

hope you will do everything you can to assist the full-time cattlemen.

Very truly yours,

WARD CONGER,
Member, Rogue Valley Junior Hereford
Association.

JARY HANSEN,
President, Rogue Valley Junior Hereford
Association.

HUGH CHASLEY,
Vice President, Rogue Valley Junior
Hereford Association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, tomorrow, when the amendment is before the Senate, I shall have more to say on this subject matter, and I shall insert in the RECORD more communications that I have received from constituents in my State who are protesting against the policies of the U.S. State Department.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate will have a very heavy day tomorrow. I say this for the RECORD, because we intend, as indicated, to start with the Williams of Delaware amendment, to be followed by the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and myself, and then one or two amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Other amendments are pending.

I am hopeful that tomorrow it may be possible to work out an arrangement for time to debate on, and then decide on, the so-called beef import amendment. It is a very important amendment. Obviously, it will bring forth considerable discussion.

RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with that notice, I now move that under the previous order, the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 3 (legislative day of February 26), 1964:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard C. Bratton, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico, vice Waldo H. Rogers, deceased.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Russell A. Bowen
Douglas J. Peacher

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3 (legislative day of February 26), 1964:

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching

staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy as an instructor with the grade indicated:

To be lieutenant

Jimmie D. Woods.

The following-named persons to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be lieutenant commanders

Marshall K. Phillips	Robert E. Gardner
Kenneth M. Lumsden	Clayton W. Collins,
Gordon R. Campbell	Jr.

Martin F. Groff	Ralph G. Isaacson
Ronald McClellan	Richard D. Mellette

The following-named persons to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be lieutenants

Harry D. Smith	Harold E. Stanley
Paul J. Bouchard	Billy R. Mull
Daniel C. Mania	Leroy W. Peterson
Richard H. Hicks	Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Robert E. Potts	Philip M. Lebet
Robert E. Diller	Edward A. Walsh

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commanders

Charles K. Townsend Ray E. Moses
Ronald L. Newsom

To be lieutenants

Sigmund R. Petersen	Leonard E. Pickens
J. Rodney Lewis	Frederick H. Gramling
C. William Hayes	Richard B. Fallgren
Seymour R. Kotler	Maurice L. Geiger
Darrell W. Crawford	Gerald R. Cichy
Arthur L. Moshos	Michael H. Fleming
Paul A. Chernoff	

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

J. Rodney Lewis	Leonard E. Pickens
C. William Hayes	Frederick H. Gramling
Seymour R. Kotler	Richard B. Fallgren
Darrell W. Crawford	Maurice L. Geiger
Arthur L. Moshos	Gerald R. Cichy
Paul A. Chernoff	Michael H. Fleming

To be ensigns

Woodrow E. Bliss, Jr.	Phillip C. Johnson
David L. Hough	Roger K. Woodruff

To be lieutenant commanders

Lavon L. Posey	Wesley V. Hull
Philip J. Taetz	Wayne L. Mobley
James K. Richards	Charles A. Burroughs
Robert W. Franklin	Richard E. Alderman
Sidney C. Miller	Ray M. Sundean
Ronald M. Buffington	George M. Poor

To be ensigns

Joseph M. Lushene	Joseph W. Dopp
Carl N. Davis	Walter F. Forster II
Edward E. Jones	Delwyn C. Webster
Frederick J. Kuehn, Jr.	Joseph T. Smith
Robert H. Leininger	James O. Murphy
John E. Dopp	Peter M. Schidrich
Conrad E. Huss	Robert C. Westphall
William Y. S. Williams	Billy G. Morrison
Fred T. Knowles	David P. Van Weele
Lindle E. Barnett	Ronald K. Brewer
William J. Cooke	Gerald R. Schimke
Neal A. Horst	John D. Boon III

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 34: 14: *Depart from evil and do good; seek peace and pursue it.*

Almighty God, in these days of crisis, when peaceloving nations are being drawn together by common devastating

perils and common democratic principles, grant that our own beloved country may take the initiative in extending to one another the overtures of friendship and fraternity.

May we take the lead in promoting the spirit of sympathetic understanding and cooperation lest we all drift apart and place in jeopardy the very existence of our civilization.

Emancipate all the nations from the spirit of self-interest and that vicious scramble for priority and advantage, and may each accept the challenge to strive for that spiritual unity which is a matter of life and death for the world.

Fill our own individual mind and heart with a passionate yearning for that wider and deeper experience of mutual regard and love which are the only and ultimate pledges of peace and prosperity.

May we be partners in putting forth more heroic effort in behalf of a nobler social order which is struggling toward the light of a new day.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whose love is the salvation of our souls and whose laws are the foundation of a world order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 20, 1964:

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

On February 26, 1964:

H.R. 8363. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1182. An act for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin;

H.R. 1295. An act for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon;

H.R. 1355. An act for the relief of Stanisawa Ouellette;

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Areti Siozou Paidas;

H.R. 1455. An act for the relief of Ewald Johan Consen;

H.R. 1520. An act for the relief of Jozefa Trzcińska Biskup and Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic;

H.R. 1521. An act for the relief of Lovorko Lucic;

H.R. 1723. An act for the relief of Agnese Brienza;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo;

H.R. 4284. An act for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou;

H.R. 4682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield;

H.R. 5144. An act for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou;

H.R. 5617. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer;

H.R. 5982. An act for the relief of Pasquale Fiorica;

H.R. 6092. An act for the relief of Alexander Haytko;

H.R. 6313. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj;

H.R. 6320. An act for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others;

H.R. 6477. An act for the relief of Captain Otto R. Bowles;

H.R. 6591. An act for the relief of Constantine Theothopoulos;

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the clerk and the marshal of the Supreme Court;

H.R. 7347. An act for the relief of Teresa Ellipopoulos and Anastasia Ellipopoulos;

H.R. 7821. An act for the relief of Wladyslawa Pytlak Jarosz;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Roy W. Ficken;

H.R. 8322. An act for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis;

H.R. 8507. An act for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force.

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

H.R. 950. An act to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; and

H.R. 7533. An act for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos.

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

S. 473. An act for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk;

S. 1237. An act for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff;

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayo Fujimoto Howard;

S. 1597. An act for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado;

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotini Dimantopoulou;

S. 1966. An act for the relief of Glenda Williams;

S. 1978. An act for the relief of Lillian P. Johnson;

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Francesco Mira;

S. 1985. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Cacciani;

S. 1986. An act for the relief of Hattie Lu; and

S. 2455. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to 49 Stat. 425, as amended by Public Law 85-474, had designated the following delegates to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Lucerne, Switzerland, from March 30 through April 5, 1964: Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORNONEY, and Mr. ALLOTT.

ARTICLE CHARGES U.S. AGENCIES PENETRATED BY REDS

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the pressing demands of our day is to thoroughly investigate the State Department. In a copyrighted story under the banner headline "U.S. Secret Agencies Penetrated by Reds," Guy Richards of the New York Journal-American has presented a strong indictment of the security policies of the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department. In talking with Mr. Richards, I am convinced that he has painstakingly investigated this situation and has presented a factual account. He has done a great service to the American people by exposing the valuable testimony which has been offered by Michal Goleniewski, a defector from the Soviet Secret Police, information which, it appears, the State Department has sought to deprecate in the past. It is time for the Congress to step in and investigate the State Department.

As could be expected, the Washington Post gave the administration's view on the former KGB official's information in a terse paragraph:

It was learned on highest authority, however, that the newspaper account was considered not only inaccurate, but inconsistent with information Goleniewski has provided American officials.

What is the truth in this matter? The American people deserve to know and, judged by the past record of the State Department, we will never learn the truth from them. Only the Congress can bring out the truth in this matter and it is imperative that we do so immediately. On November 27, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 812, which called for a thorough investigation of the State Department. I suggest that we need this investigation more than ever before, particularly in view of our fumbling foreign policy around the world and the revelations of Michal Goleniewski.

