proposals, which provide for a complete regimentation of the wheat producer, or else. This proposal is said to be a farmer's plan and that every wheat farmer will be given a choice of alternatives—a vote—a chance to say what he wants in a program. Of course, such is not the case. If this proposal is adopted, the wheat farmer will have the opportunity to vote for rigid controls, which, among, other things will cut his operations back, will compartmentize his marketings on a multiple price basis, and generally subject his business to complete Government supervision, dictation, restrictions, and penalties for noncompliance. There is a "carrot" in that the farmer would receive a payment for land taken out of production and the various support prices on his marketings. All this if two-thirds of those voting vote "yes" in a referendum. The alternative is no program at all if more than one-third of those voting vote "no." This means that there would be no price supports for wheat, and no controls whatever on producers. "Bingo," after years of Government programs, the wheat farmer would be completely on his own. While this is not much of an alternative, it might not be as unfavorable as complete regimentation.

For fear that at least 34 percent of the voting wheat farmers would think that no program would be better than the strict controls, the proposals include an authorization for CCC to sell up to 200 million bushels of wheat out of its stocks for unrestricted use at market prices. Remember now, the farmer would have to produce and market his wheat subject to a free play of the forces of supply and demand. Remember also that if there were no Government program, the section 22 import controls on wheat would have to be eliminated. So the wheat farmer would have to sell his wheat in competition with the world supply, and—in addition—in competition with CCC as it dumped up to 200 million bushels on the market. This quantity of wheat is equivalent to about two-fifths of our annual domestic use for food, or nearly one-third of our recent high annual exports.

Think what this dumping operation would do to the wheat farmer's market, to his income, to his life's work. He would be wiped out. He would be forced out of business because he would not submit to complete Government control. This proposal has an implication of how Castro and the Communists carried out their agricultural reforms and I do not believe that the American wheat farmer will be very enthusiastic about the prospect. I can imagine that he would resent being placed in the position of having to choose between these alternatives. What has he done in the short period of a year to merit the prospect of such reversal of sympathy by his Government?

EXPROPRIATION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY BY BRAZILIAN STATE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

CVIII—170

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, despite an impression that may have been created elsewhere earlier this week, I think it should be noted that Texans are students of history. Today, I seek answers to questions that reflect our recent history; answers which certainly must have some bearing on our present and future history.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to our relations not only with Castro's Cuba but most recently to our relations with Brazil. I find it all very perplexing. I am advised that the President of Brazil, Mr. Goulart, has accepted an invitation to visit the President of our United States on April 3. I am further advised that Mr. Goulart may be expected to discuss just how many millions of dollars in aid funds he may expect from the United States not only this year but next year and the year after, and, I suppose, for as long as the American taxpayer can shell out these sums.

I have some doubts, however, that Mr. Goulart should be given anything. For he is the same gentleman who has indicated that he is not responsible for the unwarranted expropriation of an American-owned telephone company in the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul last Friday, February 16.

Mr. Goulart is saying that even though his brother-in-law, Governor Leonel Brizola, has grabbed a company belonging to International Telephone & Telegraph Co., he has no control over such actions. If that is his position, as it appears to be, I submit, gentlemen, that he is not the man to whom the United States should entrust millions and millions of aid dollars. If he refuses to accept responsibility for Brizola's seizure of an \$8 million U.S. company, how can he be expected to assume the responsibility of the handling of vast sums of money which we intend to give him? These inequities are difficult to explain.

Students of history will recall that when Janio Quadros resigned as President of Brazil, many Brazilians did not want Goulart. You will recall that he returned to Brazil from abroad through Rio Grande do Sul—thanks to a sanctuary provided for him by his brother-in-law, Brizola.

Subsequently, through the machinations of Brizola, who threatened to plunge Brazil into civil war—a compromise to keep peace saw Goulart installed as president. In the light of this history, we are being asked to believe that Goulart is not responsible for Brizola's actions.

The fact is that under International Law, Mr. Goulart must accept responsibility for Brizola's unwarranted act of expropriation. But we need more information, we need more facts, before this Congress—in my opinion—should consider permitting one more dime of American taxpayers' dollars to be turned over to such a man as Mr. Goulart.

It appears to me that Mr. Goulart should be called upon to explain his statement—of lack of responsibility of

the actions of one of his State Governors, and agree to see to it that prompt, effective and adequate compensation is made in the case at hand, as quickly as possible. The offer of \$400,000 in exchange for an \$8 million property is more than outrageous. It is, in view of our wish to send more millions to Brazil, simply beyond the realm of belief.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1.

There has been widespread publicity on the announcement of the President that he would appoint Mr. Robert C. Weaver as the Cabinet officer of this Department, and an inference has been drawn therefrom—particularly by news commentators and editors—that a vote against the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be motivated by racial bias.

I want to make the record crystal clear. I am opposed to the creation of this Department, not because of the President's suggested appointment, for it is well known that I have always supported civil rights legislation and never has racial bias dictated my decisions. During the years I have been instrumental in the writing of such legislation in connection with my duties as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 would increase Federal spending of the taxpayers money and will increase Federal control over local governments and private actions.

It is estimated that approval of this plan would, in a period of 7 years, create spending programs which would cost the taxpayers \$165 billion.

Congress is morally responsible for looking ahead. We have now a Government debt billions higher than we had at the end of World War II. We cannot continue to mortgage our unborn generations.

Proponents of the proposal firmly state that this plan does not increase Federal control. It seems to me that it is evident that such a department, with authority to deal with intercity and commuter transportation, parks, low-cost apartments and renovation of apartments and housing, training programs for teenagers and workers and other urban renewal projects could not help but establish Federal controls which would eventually effect every crossroad of our Nation.

The President in his inaugural address told America to "ask not what the Government will do for you, but to ask what you can do for the Government." This was a good principle and should be followed. I feel, as a Congressman opposing this reorganization plan, I am putting that principle to work.

LITTLE PEOPLE TO LITTLE PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the New Jersey delegation, I take this opportunity to restate that which I have said before: That ours is one of the finest delegations in the House, and I include both sides of the aisle.

As an example of my admiration, let me call attention at this point to just one of our Members, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, who has served seven terms in this House. He is not only a capable and experienced Member but also a great humanitarian, community leader, and, last but not most important, an outstanding American family man. On last Thursday, February 15, he addressed this House under extension of remarks on page 2227 of the RECORD, and I ask all Members to read his "The Little People to Little People Program" as an exposition of the character of this man—a far superior guide than my poor words would seek to convey.

With a colleague like him, and with a meritorious suggestion as he offers, I am proud to stand with him and offer my support in his endeavor.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COLONEL GLENN

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all conversant with the importance of public relations in all fields of endeavor, including the political arena. Most of it in these days is self-engendered, self-serving, and needless to say expensive.

So it came like a breath of fresh air to have the exploits of an American, who seeks no reward except that which comes to all Americans regardless of position, so well received throughout the world. I, of course, refer to the successful accomplishment of the orbital flight of Col. John H. Glenn. The comments of the world press on this wonderful feat show that he and his associates have generated more good will and improved our world popularity to a greater extent than all the good will junkets both official and unofficial during the past year.

If some of our publicity-minded public officials want to increase their Gallup poll standing, I suggest they undertake orbital flight as an outstanding medium.

In a more serious vein, I want to join my colleagues and all Americans in congratulations, and wish to express my

sincere appreciation to Colonel Glenn and his associates in their successful flight, and to thank them for their dedication to the past 3 years of preparation. As one Glenn to another Glenn, I am proud that I bear this surname, and I am sure that I speak for the many members of my family in south Jersey, and other branches of the Glenn family in Pennsylvania and North and South Carolina, as well as all my constituents of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, in sending Colonel Glenn a "well done."

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs is intended to create a new executive department and transfer to it the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In accordance with the limitations of the Reorganization Act the plan does not provide any new functions or powers for the proposed department or its secretary.

The plan does, however, provide a measure of recognition to that substantial portion of our population which lives in urban areas, estimated to be between 50 and 70 percent of the Nation, depending on the standard of measurement. By giving city dwellers a voice in the Cabinet on subjects which relate exclusively to cities, it would bring them a greater degree of success in coordinating solutions to urban problems. The initial cost of enhancing the position of the Federal agencies dealing with urban affairs would be modest; approximately \$64,000 as estimated by the Director of the Budget.

I support the plan and shall vote against the resolution to disapprove it because I feel that changes on the American scene justify it. The shift from country to city living continues and the population continues to grow at a rate which commands both awe and apprehension. Under these conditions it seems to me that some reorganization of the Federal Government to meet the changing situation is both appropriate and timely.

History confirms this conclusion. Abraham Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture on May 15, 1862, when the great western farmlands had been subjected to the plow. The commercial growth of the country was recognized by the establishment under Theodore Roosevelt of the Department of Commerce and Labor in 1903, and the separation of this Department into two Cabinet posts was approved by William Howard Taft on his last day in office as President. Dwight Eisenhower created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by utilizing the same provisions of the Reorganization Act

under which the Department of Urban Affairs is proposed.

The tremendous growth of the urban population in recent years and the continuing high rate of change from country to city living have created many new problems for our cities to solve. The Federal Government has long cooperated in aiding the cities in meeting their problems through several independent Federal agencies which are in existence today. This reorganization plan under consideration will modernize the existing machinery to better carry out the functions which provide services to all communities wherever they may be geographically located. In particular I refer to the fact that the main benefit in this plan is the removal of duplication of material and effort by merging the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration into one department.

The continuing changes in living condition and rising standards of living have generated an urgent need for modern imaginative planning to provide the solutions to the problems to which our people are faced. The present Federal machinery was not designed to cope with the great urban problems that are located in every corner of our Nation today. The number of smaller cities and towns across our country have increased greatly in recent years and these communities have many interests in common with larger urban areas. The interests of all communities—from the largest to the smallest—will be benefited by the increased effectiveness that would result from giving that part of our population which lives in urban areas a voice in the Cabinet on matters which relate exclusively to cities.

By raising the status of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration the new Secretary would be more directly responsible to the Congress and the President for the effective execution of the programs now carried out by different agencies. The new Secretary will be better able to represent the interest of the 70 percent of our population which resides in cities.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY M. LIVINGSTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the curiosities of our time is the publicity treatment accorded men and women in private and public enterprise. Those who achieve good records in private industry are given ample recognition and encouragement in trade publications and the general press. Too often, the public servant, unless he is in high elected office, doing an equally efficient job remains unnoticed until he retires or dies.

Taking a leaf from private industry's book, I want to call attention to the

splendid record of service given to the House of Representatives and its workers by Harry M. Livingston, who is just completing 13 years as the disbursing clerk.

The magnitude of his task is not generally known. Mr. Livingston every year draws up a budget of about \$52 million. He supervises 20 employees and under his direction they issue paychecks to 4,200 persons working in the Capitol and offices of House Members. In 1954, Mr. Livingston mechanized his payroll system and all of us in the House benefited by his modernization of an ancient method of paying employees.

Every year the General Accounting Office makes an audit of the House Disbursing Office and for the 13 years that Henry M. Livingston has administered its affairs they have been found to be in perfect order. A report by the Comptroller General was made on the functions of his office and it is significant that it required 37 pages to describe them.

Also of note is that the Comptroller General recommended that Mr. Livingston write a manual telling of his procedures and methods of operation. Its purpose is to continue the efficient system he has evolved as a guide for anybody who might run the office at some future time.

Harry Livingston has served a multitude of us well since 1949 and it is the sincere wish of hundreds that we will have him with us and at his post for many more years. All of us can join in saying to him: "Well done."

THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 1961 feed grain program, developed jointly by the Congress and the Department of Agriculture, was a signal success, in which we may all feel the pride of accomplishment. The extent of the achievements of this program is reflected in a detailed report prepared by the Department of Agriculture. I am placing this report in the RECORD at this point in the thought that it will be useful to the Members of the House as we consider the next necessary steps to restore stability and prosperity to agriculture, to reduce farm surpluses, and to bring down the costs of farm programs.

This report was accompanied by various supporting tables which are voluminous and which, in the interest of economy, I am not including in the RECORD. However, any Member interested in this detailed material may obtain it by contacting the Office of Information, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The report follows:

THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

This is a report bringing together the current information concerning the 1961 feed grain program carried out under legislation approved by the Congress and the President on March 22, 1961. Final information on payments is not yet available, but sufficiently complete data are at hand to indicate the extent to which the program has been suc-

cessful in accomplishing the purposes intended by the Congress and the administration.

SUMMARY

In summary, these are the salient points describing the performance of the 1961 feed grain program:

As of January 26, 1962, the Treasury of the United States has received about \$496 million in receipts from the sale of feed grain under the authority of the 1961 program. It represents some 500 million bushels of grain sold by the Department from the certificates issued to farmers participating in the program.

During the time these sales have been made, the market price for corn and grain sorghums has remained at a higher level than during the comparable period in 1960.

The sale of grain to date represents over half of the funds spent during 1961 to meet the pledges of farmers to retire croplands to conserving uses.

Net farm income in 1961 is estimated to be over \$1 billion higher than in 1960, a rise of 9 percent. A large part of this gain can be attributed to the feed grain program and higher support prices for major farm commodities and to increased cash marketings.

Retail food prices paid by consumers for meat, poultry, and dairy products have shown great stability during the period of the program. These are the products which the feed grain market affect directly.

Without the feed grain program, the Federal Government would have been required to support feed grains for all producers regardless of the volume of production. Under such conditions, it is apparent that production would have surpassed total consumption by about 500 million bushels—all of which would have passed into Government hands.

The program, designed for the 1961 production year and operating under unusually favorable weather conditions, will reduce Government stocks by some 200 million bushels, rather than increasing stocks.

The taxpayer will benefit by millions of dollars in immediate reductions in storage, transportation, handling, and interest charges on grain which is now moving into the market. Government expenditures over the next 9 years approximately will be nearly \$600 million less because of the lower level of feed grain carryover.

How well does this meet the objectives as laid down by the Congress?