INDIAN FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. WESTLAND. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the Today show this morning there was quite a bit of discussion concerning a march of some Indians on the capital of the State of Washington, Olympia. There were also some comment about a fellow named Marlon Brando who was accompanying these Indians to help them in their fight for their fishing rights. Mr. Brando went out with a gill net, threw it across a river and caught a couple of steelhead trout, which is a game fish. He caught them out of season and caught them with illegal gear. He was apprehended and then turned loose. If it had been anybody else, he would have been in jail and stayed there, where he should be. Mr. Brando may be a great actor, but he does not know a thing about the

fishing industry in the State of Washington. These Indians claim they are losing their treaty rights which guaranteed them their right to fish in their "usual and accustomed places." Therefore, they have said they can fish any place they want to in the State of Washington with any kind of gear they want at any time they want to; but what they fail to state is that the phrase that follows is, "in common with all others." The Supreme Court of the United States held that any State has the right to regulate the time and method of taking fish, and so has the Supreme Court of the State of Washington. We are living up to our treaty obligation under the Point Elliott Treaty of 1854. There are only a few Indians who are doing this out-of-season, illegal-gear fishing, and I want to commend those 99 percent of the Indians in the State of Washington who believe in the conservation of our sports fishery.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE BELOVED SUSAN EDWARDS WAGNER

Mr. RYAN of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for the city of New York. The beloved first lady of our city, Susan Edwards Wagner, died yesterday at the age of 54. Gentle and charming, devoted wife and mother, Mrs. Wagner in her own right made a monumental contribution to the life of our city. As the hostess of Gracie Mansion, Mrs. Wagner will long be remembered by all who met her as a most gracious and considerate person. In addition to her other activities, Mrs. Wagner generously gave of her time to many charitable pursuits. She served on the board of directors of the Greater New York Councils, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, the Leake and Watts Home and the Carroll Club.

I know that I express the feeling of all my constituents and all citizens of New York in offering my heartfelt sympathy to Mayor Wagner and his two sons, Robert and Duncan. This morning's New York Times editorial expresses our profound sorrow at the loss of Mrs. Wagner and the gratitude we feel for the

years during which she was New York City's first lady. At this point in the RECORD I wish to include the New York Times editorial and also the news article which appeared in today's New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1964]

SUSAN EDWARDS WAGNER

Millions who never knew her will join Mayor Wagner in sorrow at the untimely passing of his wife. The relatively few who knew her personally will mourn her as a charming, attractive woman; a devoted wife and mother. But for every one of these there are thousands whose only acquaintance with her was through news photographs and stories about her activities as First Lady of New York. These duties she discharged with tact and warmth.

A gracious hostess, she was content to remain in the background when politics entered. Her loss is a hard blow to an already heavily burdened man. We hope that the Mayor will take some comfort from the knowledge that a multitude will share his sorrow. May time assuage his grief and leave him with many happy memories.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1964]

MRS. WAGNER DIES; CITY LOWERS FLAGS

(By David Halberstam)

Mrs. Robert F. Wagner, wife of the mayor, died yesterday of lung cancer. She was 54 years old.

She had been ill for nearly a year, but the seriousness of her illness had been one of this city's best kept secrets.

She died at 12:35 p.m. in Gracie Mansion, the mayor's residence. Her husband and two sons were with her at the time. Flags at the mansion and throughout the city immediately were lowered to half staff.

The body was taken to the Frank E. Campbell funeral home at Madison Avenue and 81st Street, where the public will be admitted today.

A funeral service will be held at 11 a.m. Thursday at the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, 921 Madison Avenue. The Reverend David H. C. Read, pastor of the church, will officiate. Burial will be in the Wagner family plot in Old Calvary Cemetery, Long Island City, Queens.

Sources said that the family hoped to open the funeral to the public, but that no final decision had been made yet.

Old Calvary is a Roman Catholic cemetery. Mrs. Wagner, a Presbyterian, specifically had asked to be buried in the Wagner family plot there.

DIAGNOSED LAST MAY

City Council President Paul R. Screvane and Deputy Mayor Edward F. Cavanagh, Jr., who were at Gracie Mansion at the time of Mrs. Wagner's death, ordered flags in the city to be flown at half-staff for 30 days.

The lung cancer was diagnosed last May during a checkup at St. Luke's Hospital. The cancer was already far advanced, and since then there had been repeated medical treatments, including the use of cobalt radiation.

Mrs. Wagner's condition took a turn for the worse over the weekend. Yesterday morning an aid to the mayor disclosed that her illness was critical and that she was not expected to live through the day.

A medical bulletin issued by Dr. William S. Norton, a family physician, yesterday morning said:

"Mrs. Wagner is critically ill with advanced bronchogenic carcinoma. The diagnosis was made from a chest X-ray and cervical lymph node biopsy in May 1963. In spite of full doses of cobalt radiation chemotherapy and every other medical course, it has not been possible to keep the cancer under control.

She is in bed at Gracie Mansion. She is comfortable with oxygen and sedatives."

Shortly afterward Mrs. Wagner was dead.

SMOKED CIGARETTES

She was a cigarette smoker. According to friends, at the time of her diagnosis last year the mayor, also a smoker, began to use a cigarette holder.

Shortly before Mrs. Wagner died the mayor received a telephone call from President Johnson. The President expressed his and Mrs. Johnson's sympathy and said he was prepared "to do anything in the world" to help him.

An earlier message from President Johnson gave the public an inkling that Mrs. Wagner might be seriously ill. This came in January when the President sent Mrs. Wagner a telegram while she was at St. Luke's Hospital.

Mayor Wagner had curtailed his public schedule considerably in recent weeks to be with his wife, who had been bedridden for about a month. In recent weeks the mayor also had asked several groups to pray for my wife, without disclosing the nature of her illness.

Friends said that their two sons, Robert F., III, 20, a junior at Harvard College, and Duncan Edwards, 17, a student at Kents Hill School in Maine, had not been told the extent of their mother's illness until after their recent school examinations.

Political associates also noted that in recent weeks the mayor had taken to reminiscing frequently about things he and Susan had done in earlier years. Normally, these associates said, the mayor was more reserved about his personal life and had referred to his wife as Mrs. Wagner.

LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE

In addition to President Johnson many other National, State, and city figures paid tribute to Mrs. Wagner. Governor Rockefeller told a news conference that this was "one of the saddest days for all New Yorkers that we have had in a long, long time." He also called the mayor to offer his sympathy.

Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. representative to United Nations, said: "Susan Wagner was an old and beloved friend and I am deeply grieved, for she was loved by all who knew her."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said: "Although words are tragically inadequate, I express my deepest sympathy to the mayor and to the fine sons of Susan Wagner. She was a dedicated soul who had thousands and thousands of friends."

Friends said that the mayor and his sons spent last night in a midtown hotel.

The mayor asked the public not to send flowers. He suggested that donations be made to charities instead.

Mrs. Wagner's mother, Mrs. Duncan Edwards, was also at Gracie Mansion when Mrs. Wagner died.

About an hour after Mrs. Wagner's death, the mayor, his two sons, and his mother-in-law went to St. Joseph's Church, 404 East 87th Street, where the mayor worships. Mr. Screvane and Mr. Cavanagh also went to St. Joseph's.

They later returned to Gracie Mansion. Nearby mothers walking their children on the unusually warm March day noticed photographers outside the gate and gradually small crowds began to gather.

Most persons appeared stunned by the news of Mrs. Wagner's death. Few knew she had been ill.

"But she was so young," one woman said.

From time to time Capt. Pierce Meagher of the East 104th Street stationhouse would come over and talk to the crowd.

"Folks," he would say, "Mrs. Wagner died earlier this afternoon. Her body has been removed. There is nothing here. If you'll

all just go about your normal day you'll make it easier for all of us." Then the small crowds would disperse.

From time to time a limousine bearing some official or friend of the family would draw up and the gates would open.

STRIVED FOR PRIVATE LIFE

A tall, attractive blonde with light blue eyes, Mrs. Wagner tried to draw a clear line between the public and private lives of the Wagners. But it wasn't easy.

Not long after she moved into Gracie Mansion, the mayor's official residence, she said in one of her few public statements that her job was "to lessen the strain and provide more leisure time" for her husband.

She also believed, and said, that the lovely white mansion overlooking the East River at 88th Street belonged to the people of New York. She threw it open to charitable philanthropic and civic groups. Tours of schoolchildren and other groups were allowed, and sometimes she was the guide.

Except for the summer months, the receptions, teas, and lunches averaged four a week. Mrs. Wagner, honorary chairman or vice chairman of many fundraising campaigns, was a gracious hostess. Visitors were asked to avoid fundraising in the mansion and to restrict themselves to the ground floor.