In its report on the 1961 feed grain program, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry said this:

"This bill provides for an emergency 1961 feed grain program to prevent further accumulation of supplies and begin to bring them in line with demand. Its objectives are to increase farm income, save Government funds, and hold down or reduce surplus stocks, without material effect on consumer prices. To accomplish these objectives it would (1) raise feed grain support prices, (2) condition price support on the retirement of acreage from feed grain production, and (3) provide payments in cash and in kind for participation in such retirement program."

In its report, the House Committee on Agriculture said this:

"The purpose of this bill is to establish a 1-year emergency program to reduce the production of feed grains in the crop-year 1961 and thereby alleviate conditions of oversupply and low prices which are seriously depressing a major segment of the Nation's agriculture and placing on taxpayers the burden of holding nearly \$4 billion of these grains in the bins of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"In presenting his program to the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture estimated that it would reduce feed grain production

in 1961 by approximately 1 billion bushels, would result in a saving of approximately \$500 million to the Government, and would increase the income of feed grain producers approximately 10 percent. Although the committee has made some modifications in the Secretary's program, it believes that the benefits under the bill as reported will be at least as great as the Secretary estimated for his proposal."

Supporting information and statistical data on the summary material will provide a more detailed picture as to the extent to which the program has reached the objectives laid down by the Congress. As further information is gathered on the feed grain program, it will be forwarded for evaluation.

DETAIL ON THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The success of the 1961 feed grain program can be demonstrated and measured in a number of different ways. Here are three of the most important:

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON FARM INCOME

Net realized farm income for 1961 is estimated at \$12.7 billion, an increase of \$1.0 billion, or 9 percent, over the \$11.7 billion for 1960. A substantial part of this increase is a result of the 1961 feed grain program and to increased support prices for many of the major commodities. Rural communities and all who sell to or serve farmers are benefiting from improved farm income. The outlook is that these gains can at least be maintained into the next year.

Another measure of the effect on the program is revealed in that the value to the producer of the 1960 corn and grain sorghum crop, computed at the season average price, was \$4.4 billion; and the value of the 1961 corn and grain sorghum plus the payments for acreage reduction is estimated at \$5.1 billion.

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON CONSUMERS OF FOOD

The 1961 feed grain program has not increased the price of food to consumers. Price indexes computed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the retail price of meat in November was 1.6 percent less than it was in January; the retail price of poultry has declined over 10 percent; and the retail price of dairy products has had normal seasonal fluctuations and was just about the same in November as it was in January. These are the principal products which could be affected by the program, and the figures show clearly that food consumers have suffered no adverse effects from the program.

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON THE TAXPAYERS

Without the feed grain program approved by Congress in March, 1961, the USDA would have been required to support the price of feed grains to all producers without any limitation on production. The surplus production which would have resulted from such action would have raised the national carryover of corn and grain sorghums by about 500 million bushels. But it now looks as if the total carryover of the two grains will be 200 million bushels less at the end of the crop year than they were at the start of the year. (The total carryover of all feed grains is estimated to be 280 million bushels less than a year ago.)

If there had been no emergency feed grain program in 1961, production of corn and grain sorghum this year would have totaled about 4,900 million bushels—800 million bushels more than the 4,107 million bushels estimated in the December crop summary. Without the program, the national carryover of corn and grain sorghum at the end of the 1961 marketing year would have gone up by 500 million bushels to a total of 3,200 million bushels. With the program the carryover will go down by 200 million bushels to 2,500 million bushels.

In recent years the quantity of corn and grain sorghums in private hands at the end

of the crop year has ranged between 100 and 150 million bushels. There is no reason to believe that these holdings will change materially this year. Therefore, the reduction of 700 million bushels from what would have been carried over without the program will be entirely in Government holdings; either under loan or in CCC's inventory at the end of the marketing year.

This reduction in feed grain surplus of 700 million bushels is benefiting the taxpayer right now by cutting current expenditures, but the big saving will come in the years ahead. The Government would have had to handle and store that 700 million bushels of grain for about 9 years. Government costs will be nearly \$600 million less in future years because of this reduction in 1961 corn and grain sorghum crops.

ACREAGE DIVERSION AND REDUCTION IN PLANTED ACREAGE

Preliminary estimates indicate that 25.2 million acres, normally devoted to the production of feed grains, were retired to a conservation use in 1961. Of this, 19.1 million acres came from corn and 6.1 million acres from grain sorghums.

As a result of retiring these acreages to a conservation use, the total planted acreage of corn and grain sorghums in the Nation dropped about 20.4 million acres below the 1959-60 planted acreage—a reduction of 20 percent. This represents a total of about 15.2 million acres of corn and 5.2 million acres of grain sorghums.

The number of acres diverted to a conservation use and the decrease in planted acreage of these two grains cannot be directly compared. This is true because the 1961 feed grain program was a voluntary program, and farmers who elected not to participate could increase their acreage of corn and grain sorghums if they desired. It was recognized from the beginning that this would occur. The extent to which those outside the program increased their acreage would offset some of the acreage diverted to conservation uses by growers who did participate in the program. On the other hand, many participants did not plant acreage which they were entitled to plant, even though they received no payment for this additional diversion.

PHANTOM ACREAGE

There has been considerable misunderstanding and half-truth surrounding the catch phrase "phantom acreage" used in connection with the 1961 feed grain program. What is meant by phantom acreage? This term presumably was invented to describe acreage paid for but not removed from production under the feed grain program. Some have even compared the amount by which acreage paid for under the program (25.2 million) is larger than the reduction in 1961 planted acreage for all U.S. producers, as a measure of phantom acreage.

Objectively, phantom acreage could be associated only with participating farms since this is the only group intending to reduce their acreage of corn and grain sorghums under the program. Applied to participating farms then, phantom acreage could only represent that part of the net upward adjustment made in arriving at the base acreage, which was not offset by underplanted acreage not paid for. Following is an examination of this in more detail:

1. Public Law 87-5 clearly authorized the Secretary to adjust 1959-60 average planted acreages "as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production." The 1959-60 planned acreage on participating farms was 59.7 million acres (45.3 million corn and 14.4 million grain sorghums). This average acreage was adjusted to 64 million acres (48.4 corn and 15.6 grain sorghums) to arrive at the base acreage for these farms—an adjustment clearly in line with the congressional intent of iron-

ing out inequities, and eliminating hardships resulting from adverse weather conditions in the base years. The net upward adjustment thus was 4.3 million acres (3.1 million corn and 1.2 million grain sorghums).

2. But participating farms actually planted only 32.6 million acres (25.3 million corn and 7.3 million grain sorghums), or 6.2 million acres less than the 38.8 million acres permitted them, after diverting 25.2 million acres for payment (19.1 million corn and 6.1 million grain sorghums).

3. Summarizing then, participating farms received an upward adjustment of 4.3 million acres in establishing their base acreage, but voluntarily and without payment elected to reduce their plantings by an additional 6.2 million acres. It is clear therefore, that there was no "phantom acreage" on a national basis. Following is a summary of the statistics for these participating farms:

(In millions of acres)

Item	Corn	Grain sorghums	Total
(a) Upward adjustment in base.....	3.1	1.2	4.3
(b) Underplanting of permitted acreage.....	4.0	2.2	6.2
(c) Net phantom acreage (a-b).....	None	None	None

A common misconception which has been widely circulated is to assume that phantom acreage represents the amount by which acreage paid for under the program (25.2 million) is larger than the reduction in 1961 planted acreage (20.4 million) from the 1959-60 average for all U.S. producers. This completely overlooks the fact that nonparticipants increased their acreage substantially—our information is that this increase amounted to 6 to 7 million acres. One of the important reasons why a producer did not participate is that he wanted to grow an increased acreage. The program was entirely voluntary and he could choose this course if he wished. Nevertheless, it would be completely illogical to include acreage increases on nonparticipating farms as a part of the phantom acreage.