LIVING QUARTERS INVADED

This restriction was often ignored. Curious visitors would amble upstairs, where the family living quarters are, and walk into the bedrooms or poke through cabinets.

"Sometimes I have to get dressed in a closet," Mrs. Wagner once remarked.

One woman got stuck in a broom closet and had to be extricated.

One afternoon when the mayor was shaving in preparation for an evening out, he was startled to see reflected in his mirror a group of giggling women peering in from the bedroom.

Then there were the souvenir hunters who lifted cigarette lighters, ashtrays, combs, brushes, hand mirrors, Mrs. Wagner's lipsticks, and the mayor's pipes.

Mrs. Wagner couldn't understand how people could behave like that, but in her pleasant, good-natured way she laughed it off as one of the hazards of being Mrs. Mayor.

Other hazards had political overtones. In 1960 during the mayor's second term, charges were made that the food bills at the mansion were excessive. A study showed they sometimes exceeded \$2,000 a month, not including the bills for official functions.

It also showed that many unauthorized snacks—and even meals—were dispensed to visitors. The mayor's solution was to direct Park Commissioner Newbold Morris to take over supervision of the purchases from the household staff.

The mayor, incidentally, reimburses the city at the rate of \$160 a month for the family meals.

ENTERTAINED NOTABLES

As Mrs. Mayor, Mrs. Wagner was hostess, too, to statesmen, diplomats, politicians, and their wives. Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh; Mrs. Nikita Khrushchev, Mrs. Charles de Gaulle, Queen Sirikit of Thailand, and dozens of other notables were entertained by her.

One of those who remembered Mrs. Wagner's hospitality fondly was President Johnson. In a "get well" message in January, he said that when he heard she was in the hospital, he thought about "the long hours you spent in being hospitable to me and mine in 1960."

"I realize I was one of those who probably contributed to asking you to do too much," he wrote. "Lady Bird joins me in praying that you will be out of the hospital and well

very quickly. We want you to know we love you very much."

Mrs. Wagner left speechmaking to the mayor. One speaker in a family was enough she used to say. Mrs. Wagner was not fond of the dinner circuit that is an inevitable part of every successful politician's life, but she went to functions when "Wag," as she called her husband, thought she should attend.

"Whatever Wag wants," she would tell city hall aides who inquired about her plans. In January, when Mrs. Wagner made her last public appearance at a Gracie Mansion ceremony, she was reminded that the Mayor was being mentioned as a candidate for Senator or Vice President. She was asked how she would like living in Washington.

"That is up to my husband," she said. She added that she was leaving all the family's political decisions to him.

During the Mayor's campaigns Mrs. Wagner accompanied him on handshaking and speaking tours but remained as much as possible in the background.

Her friends agree that she was essentially shy but a warm, friendly person. Miss Bert Greene, the secretary who helped with her appointments and mail, said she was "kind, considerate, appreciative, thoughtful—everything that goes to make a fine human being."

"A good sport," was the way one friend described her.

The former Susan Edwards was acquainted early in life with a busy household. She was born in Greenwich, Conn., on August 31, 1909, one of six daughters and four sons of Duncan Edwards, a New York lawyer, and his wife, Susan.

She attended Rosemary Hall in Greenwich and studied at Smith College, for 2 years. It was through her brother, Duncan Edwards Jr., that Susan met his Yale law school classmate, Robert F. Wagner Jr.

MARRIED IN 1942

An occasional date in 1937 led to their marriage 5 years later on St. Valentine's Day. Miss Edwards, a Presbyterian, and Mr. Wagner, a Roman Catholic, were married in the rectory of St. Patrick's Cathedral. The date was fortunate, for it helped to jog the memory of the mayor, who often had to be reminded to have his hair cut.

He was then a lieutenant in the Army Air Forces. When he was assigned to active duty with the 8th Air Force in Europe. Mrs. Wagner returned to her widowed mother and helped rear her brothers and sisters.

Robert F. Wagner 3d was born on January 6, 1944, after his father had gone overseas. He was about a year and a half old when his father first saw him. The couple's second son, Duncan Edwards Wagner, was born November 30, 1946.

Mrs. Wagner came from a socially prominent family—her husband first was listed in the Social Register after their marriage—but she avoided the social whirl in which she, as the city's First Lady, was so eagerly sought. Instead she placed emphasis on home life.

One of her main concerns after her husband became mayor was to try to keep her two young sons from being spoiled. To the best of her ability she kept them out of the spotlight.

Shortly after they moved into Gracie Mansion, Mrs. Wagner sealed off one of Duncan's favorite playthings, the mansion's automatic elevator, and turned the shaft into closet space.

Mrs. Wagner escaped some of the hurly burly of politics and official life by spending the summers at the family's home in Islip, Long Island. There the Wagners swam a great deal and sailed their 32-foot boat, the *SooToo*.

A better-than-average golfer, Mrs. Wagner could be found on the links with her husband whenever they found time.

She accompanied him on travels across the United States, through Europe, the Near East and South America. In 1963 she made a quick flight to Paris with the mayor to bring Robert home after he had undergone an emergency operation for a ruptured appendix.

Mrs. Wagner's favorite color was light blue, and she used it extensively in redecorating Gracie Mansion. She was looking forward with much pleasure to the proposed \$250,000 improvement of the mansion. She thought that with the added space to be provided by a new wing the Wagners might have a little more privacy.

An honorary member of many charitable organizations, she was on the board of directors of the Greater New York Councils, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, the Leake and Watts Home, and the Carroll Club.

THE LATE SUSAN EDWARDS WAGNER

Mr. MCCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues when I express our deep sympathy at the passing of Mrs. Susan Wagner, the wife of our distinguished friend and the outstanding mayor of the city of New York, Hon. Robert Wagner.

Mrs. Wagner was loved universally. Her sweet character, her kind disposition, her beautiful outlook on life impressed not only those who knew her personally but also countless millions of Americans throughout our great land.

To Mayor Wagner and his two sons I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Speaker yield to me?

The SPEAKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], and other Members in this word of tribute to the late Mrs. Robert Wagner, wife of the distinguished mayor of New York City.

Mrs. Wagner was a Christian lady of charm and character, a loving wife and mother. Her husband has occupied for several years one of the most important positions in the world, the chief executive of the world's first city. I join the Speaker and others in extending my heartfelt sympathy to the mayor and his two sons in this time of their bereavement.

THE LATE MRS. ROBERT WAGNER

Mr. LINDSAY. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the gentlemen who have just spoken on the passing of the late Mrs. Robert Wagner. As the Representative in Congress of the mayor of the city of New York and Mrs. Wagner, and the Wagner family, I should like to express my heartfelt sympathy to all of them on their tragic loss. As a member of the opposition party I have been critical from time to time of some of the mayor's policies and programs. However, there has never been any personal consideration involved in that opposition. I have always had the highest personal regard for the mayor and for his family.

Mrs. Wagner and the mayor were married for, I believe, 22 happy years. They have a wonderful family. Mrs. Wagner was a lovely person. The sadness that this loss brings to the mayor is shared by the people of the city of New York.

As the Representative in the House of Representatives of the Wagner family, I should like to express on the floor of this House my sorrow, and that of the people I represent, in this personal tragedy that has befallen the mayor, his sons, and all of the family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the death of Mrs. Wagner and that Members may have 5 legislative days to so extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in extending my sincere condolences to Mayor Robert F. Wagner on the untimely death of his beloved wife. Not only in New York City and in the United States generally but throughout the entire world, people share the grief of the mayor and his two sons.

As First Lady of New York City, Susan Wagner eschewed personal publicity and adulation; but her excellent philanthropic works in a self-effacing manner, particularly in Europe and Latin America, brought her official recognition in the form of decorations by the European governments of Austria, Italy, and France, as well as by Mexico and Nicaragua in this hemisphere.

Her personal life was dedicated and devoted to her husband and children. As the wife of the mayor of New York City, she graced the city's executive mansion in her capacity as official hostess for more than 10 years during which she provided innumerable opportunities to the people of New York to utilize Gracie Mansion for the furtherance of worthy causes.

Mayor Wagner and his wife had 22 brief years together after their wedding in the early days of World War II while he was on active duty in the Army Air Corps. They shared together his political struggles and successes and she never tired of trying to relieve him of the burdens of political life.