REDEMPTION OF FEED GRAIN CERTIFICATES AND SALES FROM CCC STOCKS AGAINST CERTIFICATES POOLED BY PRODUCERS

The feed grain legislation for 1961 authorized producers to redeem certificates for feed grains from CCC stocks or to receive cash from CCC by surrendering certificates—thus authorizing CCC to subsequently sell feed grains in the market to obtain restoration of the cash paid to the producers.

Redemptions by producers and subsequent holders of certificates for grains from CCC stocks have amounted to \$4,830,711 for 4,846,995 bushels of feed grains through January 26, 1962.

Through January 26, 1962, the Department had sold 500 million bushels of grain in redemption of rights represented by pooled certificates with a value of \$496 million.

The actions of the Department have been and will be guided by policies which were publicly stated by the Secretary in July 1961 and which follow:

"CCC sales policy under the 1961 feed grain program is designed to carry out these objectives: To honor the Department's general understanding with cooperators that they can expect to benefit by diverting their feed grain acreage to conservation uses; to assure reasonable and stable prices to users of feed grains and consumers of livestock products; to improve farm income; and to permit feed grain prices during the marketing year generally to follow patterns, relative to harvest-time prices, similar to those of recent years."

Actions taken by the Department were as follows: To implement the authorization to sell from CCC stocks for certificates redeemed in cash, the Department first announced, on June 16, 1961, an interim offer to sell grain sorghum to stabilize market prices during the summer until the 1961 crop began to move to market. Then on July 21, 1961, with the 1961 grain sorghum harvest beginning in volume, the Department announced a continuing offer to sell grain sorghums at market prices. At that time the Secretary made the statement quoted above.

On September 13, 1961, the Department first offered CCC-owned corn for sale at market prices, initially applying this offer to those areas where supplies were needed to aid in maintaining feed grain prices at reasonable levels for livestock producers and thus helping to stabilize prices for consumers of livestock products.

On September 14, 1961, the Department offered barley for sale at market prices against certificates in limited amounts in the Pacific Northwest in order to stabilize prices to feed grain users in that area and to avert disorder in the production and marketing of livestock and poultry.

On October 27, 1961, the Department augmented the open offers to sell corn and grain sorghum by the establishing of minimum price guidelines at levels which would not permit sales by CCC at prices below generally prevailing prices received by farmers in the fall of 1960 for the 1960 crop. The Department stated also that all dispositions of corn and grain sorghum for unrestricted use, including sales of nonstorable grains, would be in redemption of feed grain certificates.

On November 9, 1961, the Department announced an offer to sell CCC-owned feed barley to livestock owners (including poultrymen) in the north-central area covering the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

On December 29, 1961, the Department modified the terms of sales to provide that only sales of storable corn and grain sorghum would be in redemption of certificates or rights represented by pooled certificates.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In February a committee of feed grain farmers met with representatives of the Department and fashioned a feed grain program. It was an emergency program, developed under the pressure of planting deadlines. It was designed to increase farm income, to prevent further buildup of the feed grain surplus, to reduce ultimate feed grain program costs to taxpayers, and to help assure consumers of fair and stable prices for meat, poultry, and dairy products.

On March 22 legislation authorizing the program was enacted and Department officials left that evening to carry the program to State ASC committees. Within 3 days every State committee in the Nation had been informed on program provisions. In record time, the State and county committees carried the story to producers. Although planting was already underway in Southern States at that time, signup by June 1 exceeded expectations and justified the action of Congress in giving farmers the opportunity to cooperate together toward solving the feed grain problem.

The legislation provided for a 1-year voluntary program that called upon producers to reduce their 1961 corn and feed grain acreage 20 to 40 percent below the average of 1959 and 1960 acreage. Price support for feed grains was raised to the following levels: corn, \$1.20 per bushel; grain sorghums, \$1.93 per hundredweight; barley, 93 cents per bushel; oats, 62 cents per bushel; and rye, \$1.02 per bushel. In order to be eligible for the higher price supports, producers are required to reduce 1961 acreages by 20 percent of the 1959-60 corn and grain sorghum acreages. Producers who do not elect to

participate are not eligible for price support on any of the feed grain crops.

To maintain income for farmers reducing their acreages of corn and grain sorghums, payments are made in certificates redeemable in kind from feed grains in CCC inventory. Payments compensate farmers for carrying out approved conservation practices on the retired acres. Cooperators who wish to receive the cash equivalent of grain may ask CCC to act as their agent in marketing their certificates. As agent for the producer, CCC advances the payment to the producer in cash through county ASC offices and subsequently markets the grain. Half the estimated total payment for a farm was offered to the producer as soon as he signified that he would cooperate in the program.

For retiring acreages equal to 20 percent of their base, producers are eligible for a payment equal to 50 percent of their normal production on their diverted acreage times the county support price. Actual payment computation is based on a payment rate per acre for the country multiplied by the acreage diverted and by the farm's productivity index. Such index reflects the farm's 1959-60 average yield, relative to the county average.

As an added incentive, the program provides for further reductions at a higher payment rate. This additional reduction can be any amount up to 20 percent more, and the higher rate is based upon 60 percent of the 1959-60 average yield.

The program also provides an inducement to farms with small base acreages to participate. Where the minimum reduction of 20 percent amounts to less than 20 acres, the producer may elect to divert for payment either the actual computed minimum or up to 20 acres. In addition, he may divert another 20 percent. Therefore, farms having a feed-grain base of 25 acres or less may retire their entire base acreage and receive compensation.

Producers who participate in the program are required to devote the acreage diverted from corn or grain sorghum production to conserving uses. This is in addition to the average 1959-60 acreage devoted to soil-conserving uses of the farm. Diverted acreage cannot be harvested or pastured, except under special conditions in designated disaster areas.

Producers are eligible to receive price support for feed grains even though they divert acreage to the production of castor beans, safflower, sunflower, or sesame. They will not, however, be eligible for program payments on such acreage.

ADDENDA

Tables which accompany this report and which may be obtained by contacting the Office of Information, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA, are:

Table No. 1: Comparison of supply and utilization data and value of production with and without the 1961 feed grain program (millions, except prices and yields).

Table No. 2: Estimated savings resulting from the 1961 feed grain program (in millions of dollars).

Table No. 3: Total base acres of corn and grain sorghums and base acres of corn and grain sorghum on farms participating in the program.

Table No. 4: Acres of corn and grain sorghums diverted for payment and value of payments earned.

Table No. 5: Extent of farms participating in the program.

Table No. 6: Summary of planted acreage, base acreage, and acreage diverted for payment by participating and nonparticipating farms.

Table No. 7: Weekly report of feed grain certificate redemptions (producer and subsequent holder).

Table No. 8: Sales against certificate pool.

USDA'S FIRST CENTURY

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its cooperating land-grant colleges. The autumn issue of *Corn*, published by Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., is a review of the services and accomplishments of USDA's first century.

I am inserting this review at this point in the *RECORD*, to make it available to all the Members of the House, because it is a fitting tribute and also an example of what other organizations can do to help celebrate this centennial.

USDA'S FIRST CENTURY

At this precise point in our history, our population is well fed, well paid, comfortable. Hunger, malnutrition, and the prospect of famine—familiar conditions among millions elsewhere in the world—are almost unknown to us. We take food for granted.

For this happy state of affairs we are indebted to an agricultural system without an equal anywhere, and, in large part, to a single agency of Government which, for the past 100 years, has been guide and mentor to generations of farmers.

Perhaps now, on the eve of the centennial of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is an appropriate time to take a brief look at its history, its problems and achievements in managing that basic industry which has made us the best-fed people on earth.

For agriculture is an industry, indeed the largest industry we have. Its total investment exceeds \$206 billion. It employs 7.1 million people—more than the combined employment in the steel, automotive, transportation, and public utilities industries. In the production, distribution and processing of its products it creates vast employment elsewhere.

Other industries, as they grow, construct new plants, occupy more space, hire more employees. The history of agriculture reveals just the opposite trend. Today, with its production at virtually an alltime peak, agriculture occupies far fewer acres than formerly, for it has steadily lost its lands to other industries, highways, urban development. Agriculture's staff—the farmers who produce its commodities—has gradually diminished and is now at an alltime low. Today one man produces food and fiber for 25 others besides himself. As comparisons with Russia are becoming fashionable, it is perhaps pertinent to point out that the Soviet's average farmer produces food for only four or five others.

This fact of increasing production from a steadily shrinking plant, and by fewer employees, is striking testimony to American agricultural efficiency.

Back of this achievement is the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the cooperating system of land-grant colleges, with their regional research laboratories, their Federal and State experiment stations, their extension services that fan out to every country where land is farmed. The agricultural colleges teach the science of farming not only to undergraduates but via their extension departments and the county-agent system, to every farmer in the State who has a problem and needs a solution.

The USDA, in effect a Federal university of agriculture with a store of knowledge any farmer can tap for the price of a 4-cent stamp, has become what Abraham Lincoln and a few other agricultural idealists dreamed it should be.

U.S. AGRICULTURE BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT

The Department is nominally a century old but it existed, under different names and in rudimentary forms, much more than a century ago. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson had, in their different

ways, the same dream which Lincoln brought to reality in 1862. History reveals that both Washington and Jefferson knew how to farm and looked to a day when their own agricultural competence would be the property of every farmer. In effect, George Washington, and his Mount Vernon, with its five farms, was our first agricultural experiment station.

Beyond Mount Vernon and Monticello, however, such farming as Washington and Jefferson could see was inefficient by their own standards. Both statesmen saw the need of a central organization of government to disseminate farming knowledge and to integrate the Nation's agriculture.

Yet USDA is not and never was the brainchild of any single President or statesman or bureaucrat. The Department grew slowly, evolving step by step in response to the public need and demand. Public aid to agriculture is as old as the history of government, for food is basic to life itself and to the conduct of any nation in peace or war. Droughts, floods, and insect infestations historically have demanded governmental action to save the food supply.

The U.S. Patent Office, surprisingly enough, was the true progenitor of the Department of Agriculture. Established in 1790, the Patent Office seems to have had little concern with farming until the late 1830's. Then newly reorganized and under the wing of the State Department, the Patent Office undertook to distribute seeds and collect agricultural statistics.

The first Patent Commissioner under the new setup was a farm-minded individual named Henry L. Ellsworth. Mayor of Hartford, Conn., and a lawyer by profession, Ellsworth had a solidly urban background. Yet he had his own farm and was prominent in the Hartford County Agricultural Society.

Ellsworth's first report, made to President Martin Van Buren in 1839, is a historic curiosity. Only two pages long, it summarized the agency's disbursements in a sentence: "The ordinary expenses of the Patent Office the past year, including payments for the library and agricultural statistics was \$20,799.95."

The existence of a few agricultural societies in the 1830's helped to integrate the work of individual farmers under country-wide and statewide direction. Indeed, such group efforts were not new, even then. As far back as 1785 the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture was founded, with George Washington an honorary member. By 1860, still 2 years before USDA itself, such organizations numbered over a thousand.

In their periodic meetings they discussed their common or unique problems, and doubtless the science of agriculture was advanced considerably through such early seminars. But the spoken word, then as now, was not enough. Visual education was needed, and the permanence of print. These needs were met by the annual farm fair, exhibiting crops and livestock (one is recorded as early as 1810), and by the agricultural press.

First of a long line of periodicals to spread the gospel of farming in print was the *Agricultural Museum*, published in Georgetown, D.C., from 1810 to 1812. Destined for a far wider influence, the *American Farmer* appeared in Baltimore in 1819. The latter journal seems to have been sufficiently eloquent to spark a new congressional awareness of the importance of farm production. For in 1820 the House established a Committee on Agriculture, and in 1825 the Senate followed suit.

Thereafter, farm journals multiplied; today, well over 700 agricultural magazines and newspapers are regularly issued in the United States. Probably at least 500 daily newspapers employ a farm editor, and as many or more radio stations carry a regular farm

program. Much of the output of these private commentators stems from USDA itself and the land-grant colleges. In its books, booklets, experiment-station bulletins, press releases and published speeches, the Department of Agriculture is today one of the largest publishers in the world.

THE MOUNTING NEED FOR USDA

By 1845 the science of agriculture had become a major concern of the Patent Office. Technology was asserting itself in the farm fields. The steel plow was cleaving the springtime earth; McCormick's reaper was harvesting grain; the threshing machine was separating grain from chaff. The farmer's investments were mounting; to meet his debts he needed credit and he needed broader markets for his crops. Commissioner Ellsworth's first report, for 1839, had taken two pages. His last, only five years later, constituted a book of 520 pages with an index.

On the farm, guesswork and hereditary notions were yielding to scientific analysis and research. Experiments with cornstarch sugar convinced Ellsworth (mistakenly, as history has shown) that this product would soon be produced commercially. Already Thomas Kingsford's plant in Oswego, N.Y., was processing corn kernels to produce starch, but neither Kingsford nor Ellsworth thought then of converting starch into the corn sirup and sugar (dextrose) that were to become staple food items.

In 1849, with the Patent Office now in the new Department of the Interior, President Zachary Taylor urged a Bureau of Agriculture in that Department, but Congress took no action.

Through the next decade the agitation for agricultural colleges, free land, and more governmental assistance to farmers became increasingly vocal. Such moves were consistently opposed, however, by southern Congressmen who held that the doctrine of States rights forbade Federal intervention. One land-grant college bill did win congressional blessing, but President Buchanan vetoed it as not only extravagant but unconstitutional.

By 1861, agriculture was outgrowing the Patent Office and no one knew it better than the new Commissioner, David P. Holloway. His report for that year, submitted to President Lincoln in 1862, largely omitted statistics but contained an impassioned plea for a Federal institution to serve agriculture, a calling which still occupied well over half of the people.