Susan Wagner will be sorely missed by her husband and sons and by the people of New York. My sympathy goes to the mayor and his sons.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened at the untimely death of the First Lady of New York City, Mrs. Robert F. Wagner. Our sympathies and condolences go out to her husband, the mayor of the city of New York, and their sons, Robert and Duncan.

Mrs. Wagner was a true helpmate and a wonderful lady—she will be missed by all. It was she who opened Gracie Mansion to the citizens of New York. The mansion became the scene of many teas and parties in support of charitable, civic, and philanthropic benefits. She won international fame for her work in charitable campaigns and was decorated by Austria, France, Italy, Mexico, and Nicaragua.

The city of New York has suffered a great loss and we pray that God will comfort all those who mourn the passing of Susan Wagner.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] in expressing my sincere sympathy to Mayor Robert F. Wagner and the family on the death of Mrs. Wagner.

Her passing was, indeed, a shock to all of us who knew her as the warm and gracious First Lady of New York.

Her life as the helpmate of Mayor Wagner can be an example and an inspiration to the wives of other men in public service. She ably assisted her husband in the ceremonial duties expected of the chief executive for the world's largest city, while devoting herself wholeheartedly to providing a normal home life for the Wagner children.

My wife joins me in this expression of condolence. May Mayor Wagner and the children take comfort in the knowledge that God has chosen her to be among His very own.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Mrs. Robert F. Wagner, wife of the mayor of the city of New York, has brought great sorrow to us. I know that I express the sentiments of the people of the 22d District of New York, my constituents, when I speak these words.

Susan Wagner was dearly loved, not only by the people of New York City, but by countless persons in countries throughout the world. She was noted for her active work in many charitable organizations; she was selfless in her devotion to her duties as the First Lady of New York City; her concern for others was genuine and sincere. As first lady and hostess of Gracie Mansion, her hospitality and innate kindness earned for her the respect and admiration and affection of all who knew her. She will be sorely missed and her good works will long be remembered, for she made many

outstanding contributions to our city and State of New York.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mayor Wagner and their sons, Robert and Duncan. Mrs. Wagner was a great lady, a wonderful wife and mother. Her husband and sons have suffered a grievous loss; our thoughts and prayers are with them in this time of grief and sorrow.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join in this tribute to the memory of Mrs. Robert F. Wagner.

This wonderful first lady of the city of New York was a shining example of graciousness in all she did. Hers was not an easy task in trying at all times to draw the line between the public and private lives of the Wagners. In one of her few public statements she said that she felt it was her job to lessen the strain and provide more leisure time for her husband, the mayor.

Susan Wagner believed that Gracie Mansion, the lovely white mansion overlooking the East River, belonged to all the people of New York, and she threw it open to charitable and civic groups. At times she was the guide for tours of schoolchildren and other groups.

Mrs. Wagner's death is a real loss and I join my colleagues in extending my profound sympathy to Mayor Wagner and his two fine sons.

JOSE BENITEZ AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, Jose Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of Micronesia resigned his post on Monday last. According to Department of the Interior officials, he was given a choice of returning to the trust territory or resigning and he chose the latter alternative.

For an extended period, Mr. Benitez was engaged in political pursuits in the United States rather than working at the job for which he was hired. If this course of action was not stimulated or at least condoned by the Department, he would have been removed from his position before congressional pressure was applied.

Last week this gentleman was involved in the Rules Committee investigation in the other body. At that time, he joked about how he had misled Department officials and the press and indicated absolutely no pangs of conscience for his lack of industry or integrity.

Yet, the same Department which fired him has now hired him as a consultant at rates of about \$65 per day. The administration, thus, has rewarded him for his wayward behavior and has mocked the investigation of conflict of interest.

The individual taking the heat for this bizarre treatment is Assistant Secretary John Carver, a devoted public servant. I have not contacted Mr. Carver or anyone

in his office, but with some knowledge of this Department, it is my opinion that he has been caught in the middle of the controversy without having participated in the decisions which make the situation so objectionable. I mention Mr. Carver only because his name is the only one injected by the press.

I believe criticism of Department action is legitimate when someone has fired Mr. Benitez for obvious good reason, only to hide him away as a consultant at approximately the same salary he received as a titled official of the administration. His connection should be completely severed.

NO PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL GAMES ON FRIDAY NIGHT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Commissioner Pete Rozelle of the National Football League for favorably reacting to the protests of high school and college athletic associations when it was revealed that the NFL tentatively planned to televise five Friday night football games next fall.

This week, Rozelle announced that no National Football League games will be televised on Friday night during the 1964 season on a national scale.

Obviously, Friday night is "football night" at our high schools and colleges across the country. As I made clear on February 17 in a speech before the House of Representatives, I was opposed to this proposed television contract between individual professional clubs and a major television network because it would seriously affect attendance records at amateur school games.

Had this TV deal been contracted, there would have been a violation of the spirit of the Federal law protecting college and high school games from professional competition.

Rozelle's sportsmanlike decision will enable the colleges and high schools to successfully continue all athletic programs which exist on revenue from football receipts, to continue sending the professional clubs well-trained athletes, and to maintain a healthy atmosphere for sports activity on the campus.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ON STATE AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PLACEMENT AND FOSTER CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 237)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending you a copy of the report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, dealing with the matter of State agency responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children. This is in accordance with section 155 of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, as amended.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1964.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

THE SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300), a bill for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH FURTHER CALL OF BILLS ON THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

MR. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of bills on the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DEMETRIOS DOUSOPOULOS

MR. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7533) for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all after "Act" down to and including "impose" in line 11.

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code".

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE KAY FURCOLO

MR. BURKE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MR. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of Mrs. Kay Furcolo, wife of former Gov. Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts. Mrs. Furcolo died last Friday night at the Massachusetts General Hospital. Mrs. Furcolo had been plagued by illness since 1958, when she entered the Phillips House of the Massachusetts General Hospital for what was termed as minor surgery. In recent years, because of illness Mrs. Furcolo had to curtail her many philanthropic activities.

Mrs. Furcolo was one of the best known women in Massachusetts. When her husband was Governor and during his term as Congressman she was with him at countless functions and was always at his side. Her loyalty and devotion to her beloved husband and their five children, Mark, David, Foster, Jr., Hope, and Richard earned for her the love and respect of all.

Mrs. Furcolo served on many committees and boards of State hospitals and was a trustee of the University of Massachusetts and the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary. Mrs. Furcolo was a member of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem. The induction ceremony to this order was conducted by Cardinal Spellman at St. Patrick's Cathedral, N.Y., in September 1959.

While her husband served as Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts she was almost constantly touring the State visiting State hospitals, colleges and institutions. She addressed many groups and was particularly interested in education and the problems of the aged.

Mrs. Furcolo prior to her prolonged illness had boundless energy; she gave unstintingly of her time promoting the cause of the underprivileged. Her philosophy in life led her to great works on behalf of those who needed assistance in obtaining an education. Foster Furcolo while a Member of the U.S. Congress was picked as one of the 10 outstanding Members of the House. His loyal and beautiful wife Kay was the one who deserves a great deal of the credit for the success Foster Furcolo enjoyed in public life.

I know I echo the sentiments of all his former colleagues in expressing our deepest sympathy to Foster Furcolo and the Furcolo family in this hour of grief. Our prayers are with them at this time.

MR. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

MR. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman in this word of tribute to Mrs. Kay Furcolo, whose husband was a colleague of mine during his entire service in the House of Representatives. He was a respected and able colleague.

I particularly join the gentleman in his word of tribute to a woman who was of Christian character, a devoted wife and a great American.

I extend to those loved ones she has left behind my deepest sympathy in their hour of bereavement.

MR. BURKE. I thank the gentleman.

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Mrs. Foster Furcolo has brought

deep personal sorrow to Mrs. McCormack and to me, who were privileged to know her well, as well as to many people whose lives she touched and cheered more briefly. Kathryn Foran Furcolo, the wife of a man of outstanding gifts, sympathies, and achievements, brought to their partnership a strength of character, a warmth of affection, and a breadth of vision to match his own. In his career as lawyer, as Member of Congress, as Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and as Governor of Massachusetts, Foster Furcolo was aided and sustained by her intelligent comradeship, her charm and tact, and her devoted love.