Holloway found reinforcement in two quarters. The secession had removed from Congress the bloc of States rights advocates who opposed Federal farm aid, and had shifted the dominant political influence from the agricultural South to the industrial North. Hence the need for farm representation in Washington was more than ever acute.

Also supporting Holloway was the influential U.S. Agricultural Society, with a membership that was virtually a Who's Who in American agriculture. The society's widely respected journal had long pressed for a Federal department. This pressure was intensified when the society's member, Charles B. Calvert, of Maryland, was elected to Congress in July 1861, and appointed to the Committee on Agriculture.

Meanwhile, accurately appraising the trend, Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, gathered support for his land-grant college bill.

THE DEPARTMENT AT LAST

Lincoln had "suggested" a Bureau rather than a Department, but the organizational details seem to have concerned him but little.

The House committee decided in favor of a Department, without Cabinet status and in charge of a Commissioner, and the bill was so drawn. President Lincoln's signature made it law on May 15, 1862.

The official seal of the new Department depicted wheat. Later it was changed to show a shock of corn, and the wheat was removed, despite its importance as the "staff of life." The seal says, better than words can, that corn is so great a crop it can symbolize all of U.S. agriculture.

On May 20 Lincoln signed the Homestead Act, providing for the apportionment of 160-acre freehold farms from the public domain, to citizens who would make their homes on such land and till it for 5 years.

The Land-Grant College Act, fathered by Senator Morrill, received Lincoln's signature on July 2. Under this law the States were empowered to sell 11 million acres of public land, use the proceeds to endow agricultural colleges, and thereafter to operate the colleges themselves. The Morrill Act is historically and socially significant, for it signaled the beginning of Federal grants-in-aid to the States, and it opened to virtually everyone those gates of higher education to which only the privileged had hitherto possessed keys.

Isaac Newton, a Quaker of farm stock, had headed the Agricultural Division of the Patent Office, and he now became the first Commissioner of Agriculture. Newton's budget for the Department's first fiscal year was \$60,000.

In its preamble, the act establishing the Department cites the duty "to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word."

A glowing promise, yet it failed to quicken the pulse of the dirt farmers who produced most of the crops. The new Department faced public apathy for some time. The pressure for it had been generated largely by "gentlemen farmers" and their societies, but most of rural America believed in the Jeffersonian maxim that the best government is the least. Senator Hale remarked that the prevailing dirt-farmer attitude was "For God's sake, let us alone."

The Department's pre-Cabinet history—1862-1889—shows a gradual expansion. In 1867 Congress appropriated \$100,000 for a building to house the Department, at 12th and B Streets. The structure was finished a year later, under Commissioner Horace Capron, and the Department's 47 employees moved in. A stable was built in 1879, a building for the Seeds Division in 1881, and a greenhouse in 1883.

The old Patent Office had had its troubles with statistical compilations, for crops were then largely unreported, and accurate data were hard to come by. By 1866, however, annual harvests were beginning to look impressive, reporting facilities had improved, and a demand for facts and figures was finding wide public expression. The Corn Belt had shifted from the war-exhausted Southeast, where Tennessee and Kentucky had been the top corn States, to the Central West, and the Wheat Belt was moving in a similar direction. Perhaps something ulterior was back of the public demand for statistics, however, for certain speculators were using them as guides to future market fluctuations.

Forestalling such misuse of its forecasts, USDA has for many years guarded its monthly crop estimates with the utmost secrecy until the day and hour of release.

The work of the Bureau of Animal Industry, organized in 1883, marked another extension of Federal aid to the various States. Animal diseases, particularly contagious pleuropneumonia and cattle-tick fever, crossed borders and presented problems beyond State control. The Bureau's research eradicated contagious pleuropneumonia in 5 years; later its studies of other diseases sharply diminished livestock and poultry losses.

Norman J. Colman, appointed by President Grover Cleveland in 1885, was the last Commissioner of Agriculture. His efforts helped the passage of the Hatch Act, in 1887, creating the State agricultural experiment stations and giving the Department its second bureau, the Office of Experiment Stations. The resulting Extension Service brought the knowledge acquired in research direct to farmers in every State.

CABINET STATUS FOR USDA

The 50th Congress was overwhelmed with petitions urging Cabinet rank for the Department. On February 9, 1889, the Department was raised to this status, and on February 13 Commissioner Colman was appointed the first Secretary of Agriculture.

Colman held this historic post for less than a month, for he left office with President Cleveland. The incoming President, Benjamin Harrison, appointed Jeremiah M. Rusk as Secretary of Agriculture. Farmer, tavern keeper, and eventually Governor of Wisconsin, Rusk had a sense of public relations that was rare for his day. He interested the press in the Department's work, and inaugurated the publication of bulletins which informed farmers on new findings of research. Under Rusk, USDA acquired the Weather Bureau, formerly of the War Department.

Rusk and his immediate successors, J. Sterling Morton (1893-97) and James Wilson (1897-1913), guided the Department through a kind of golden age, a tranquil time in which the problems seem minor, in historical perspective, beside those presented later by two world wars and a long depression.

Morton had two passions: saving money and planting trees. The former led him to stop free-seed distribution (it was later resumed but ended permanently in 1923); the latter earned him the distinction of becoming the founder of Arbor Day.

Under Morton, the Department obtained civil service status for its employees, then numbering 2,019, including 429 women. Despite his insistence upon economy, Morton held that most of them were sadly underpaid. (Chiefs of scientific bureaus drew \$2,500 annually.) The Department's budget in Morton's final year, 1896, was \$2,583,750.

In appointing James Wilson, of Iowa, to head Agriculture in March 1897, President McKinley inaugurated the longest secretarial tenure in the Department's first century. Wilson stayed in office 16 years, serving under Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt and William H. Taft.

TURN OF THE CENTURY

Wilson's era saw the Department grow faster than the weeds it attempted to control, and enormously expand its services to agriculture.

Industrial, technological and social changes which later were to revolutionize agriculture were becoming evident early in the new century. The upsurge of population demanded vastly more food; railroads were tapping new lands; the automobile and improved roads brought markets nearer the farm; machinery began to replace manpower; electricity, the telephone and plumbing gave a new and pleasanter aspect to rural life.

Keener competition put a premium upon efficiency in farm management. Many deserted farming for the cities—by 1910 agriculture claimed only 32 percent of all employed.

Wilson reorganized related USDA units into four new Bureaus: Plant Industry, Chemistry, Forestry, and Soils, with Chiefs' salaries upped to \$5,000. Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, crusading for pure foods, headed the Bureau of Chemistry. Gifford Pinchot, later Governor of Pennsylvania, was in charge of Forestry.

The Bureau of Plant Industry had organized in 1901 a new farm-demonstration program. A year later, when Texas cotton was so stricken by the boll weevil that \$500,000 in Federal aid was demanded, the Bureau's forces demonstrated on farms how to fight the cotton pest.

Wilson was 70 years old in 1906 but he and his Department were striding ahead. Agriculture's appropriation was now over \$7 million. In the decade past, its staff had more than tripled—from 2,019 to 6,242. It increased further when the Pure Food and Drug Act was passed on June 30, 1906, and Dr. Wiley's Bureau of Chemistry was charged with the law's enforcement.

Having boosted production through research, the Department began to look now at the social and cultural aspects of farm life. In 1908 the Bureau of Plant Industry undertook a study of farm economics, and President Theodore Roosevelt appointed his Country Life Commission. With such eminent members as Henry Wallace, Walter Hines Page, Gifford Pinchot and others, the Commission sought to increase farmer cooperation in buying and selling, to promote rural social advantages, and to organize extension work on a national basis.

Secretary James Wilson, leaving office with President Taft in 1913, had laid the groundwork for much that followed.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND AFTER

David F. Houston, appointed by Woodrow Wilson in 1913, had been Secretary of Agriculture for 4 years prior to the United States entry into World War I. An economist, financier, and educator, Houston was more sociologist than agriculturist. The economic and cultural upgrading of rural life was close to his heart. His efforts led to several reforms: He established the new Office of Markets and was instrumental in the passage of the Cotton Futures Act. The Smith-Lever Act, broadening the Extension Service to include personal contact teaching via the land-grant colleges, was passed in 1914. By 1916, laws establishing standards for agricultural products, grain futures, warehousing, and Federal farm loans, had been enacted.

Crop production, traditionally the first aim of the Department, had not been neglected, however, and in 1917 the needs of war could be faced with confidence.

The Food Administration got underway with Herbert Hoover in charge. The Extension Service found new usefulness in teaching farmers to produce more than ever. "Food will win the war" was not only a slogan but an agricultural challenge. Farmers met it with record crops.

The boom in crop production had led inevitably to land speculation, and now the postwar aftermath of overexpanded acreage, topheavy mortgage indebtedness, declining values and surplus crops confronted the new Secretary, Edwin T. Meredith, for his brief tenure of 13 months, and his successor, Henry C. Wallace. The industrial depression of 1921, taking its toll of farm markets, added its murk to the already clouded agricultural landscape. The Department shifted its emphasis to marketing practices, cost-reducing methods, home economics.

Wallace died in office on October 25, 1924, and Assistant Secretary Howard M. Gore became Secretary a month later. Resigning in March 1925, to become Governor of West Virginia, Gore was succeeded by William M. Jardine, president of Kansas State College.

Jardine and his successor, Arthur M. Hyde, saw the somber state of agriculture falsely brightened by the reflected glow of an industrial boom and a rising stock market. Farm groups demanded further reforms: easier credit, lower freight rates, lower taxes, more aid in the farm cooperative movement. Hyde, heading Agriculture under President Hoover in March 1929, was soon to face the farm debris left by the now historic stock market crash. Meanwhile, the Federal Farm

Board had been created, with authority on commodity stabilization and enabled to make loans from a \$500 million fund.

By 1930 only 21.5 percent of all employed persons were farming, yet agricultural surpluses continued to plague the Department. Now it seemed that USDA and the land-grant colleges had taught production too well. Declining export markets aggravated the problem. Loans to Europe had virtually ceased; U.S. tariffs drew reprisals abroad in the form of barriers against our exports.

THE NEW DEAL AND WORLD WAR II

From 1933 to 1940, Secretary Henry A. Wallace seemed to change the countenance of American agriculture more than had all his predecessors combined. Though many of the New Deal's social and economic tenets had their roots in the past, and had been applied to agriculture under Jardine and Hyde, Wallace dramatized these principles, sometimes by actions that many deemed revolutionary.

Surplus commodities, low prices, and farm debt began to seem chronic agricultural ills. The Department focused its resources upon land utilization, elimination of waste, the balancing of crops and markets via such devices as the "ever-normal granary," and finding new industrial uses for farm products. An example of the last was the discovery, at USDA's Peoria laboratory, of corn steepwater's virtue in the production of penicillin.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 initiated crop and marketing controls. Surpluses were indeed reduced, but whether you credited the new farm program or the record-breaking drought of 1934 perhaps depended upon your politics.

Other legislation reflecting governmental concern with the plight of agriculture, in the years 1933-38, included the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and laws regulating farm mortgages, farm credit, soil erosion, rural electrification, flood control, surplus commodities, farm tenants, farm forestry, and crop insurance.

Secretary Wallace, now a candidate for the Vice Presidency, resigned from Agriculture in September 1940. Claude R. Wickard, an Indiana dirt farmer and Purdue graduate, had been Under Secretary, and he now succeeded Wallace in the top post.

Wallace had dealt with a long depression, and under his regime the Federal Government had become deeply and indeed personally involved with farmers everywhere. Other and equally grave responsibilities soon faced Wickard. World War II, with the suddenness of a thunderbolt, turned agriculture back to its old, almost forgotten aim of heavy production. For food was again a munition of war.

Organizing the agricultural front lines, Congress passed a great sheaf of new legislation and created many new agencies. The Department's wartime powers gave it far more authority than ever before. In its jurisdiction over the production and distribution of food, the Department touched the day-to-day life of every citizen.

Farmers answered history's greatest call by harvesting record crops in 1942 and 1943. Now only 18 percent of all employed persons were in agriculture, and even this figure declined through the Armed Forces buildup. Those left on the farm were often handicapped by shortages of materials. But, importantly, they knew their business. They knew how to farm, largely because the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges had taught them, and their fathers, how to farm. New knowledge, uncovered by prior research but kept from full utilization by the long depression, was now applied to the hilt and helped produce the record wartime harvests.

EIGHTY—NINETY—ONE HUNDRED YEARS

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Congressman from New Mexico, took office as Secretary in July 1945. He and his successor, Charles F. Bran-

nan (ANDERSON resigned in 1948 to run for the Senate), faced an enormous postwar readjustment. Hitherto, agricultural problems had been largely national. Now they became international. Overseas, famine stalked across many lands. President Truman's famine relief program, in 1946, was immediately a USDA charge. A Famine Emergency Committee defined steps for the conservation of wheat, wheat products, food fats and oils.

Meanwhile, the constitution for the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization had been proposed, and agricultural groups abroad had joined with USDA in the U.N. Food and Agriculture Conference in 1943.

The Department's history under Ezra Taft Benson, in President Eisenhower's administration, and Orville L. Freeman, who succeeded Benson in January 1961, is so recent there is little need to recapitulate it here.

Benson was the first Secretary in years whose economic philosophy was rigidly opposed to price controls. The war years had geared farmers to heavy production; under both Benson and Freeman surplus crops have constituted the major agricultural malaise. Each has sought, in his own way, to effect a cure.

Freeman sees another grave problem looming in the future of agriculture, and he voiced it as recently as October 4, addressing the Graduate School of USDA. It concerns the displacement of the owner-operated, family farm by larger farms with heavier investment in machinery, access to greater credit, and hence higher production per dollar of cost. Mr. Freeman fears that able young farmers may thus be forced out of agriculture, and he acknowledges a governmental responsibility to help such men find other employment.

THE SECOND CENTURY?

The first century of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has paralleled the first century of U.S. industry. A hundred years ago the two were apart, separate entities in our economic and social life. Indeed the needs of one were often considered antipathetic to the needs of the other. As the century progressed, the two grew together, today they are interlocked and interdependent. Agriculture is said to provide 4 of every 10 jobs in private industry. Yet there could be no agriculture, as practiced today, without industry behind it, making its machines, fertilizers, chemicals, feeds. In utilizing agriculture's raw materials, industry has made the markets that have raised agriculture to its current peak.