Kathryn Furcolo, outstanding as the resourceful wife of a public man, and outstanding also as the mother of their five fine children, has made a place for herself in the hearts of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through her vigorous and highly successful work for numerous public and charitable activities. As a member of the hospital board, and as a trustee of the University of Massachusetts, she has brought her great gifts of heart and mind to bear on major problems of the welfare of the Massachusetts people, by whom her loss will be deeply mourned. To my good friend, Foster Furcolo, and to their children, Charles Mark, David Foran, Foster, Hope, and Richard, Mrs. McCormack and I offer our affectionate sympathy and our prayers.

MR. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, like our other delegation members, here, I was indeed saddened to learn of the untimely death, last Friday evening, of Mrs. Kathryn Foran Furcolo, wife of our former House colleague and recent Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Foster Furcolo.

Kay, as she was affectionately known to us when she was in Washington, was a gracious, energetic and vivacious lady. She gave unstintingly of her time and effort to the promotion of charitable activities, both here in the Capital and in Massachusetts over the last 20 years.

It is not easy to be the wife of a man bearing heavy public responsibilities, but Kay Furcolo understood the demands of public office and was the chief inspiration of her husband and on many occasions took over his social meetings when it was impossible for him to be present. Through this painstaking work, she was universally admired and respected not only for her patience and courtesy, but for her contribution to political and sociological discussions in whose intricacies she was exceptionally well versed.

Unfortunately, through recurring sickness and operations, Kay's participation in these activities had to be restricted, over the past 5 years.

But above all things she was a devoted wife and a loving mother. The welfare of her family came before everything else and it is for this dedication to family we particularly revere her memory.

Our heartfelt sympathy, in this hour of great sorrow, goes out to her distinguished husband, Foster Furcolo, and her five wonderful children. While we join in praying that the good soul of Kay Furcolo may rest in peace we ask divine

providence to grant her husband and children the grace of understanding and resignation to the will of the Almighty in calling a wonderful wife and mother to her Heavenly reward.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] in extending heartfelt condolences to Gov. Foster Furcolo on the untimely death of his beloved wife.

Because Foster was also a member of the "freshman class" in the 81st Congress, my wife and I came to know him and Mrs. Furcolo rather well. We always found her to be a most gracious and kindly woman.

Mrs. Furcolo possessed a warm personality and an unmistakably feminine charm. She devoted herself tirelessly to those tasks which lessened the strains of office upon her husband as he served in Congress and as Governor of Massachusetts.

May it be of some consolation to Gov. Furcolo and the family to know that she has gone to a well-deserved rest in the bosom of the Almighty. Mrs. Zablocki joins me in this expression of sincere sympathy.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed sad for me to inform my colleagues in the House of the death of a gracious lady, Mrs. Kathryn Furcolo, the beloved wife of my predecessor in Congress, and former Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Foster Furcolo. Mrs. Furcolo passed away Friday night, after a long illness, at the Phillips House of the Massachusetts General Hospital, in Boston, and funeral services were held this morning following solemn requiem mass in St. Ignatius Church, Newton.

The mother of five lovely children, Kay Furcolo found abundant time to be of valuable assistance to her husband in political campaigns and while he served in the 81st and 82d Congresses, as State treasurer of Massachusetts from 1952 until January 1955, and as the First Lady of Massachusetts from January 1957 to January 1961. She gave unsparingly of her time to a large number of worthwhile civic, welfare, and humanitarian organizations, and to fundraising drives for polio, cystic fibrosis, mental health, muscular dystrophy and retarded children.

In recognition of the time and effort and devotion she put into these projects on behalf of humanity, Mrs. Furcolo was named by the late Pope John XXIII as a Lady of the Equestrian Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher, one of the highest of papal honors.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I want to extend my profound sympathy to former Gov. Foster Furcolo and to his children on the loss of their beloved wife and mother. I also ask permission to have included with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield Sunday Republican of March 1 on Mrs. Kathryn Furcolo, and the obituary story from the Springfield Union of February 29:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican, Mar. 1, 1964]

MRS. KATHRYN FURCOLO

Mrs. Kathryn (Foran) Furcolo, wife of former Gov. Foster Furcolo, who died Friday after a long illness, was widely known

and highly esteemed for her very extensive and valuable participation in a large number of worthwhile civic welfare and general humanitarian organizations.

She was an active leader in many important fund-raising drives, such as those for polio, cystic fibrosis, mental health, muscular dystrophy and retarded children, as well as campaigns for many other causes of general community value.

In recognition of her exceptional endeavors on behalf of humanity, typifying the finest kind of Catholic lay leader, Mrs. Furcolo received from the late Pope John XXIII, in 1959, the exceptionally high honor of being named as a Lady of the Equestrian Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher, one of the highest of the papal orders.

In addition to being a very valuable leader in good causes, Mrs. Furcolo was a true lady, a devoted wife and mother, honored and respected by all who knew her.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Feb. 29, 1964]

FORMER GOVERNOR FURCOLO'S WIFE, 51, VICTIM OF CANCER

Mrs. Kathryn (Foran) Furcolo, wife of former Gov. Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts, died in Massachusetts General Hospital Friday night after a long series of operations that spanned 6 years. Death was attributed to cancer of the bone. She was 51.

HOME FOR CHRISTMAS

Although she was taken to her home at 45 Tudor Road, Newton, for the Christmas holiday, friends reported that it was quite evident at that time Mrs. Furcolo had not long to live.

As wife of the Congressman from the Second Congressional District, Mrs. Furcolo thoroughly enjoyed her life in Washington from 1949 to 1952 and was an active member of the 81st Congress Women's Group, among other things.

When Mr. Furcolo became governor in 1958 she became even more active in various hospital and charity drives and social affairs, yet she still found time in her busy 16-hour day for her family of five children.

HONORED BY POPE

As a result of her valuable work in fund-raising campaigns, including the drive for polio, cystic fibrosis, mental health, muscular dystrophy and retarded children and various other community ventures, and the fact that she was a truly representative Catholic lay leader, she was singled out by the late Pope John XXIII as a Lady of the Equestrian Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher, one of the highest of the papal orders. She was formally invested in the order in September 1959, in colorful ceremonies in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York by Francis Cardinal Spellman.

Mrs. Furcolo was born in New Haven in 1912, was graduated from St. Mary's Academy and Hillhouse in New Haven and from Elmira College, where she majored in English. She met Mr. Furcolo when he was studying law at Yale and they were married in 1937. She also studied law 2 years at the Springfield branch of Northeastern University.

WIDELY KNOWN IN AREA

Mr. Furcolo opened his law practice in Springfield a short time later and the Furcolos made their home both in Springfield and Longmeadow for many years until he was elected to Congress in 1946.

She became widely known in western Massachusetts and the rest of the State because she always took a very active role in her husband's political campaigns. An attractive, intelligent, and affable woman, she was able to make friends easily and was regarded as a tremendous help to Mr. Furcolo. She conducted many coffee hours throughout the State and addressed numerous wo-

men's groups. Over the years she became a familiar sight to political reporters who met her often during her campaigning for Mr. Furcolo.

Mrs. Furcolo was appointed as manager of the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary in Boston, an unpaid office, in 1959. She was reappointed last year by Gov. Endicott Peabody.

She also was designated as chief liaison agent between the Governor's office and various hospitals, schools, and other institutions throughout the Commonwealth. The work involved all institutions, public and private. The post was created primarily to provide the Governor's office with a more complete and unbiased report on prevailing conditions than would otherwise be possible.

Mrs. Furcolo, in 1960, also was confirmed as a member of the board of trustees of the University of Massachusetts.

Friends said she was a versatile person of many talents, equally at home in her kitchen preparing meals for her family or attending State functions. Although the Furcolos have occupied an impressive English Tudor mansion in Newton since the days he was Governor, Mrs. Furcolo never lost her interest in her wide circle of Springfield and Longmeadow friends.

Her husband and her five children were her particular pride. She leaves Mark, 22, a senior at Yale; David, 20, a junior at Holy Cross; Foster, Junior, a freshman at Yale; Hope, 12, and Richard, 9.

She also leaves two sisters, Mrs. Eleanor McGuire of Branford, Conn., and Mrs. John Conway of New Haven. Her mother, Mrs. Catherine A. McGuinness, died in 1961 in Middletown, Conn.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join members of the Massachusetts delegation and other colleagues who have risen to pay tribute to the memory of the late Kathryn Furcolo, wife of the former Congressman and Governor, who died recently in Boston after a long and tragic illness.

Mrs. Foster Furcolo was a gracious and charming lady.

She was a gifted human being who gave unsparingly of her time and talent for a number of worthy causes. Among these were activities in behalf of the mentally retarded, those stricken with polio, muscular dystrophy, and cystic fibrosis.

At all times, however, she was a wonderful mother of five who viewed her official responsibilities as part of a wider role as wife of a government official. She brought sincerity and sense to everything she believed in, and one high honor she received gave indication of the impact she had.

She was named as a Lady of the Equestrian Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher by the late and great Pope John the XXIII.

This is one of the highest papal honors and one that was certainly deserved.

But more than anything else, I remember at this time the charm, the personal interest, and the devotion of Mrs. Furcolo. I will miss her, and I want to extend my deepest sympathies to her husband and five children.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative

days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late Mrs. Kay Furcolo.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

(Roll No. 52)		
Abbitt	Hagan, Ga.	Murray
Ashley	Hays	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Hooven	Osmers
Bass	Hoffman	Passman
Blatnik	Hosmer	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Powell
Bruce	Jarman	Rains
Buckley	Johansen	Randall
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cheif	Kee	Roberts, Ala.
Cramer	King, Calif.	Rosenthal
Diggs	Kirwan	St. Onge
Donohue	Kluczynski	Teague, Calif.
Elliott	Laird	White
Fulton, Tenn.	MacGregor	Wickersham
Gray	Mathias	Willis
Gurney	Meader	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADVANCED RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. 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 the bill (H.R. 10199) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and for other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10199, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

Mr. Chairman, at this time we submit for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1965.

It is a distinct pleasure to be permitted to serve on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN]. All of these gentlemen are outstanding Members of the House and have rendered excellent service as members of this subcommittee.

We carefully considered budget estimates totaling \$357,702,300 for fiscal year 1965. We recommend that the sum of \$338,205,200 be approved.

The amount recommended for fiscal year 1965 is the largest amount ever recommended by the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia budget. The amount that we recommend for fiscal year 1965 is \$25,089,538 more than the total amount appropriated for fiscal year 1964 and \$19,497,100 below the 1965 estimates.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five funds: a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary sewage fund.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend a Federal contribution of \$37,500,000 for the general fund, \$2,047,000 for the water fund, and \$1,173,000 for the sanitary sewage works fund. The Federal payment requested for the general fund for fiscal year 1965 totaled \$50 million.

Our committee, of course, was disappointed that an unbalanced budget was submitted by the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1965. On the surface this budget appeared to be in balance but \$16,700,000 of the anticipated revenue to carry out the proposals, supposes the enactment of legislation increasing taxes and for action on the part of the Commissioners concerning a raise in real estate tax. This type of a budget, of course, is exceedingly difficult to resolve and after carefully considering the pro-

posals offered, the Committee on Appropriations decided that the budget for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1965 should be a balanced budget. For a number of years now the District of Columbia budget has been delayed for one reason or another and this delay, of course, caused considerable difficulty in the administration of the affairs of our Capital City. In all fairness we believe that this budget should be approved as quickly as possible so that important capital outlay projects may start under construction.

Our committee recommends \$26,400,000 for loan authorization for capital outlay projects financed through the general funds, highway fund, and sanitary sewerage works fund.

Of the total amount recommended of \$338,205,200 the sum of \$276,954,200 will be used for operating expenses; \$5,364,000 is for repayment of loans and interest to the Federal Government and \$55,887,000 is for capital outlay.

Our committee recommends the sum of \$18,677,000 for general operating expenses. This is an increase of \$794,122 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1964 and \$734,000 less than the budget estimates.

For "Public safety" we recommend the sum of \$69,041,000. This is an increase of \$3,069,340 over fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$341,500 in the estimates.

During the hearings on the requests for "Public safety" we carefully considered all requests for the Metropolitan Police Department. We have an excellent Police Department in our Capital City and the Chief of Police, Robert V. Murray, has made an outstanding official. It is with regret that we now are informed that before too long Major Murray will retire. Last year a request was made for 100 additional police officers and 25 man-dog teams. Both requests were granted and this brought the authorized strength of the Police Department up to 3,000 and the man-dog team forces up to 100.

In 1963 we had 23,194 serious crimes committed—part I crimes in the FBI classification. For instance, we had 100 homicide cases, 142 rape cases, 2,436 robbery cases, and 5,789 house break-in cases. Crime increased 15 percent and this was quite an increase for the District of Columbia. This was not an increase in any particular category but for crime generally across the board. In this bill we recommend approval of the request for a police cadet corps. For a number of years now the police department here in our Capital City has formulated plans for such a corps but all proposals were deferred for priority needs in police strength and other services.

Adoption of this corps and program will enable our police department to obtain for the police service young people who are interested in a police career soon after they leave school and before they are otherwise employed. Adoption of this program will improve the caliber of police recruits and will make a better police department for the District of Columbia. Recruits under this program can be used from time to

time to relieve policemen who are now performing office tasks.

In addition we recommend approval of the request for reallocation of 10 uniform sergeants to the rank of lieutenants. Approval will then see a police department which has a lieutenant in charge of each precinct at all times. This would mean that there would be at least four lieutenants in each precinct and in some precincts there would be five lieutenants. The total precinct lieutenants now is 48 and when you consider days off and sick and annual leave this would cover only 30 tours of duty daily. In order to cover the 3 tours of duty daily in the 14 precincts daily 42 tours will be required. The increase of 10 would cover 37 of these tours and the remaining tours would be covered during the daytime by the commanding officer. In a number of instances sergeants who have been in charge do not have the experience necessary to meet emergencies which are constantly arising.

Mr. Chairman, under no circumstances should children in our Capital City go hungry or qualified welfare recipients suffer. The welfare problem is one of the most serious problems confronting Washington today.

The Department of Public Welfare administers all public assistance programs in the District. They include the four federally aided category of the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children. In addition, the Department administers a program of general public assistance at District expense.

We recommend the adoption of the program for needy children of unemployed fathers. At this time the department of welfare has under its care 5,600 children. This number includes children in foster homes; under care in their own homes and also children in institutions. A total of \$310,375 is requested for a 6-month program.

A work training program is proposed to go along with this request and one position is requested to develop such a program. Any unemployed person who would be eligible under this program would be placed in the national manpower training program. Others would be placed on work training and basically this program would have as its major aim the moving of men and women who qualified under the program into full time employment.

Unemployed fathers—and mothers—who are deemed to be heads of households will under this program be required to comply with periodic referrals to U.S. Employment Service. Failure by the recipient to accept a reasonable offer of employment would terminate assistance. Unemployed recipients who because of lack of marketable experience or repeated ineligibility to be placed in employment would be required to enroll in a community or other work training program as a condition of eligibility. Training under this program would be meaningful and the underlying objective would be to assist the recipient and develop job skills in work areas in which there is an apparent likelihood of job placement upon the completion of training. In addition a community work training program would be set up in co-

operation with the Commissioners and department heads with this program established in accordance with HEW regulations. Such a community work training program would be designed to qualify the participant for employment in the field in which he was trained. Failure of an employed parent recipient to accept enrollment in a training program or to terminate training without acceptable cause would be deemed grounds for termination of benefits.

The unemployed parents program provided for under Public Law 87-543 is intended to meet the needs of children of unemployed fathers—mothers. This program is now in operation in 16 States.

Unemployment in the District of Columbia at this time is estimated to be 3.5 percent. Unemployment for the metropolitan area is estimated to be 2.4 percent.

For parks and recreation we recommend the sum of \$9,769,000. This is an increase of \$702,139 over fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$198,000 in the estimates.

For the first time since 1936 plans for construction of new swimming pools in the city were submitted and approved by our committee. We recommend in this bill \$680,000 for new pools, recreation centers, and playgrounds.

Here in the District of Columbia we still have approximately 250 teenage gangs, each composed of from 15 to 35 members. Our roving leaders in the Recreation Department are now working with a number of these gangs and are producing results. If we have the full cooperation of our courts, police department, and recreation department then, in time, we will no longer be confronted with teenage gangs.