Problems USDA has faced in its first hundred years may well appear trivial beside those that will challenge it between now and 2062. Anyone who lays his sights along the next decade can see at once a single and huge challenge to agriculture. Population, in a word. Reproduction of people challenging production of food. If we have 230 million people by 1975, as assuredly we shall unless the 50-megaton bombs begin to fall, agriculture will be faced with such extra food demands as these: 16.3 billion pounds of red meat, 47 billion pounds of milk, 20.7 million tons of fruits and vegetables, 20 billion eggs.

Likely agriculture can meet these quotas. But if the current rate of human reproduction is maintained, we will have 353 million people by the year 2000, and very close to a billion people by the close of USDA's second century.

Can agriculture feed them, on a total acreage that is shrinking day by day? Many authorities answer an unqualified yes, citing advancing farm science and greatly increased yields per acre. Others, haunted perhaps by the ghost of Malthus, shake a doubtful head or answer a flat no, and speak of ocean farming, exploiting that still-untapped 75 percent of the globe, as the key to future food.

But, considering the accomplishments of the Department and the land-grant colleges in their first century, all of us can be confident that the stewardship of our food, and our great-grandchildren's food, is in able hands for the next hundred years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, on February 22, on account of attendance at funeral of a friend.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for February 21 and balance of week, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD, for 15 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes today, on two subjects and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour on Tuesday, next, February 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. DOWNING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. DOOLEY, to extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and include a letter and a table.

Mr. TUPPER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1126. An act to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Evangelos J. Marthakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Maria La Bella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Bocalery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady;

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961; and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evangelos Mablekos;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Aic. Percy J. Trudeau.

S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback;

S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of Sulzbach Construction Co.;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;

S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng;

S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rloux;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa;

S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg.

S. 2163. An act for the relief of Salfook Chan; and

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phak Koui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1727. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 14th semiannual report of its activities as of June 30, 1961, pursuant to 64 Stat. 12; 22 U.S.C. App. 1621-1627, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overcharges by the Shipbuilding Division of Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., for materials and supplies acquired for use under Government cost-type contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1729. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on our fiscal year 1960 review of the education and training programs administered by the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of veterans of the Korean conflict and war orphans; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1730. A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Operations, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of foreign excess property disposed of during calendar year 1961 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1731. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3470 of the Revised Statutes to authorize the heads of departments and independent agencies to appoint agents to bid on behalf of the United States, at sales, on execution at the suit of the United States, of lands or tenements of a debtor"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1734. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U.S. mining laws"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1735. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the sixth report of the Attorney General on competition in the synthetic rubber industry covering the industry's operation under private enterprise in the calendar year 1960, pursuant to Senate Report 117, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1736. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General relating to the review of voluntary agreements and programs, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10144. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; without amendment (Rept. No. 1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1371. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9699. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1691. An act to provide that any juvenile who has been determined delinquent by a district court of the United States may be committed by the court to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study; without amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8941. A bill to authorize acceptance of the gift made to the United States by the will of Esther Cattell Schmitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1604. A bill for the relief of Spencer E. Hewitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1918. A bill for the relief of John D. Morton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Barbara W. Trousil, Edward G. Trousil, and Robert E. Trousil; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4563. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gelb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willie Mae Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6076. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Geyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6272. A bill for the relief of Carl D. Soresl; with amendment (Rept. No. 1381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7549. A bill for the relief of the Lewis Invisible Machine Stitch Co., Inc., now known as Lewis Sewing Machine Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8886. A bill for the relief of Thelma E. McClench; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8946. A bill for the relief of Mary R. Galotta; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9409. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iris Ann Landrum; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 10317. A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10318. A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 10319. A bill to adjust the retirement and relief compensation of certain Police and Fire Department personnel of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 10320. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10321. A bill to extend and improve the special education and rehabilitation services provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 10322. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant retirement credit for certain service in the U.S. merchant marine in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 10323. A bill to amend section 624 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator to furnish hospital care and medical treatment for wartime service-connected disabilities to those veterans living abroad; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 10324. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary provision for approval of

certain State plans for aid to the blind under title X of the Social Security Act which do not meet in full the requirements of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 10325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to replace the existing retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage, etc., with equivalent manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 10326. A bill making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday to be known as Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 10327. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to confer insured status for disability insurance benefits thereunder upon disabled individuals who are not presently insured for such benefits but who were insured for such benefits at the time of the injury, or the inception of the disease or condition, which gave rise to their subsequent disabled condition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 10328. A bill to place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously allocated bands of frequencies, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 10329. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10330. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10331. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 10332. A bill to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10333. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue despite his adoption by a great-aunt or great-uncle, the same as it would if he were adopted by a stepparent, grandparent, aunt, or uncle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 10334. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude expenses of the last illness and burial of a spouse from the annual income computation of a dependent parent in determinations of entitlement to dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 10335. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguished brands,

names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10336. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 10337. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10338. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individual taxpayers the same 2-year carryover with respect to the deduction for charitable contributions as is presently provided for corporate taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 10340. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 10341. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1936, the Walsh-Healey Act, to disallow certain items of excessive costs incurred by contractors and directly attributable to the employment of individuals to replace employees engaged in a strike against such contractor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 10342. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to specify certain procedures for use by system, group, or regional boards of adjustment, including provision for the payment by the Mediation Board of compensation to referees sitting with such boards of adjustment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10343. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the spouse of an individual receiving a disability annuity may if otherwise qualified become entitled to a spouse's annuity regardless of whether such individual has attained age 65; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10344. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10345. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10346. A bill to provide for a conservation program for the Appalachian Highlands area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10347. A bill to provide that copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census shall be immune from legal process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 10348. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10349. A bill to amend chapter 14 of title 38, United States Code, to make all veterans awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor eligible for special pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACK:

H.J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 433. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 434. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. Con. Res. 435. Concurrent resolution providing that no funds will be appropriated for the purpose of training military personnel from any Communist country or any country dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 436. Concurrent resolution to explore an OECD Parliamentary Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 10350. A bill for the relief of Sang Yong Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10351. A bill for the relief of Jung Sun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 10352. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rafala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 10353. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Vedova-Rocchi Catta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 10354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elaine Childs Elser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1962

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

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

O Thou God of all worlds—

Lord of all being throned afar,
Thy glory flames from sun and star;
Center and soul of every sphere,
Yet to each loving heart how near.

Void of Thee, all is vanity, and life itself barren, joyless, robbed of its wonder, its dignity, and its beauty.

Without Thee even our wistful hopes for humanity are like winter's withered leaves, once verdant and bright—now crumpled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

To these servants of this free land whose questing spirits seek the paths of a just peace through all the tangle and tragedy of these baffling days, may there come light out of darkness, concord out of discord, strength out of struggle, forgiveness out of guilt, and faith out of fear.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 20, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

- S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;
- S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;
- S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;
- S. 429. An act for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau;
- S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback;
- S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;
- S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;
- S. 1348. An act for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.;
- S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;
- S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;
- S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone;
- S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng;
- S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;