We recommend the sum of \$78,833,000 for health and welfare. This is an increase of \$4,306,952 over fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$663,000 in the estimates.

We are still confronted with a serious venereal disease problem in the District of Columbia. During the past 2 years additional amounts have been recommended by our committee for venereal disease eradication and the report which we received during the hearings for fiscal year 1965 shows that our venereal disease rate is declining just a little. Our committee again urges that every effort be made to bring this serious problem under control and recommends in this bill adequate funds for this purpose.

The drug situation at District of Columbia General Hospital seems to be under control with the new regulations which were inaugurated following the disclosure that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of drugs had been stolen from the District of Columbia General Hospital. Again we recommend that every precaution be taken to eliminate this thievery.

In our Capital City we have one of the best fire departments in the country. For a number of years the National Board of Fire Underwriters named Washington, Los Angeles, and Detroit as the top three cities. Two years ago we lost our top rating and in the bill we make certain recommendations pertain-

ing to the establishment of an officers training corps and preventative maintenance program which should go a long way toward reestablishing our position.

For education we recommend the sum of \$67,910,000. This is an increase of \$4,049,407 over fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$697,000 in the estimates. The illiteracy rate in the District has risen during the past 30 years notwithstanding the fact that illiteracy generally has decreased throughout the rest of the country. The records of the Census Bureau show that illiteracy rates for the country generally have declined since the year 1930 but in our Capital City we have an increase of from 1.7 to 1.8 in 1950 to 1.9 in 1960.

Problems relating to education are among the more serious in our Capital City today. We continue to have 34 percent of our teachers in the temporary category. Temporary teachers are those who have not passed the qualifying examination for permanent status or whose academic preparation is technically deficient under school board rules. The number of temporary teachers has increased during the past few years.

For fiscal year 1964, we recommended 343 new teachers for our District schools. A total of 242 new teachers is recommended in this bill.

Under capital outlay for our public schools, we recommend 15 replacements and additions. The total amount involved is \$11,968,100. For fiscal year 1964, under capital outlay for schools, we had \$15,626,000; for fiscal year 1963, \$7,693,000; for fiscal year 1962, \$8,886,000. The bill before us today provides for the construction of several thousand additional classroom spaces. The additional teachers and capital outlay projects recommended should be approved by this committee.

Under capital outlay for the Department of Public Welfare we recommend six projects. The total amount involved is \$441,300.

For highways and traffic we recommend the sum of \$13,573,000. This is an increase of \$1,165,016 over fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$90,000 in the estimates.

Our committee carefully investigated the problems relating to the Highway Department and again we would like to emphasize that any attempt to bring important highway projects in the District to a complete halt is a serious mistake. We still believe that in order to meet the tremendous day-to-day growth of traffic in Washington, we must carry the highway program along with any and all proposals concerning a rapid transit system. This program is one of the major long-established activities of the District government. In order to have an effective highway program, it must be a continuous program.

Under capital outlay for highways and traffic we recommend 15 projects. The total amount involved is \$13,739,000.

We recommend the sum of \$3,816,000 for Public Library. This is an increase of \$337,605 over fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$36,000 in the estimates.

We recommend approval of the sum of \$2,351,000 to be used to purchase the

site of a new downtown Central Library. The present building was constructed in 1903 with Carnegie funds and at that time the population of Washington was less than 300,000. Growing demands upon the District of Columbia Public Library set forth the need at this time for a larger downtown Central Library. We must have a larger modern-type building to provide the kind of service that is necessary at this time. This new Central Library will contain some 400,000 square feet and be located as near to the heart of the business district as possible. The site to be purchased is located at Ninth Street NW., and faces on G at Ninth Street NW., extending from Ninth to the Congressional Church at 10th and Ninth from G to G Place. This location will become better and better as time passes.

For sanitary engineering we recommend the sum of \$21,750,000. The amount includes \$3,055,000 for the Washington aqueduct. This is \$101,100 less than the amount for fiscal year 1964 and a reduction of \$40,000 in the estimates.

Our committee recommends approval of every capital outlay project requested for the Department of Sanitary Engineering. We recommend approval of 26 projects which will cost \$21,648,000.

Currently there is a total of 28,432 positions authorized in the District government. Additional positions totaling 1,121 were requested for fiscal year 1965. We recommend 750 with approximately 40 percent of the new positions going to the Department of Public Education. Most of these new positions in education are teachers.

We recommend a total of \$55,887,000 for capital outlay projects for the fiscal year 1965. For fiscal year 1964, Congress approved \$42,993,900 for capital outlay projects for public schools, libraries, highways, and sanitary engineering. For fiscal year 1965 we recommend \$50,337,100.

Passage of this bill will establish important milestones in the progress of our Capital City.

Pollution control of the Potomac by separating the city's storm and sanitary sewers is milestone No. 1.

Milestone No. 2 will be adoption of the program to provide aid to the children of unemployed parents.

Purchase of the site for the new Central Library at Ninth Street NW., will be milestone No. 3.

Milestone No. 4 will be the establishment of the Police Cadet Corps.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend this bill to the Members of the House.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, and the members of his subcommittee. I know of all the pressures which have been put on them at all times by various government agencies in Washington in an effort to have funds appropriated for items

for which there has been no authorization.

I realize that there are a number of items in the bill for which there has been no authorization. I realize that some of these items are worthwhile and possibly should be approved.

I will not make a point of order on these items today.

My reason for getting up to say a word is to place the various government agencies in the District of Columbia on notice that hereafter they must come before the legislative committee and get authorizations for funds for all programs before they can go before the Appropriations Committee to pressurize them, in the endeavor to get additional funds.

I believe the gentleman has done a wonderful job. The only item I would ask to have explained a little more thoroughly is the one to grant additional aid to children of the unemployed.

At the present time the law is that they can receive aid provided the unemployed is physically disabled. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. At the present time, if there is no man in the house. In other words, if you have a man in the house who is able bodied and able to work there can be no assistance to these children.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is true.

Mr. NATCHER. If the parent is missing, if he leaves home or is dead, there can be assistance. If he is physically unable to work, there can be assistance.

Mr. McMILLAN. If he is able to work, can he receive this assistance?

Mr. NATCHER. If he is able to work under this program we recommend to the House, if he complies with the requirements of the Department of Welfare and he goes to the employment office and his name is placed on the list and he keeps in touch with them, and if a work program is set up and inaugurated, such as all of the program which we recommend here to the House, then he would be entitled to assistance. As soon as the job is offered and refused he comes off the rolls.

Mr. McMILLAN. The reason why I am asking that is I did not want to get the District of Columbia out of line with the same program that they have in the States.

I want to insert in the RECORD at this point a number of items which are questionable as far as a point of order is concerned. Again I want to place the District officials on notice that they must come before the legislative committee to get authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on the District of Columbia for some time has been quite concerned over the practice of certain officers of the District of Columbia submitting to the Congress requesting appropriations for various agencies and purposes not specifically authorized by the Congress.

I hold in my hand here, a list of 89 various items which admittedly have no legislative authorization therefor, and which have been carried from year to year in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act.

It is not my intent to object to all of these items since some of them are for

valid purposes and are reasonably essential for the District of Columbia government and if these were stricken from the bill, it might seriously hamper or curtail certain activities to which we are not opposed; however, looking at the pending bill H.R. 10199 and the Appropriations Committee report thereon, I want to point out certain specific items which have been included and which go far beyond the authorizations provided by the Congress, and beyond the intention of at least the House Committee on the District of Columbia with respect thereto.

For example, there is included in the report at page 11, under Department of Public Welfare, the following, and I quote:

The committee has included the request for 25 positions and \$310,375 to establish the aid for dependent children of unemployed parents—AFDC-UP—in the District of Columbia. In addition to the allowance in the bill Federal reimbursements totaling \$279,934 will also be available. Requests elsewhere in the Department's budget relating to the AFDC-UP program have also been provided. These allowances are for operation of the program on a 6-month basis.

This is a new program proposed to be established under the language in this appropriation act. Two years ago, the House Committee on the District of Columbia reported to the Congress a bill (S. 914), to provide more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia—House Report No. 2447. This bill which became Public Law 87-808, did not authorize any such program as is provided in this pending bill.

Local groups and agencies of the District of Columbia initiate new programs frequently through the use of private funds. A grant will be secured from some foundation or by public solicitation, to operate in the District of Columbia for a period sufficient to establish the new program. Thereafter, requests are transmitted to the Appropriations Committee to perpetuate such unauthorized functions. Thus, the process of legislative authorization is avoided and the Appropriation Committee and the Congress is called upon to authorize annually in appropriation measures funds for such programs.

I call particular attention to several other items which have no place in this bill, and should be eliminated:

A provision authorizing the Commissioners to install a multiple asphalt plant on District of Columbia owned property, including all auxiliary plant equipment and preparation of site under the heading "Capital outlay, Department of Highways and Traffic." No such plant exists nor has there been any legislative authority for the construction of such a plant.

Another is the provision relating to the hiring of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the Secretary of Interior, and the purchase and maintenance of draft animals, harness and wagons under the heading "National Capital Parks."

Next I should mention the item for the Council on Human Relations under the

heading "Executive Office." This function was established by means of a private grant for a period of 2 to 3 years. The Council assumed authority to inject itself into labor problems and religious matters, among other things. It now presumes to operate under regulations under which private persons may be brought before the District government for prosecution and fined for violation of regulations which are issued pursuant to a purported act of Congress dated 1892. The record shows clearly that the 1892 act never passed both Houses of Congress and therefore lacks the essential validity required under the Constitution of the United States.

Another item relates to the fencing of public and private property designated by the Commissioners as public dumps, under the heading "Department of Sanitary Engineering."

Next I mention a provision relating to compensation of consulting physicians and veterinarians at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners, under the heading "Department of Public Welfare." Another similar provision is that relating to travel expenses and fees for visiting lecturers or experts in public health and related fields and for compensation of consulting physicians and dentists at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners under the heading "Department of Public Health." A contradictory provision which is surplusage relates to the use of parking meters. The Congress has by special act authorized the Commissioners to purchase, install, and operate parking meters and devices and to collect fees therefrom and otherwise carry out all actions necessary in connection with the use of parking meters. The Congress has also authorized formation of the parking agency with authority to administer the powers delegated to them by the Commissioners for this purpose. Yet in the appropriation language we find a provision authorizing and empowering the Commissioners to pay the purchase price and the cost of installing new parking meters or devices from funds collected from such meters and devices under the heading of "Department of Highways and Traffic." This language is not needed.

The foregoing items are mentioned in particular as legislative authorizations for items which should be taken from this bill. It is not my desire to create problems in connection with the action on this measure today, but to express the purpose that in further processing of this bill these items be removed before final action by this Congress.

Partial list of items or activities in the District of Columbia for which appropriations are included but which are now authorized only by the annual appropriations bill for the District:

First. Compensation of members of the Redevelopment Land Agency.

Second. Expenses and compensation at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners of members of the Apprenticeship Council.

Third. Aid in support of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the Greater National Capital Committee

of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

Fourth. General advertising authorized and required by law in newspapers—including the District of Columbia Register—and legal periodicals in the District of Columbia—hereinafter referred to as the "District"—but not elsewhere, unless the need for advertising outside the District shall have been specifically approved by the Board of Commissioners—hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioners"—including notices of public hearings, publication of orders and regulations, tax and school notices, and notices of changes in regulations.

Fifth. Expenses of Youth Council, Council on Human Relations, and the Board of Appeals and Review.

Sixth. Expenses in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insanitary conditions, flood, fire, or storm, and for expenses of investigations.

Seventh. District government employees' disability compensation, which shall be available for the advance payment of costs and expenses for the enforcement of recoveries in third party cases.

Eighth. Administrative expenses, workmen's compensation, to be transferred to the U.S. Department of Labor for the administration of the law providing compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employment in the District—Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Ninth. Affiliation with the National Safety Council, Inc.

Tenth. Juror fees in connection with inquests held by the Office of the Coroner.

Eleventh. Litigation expenses including, without limitation, witness fees and expert services in cases before any of the courts involving the government of the District and, in their official capacity, officers or employees thereof.

Twelfth. Civilian crossing guards including uniforms and equipment, at rates of pay and hours of employment to be fixed by the Commissioners.

Thirteenth. Compensation of civilian members of trial boards of the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners.

Fourteenth. Payment of rewards in connection with apprehension of fugitives.

Fifteenth. Purchase, rental, installation, operation and repair of radio and teletype systems and equipment.

Sixteenth. Expenses of attendance, without loss of pay or time, at pistol and rifle matches, including entrance fees.

Seventeenth. Travel expenses of visiting lecturers or experts in criminology.

Eighteenth. Expenses of traffic school.

Nineteenth. Official uniforms and equipment, including cleaning, alteration and repair of articles transferred from one individual to another, or damaged in the performance of duty in the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments.

Twentieth. Maintenance of a suitable place for the reception and detention of girls over 17 years of age and women arrested by the police on charges of offense

against any laws in force in the District, or held as witnesses or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise.

Twenty-first. Expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime under his certificate approved by the Commissioners, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

Twenty-second. Lodging and meals for jurors, bailiffs and deputy U.S. marshals while in attendance upon jurors, when ordered by the courts.

Twenty-third. Meals for prisoners while held by the police or while in courthouses.

Twenty-fourth. Reimbursement to the United States for services rendered to the District by the judiciary, General Services Administration, and the Department of Justice.

Twenty-fifth. Subsistence of medical and dental interns.

Twenty-sixth. Support, maintenance, and transportation of prisoners transferred from the District.

Twenty-seventh. Interment or transporting the remains of deceased prisoners to their relatives or friends in the United States.

Twenty-eighth. Identifying, pursuing, recapturing—including rewards therefor—and returning to institutions, escaped inmates and parole and conditional-release violators.

Twenty-ninth. Returning released prisoners to their residences, or to such other place within the United States as may be authorized by the Director of the Department of Corrections.

Thirtieth. Furnishing to released prisoners suitable clothing and, in the discretion of the Director of the Department of Corrections, an amount of money, the maximum of which shall be fixed by the Commissioners, regardless of length of sentence.

Thirty-first. Compensation at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners of members of boards to survey unsafe structures and excavations.

Thirty-second. Purchase of commodities and for personal services in connection with investigation and detection of sales of short weight and measure.

Thirty-third. Obtaining evidence necessary for prosecutions in connection with businesses of pawnbrokers, mediums, secondhand dealers, and other businesses requiring licenses.

Thirty-fourth. National Guard of the District, including compensation to the present commanding general at not to exceed \$13,300 per annum.

Thirty-fifth. Attendance at meetings of associations pertaining to the National Guard.

Thirty-sixth. Expenses of camps, and payment of commutation of subsistence for enlisted men of the National Guard detailed to guard or to move U.S. property at home stations on days immediately preceding and immediately following annual encampment.

Thirty-seventh. Reimbursement to the United States for loss of property for which the District may be held responsible.

Thirty-eighth. Cleaning and repairing uniforms, arms, and equipment of the National Guard.

Thirty-ninth. Instruction, including purchase and maintenance of athletic, gymnastic, and recreational equipment, at armory or field encampment of the National Guard.

Fortieth. Practice marches, drills, and parades.

Forty-first. Rents of armories, drill halls, and storehouses for the National Guard.

Forty-second. Advertising incident to recruiting for the National Guard.

Forty-third. Care and repairs of armories, offices, storehouses, and machinery of the National Guard.

Forty-fourth. Alterations and additions to structures of the National Guard.

Forty-fifth. Construction of buildings for storage and other purposes of the National Guard.

Forty-sixth. Education of foreigners, regardless of age, in the Americanization schools.

Forty-seventh. Subsistence supplies for pupils enrolled in classes for crippled children.

Forty-eighth. Maintenance and instruction of deaf, mute, and blind children of the District by contract entered into by the Commissioners upon recommendation of the Board of Education of the District.

Forty-ninth. Transportation of children attending schools or classes established for severely handicapped pupils.

Fiftieth. Distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk to public and charitable institutions, and for the carrying out, under regulations to be prescribed by the board of education of a milk program for the schoolchildren of the District, including the purchase and distribution of milk under agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Fifty-first. Services of experts and consultants, including travel expenses and fees to be fixed by the Commissioners.

Fifty-second. Operation and maintenance of recreation facilities in and for the District.

Fifty-third. Maintenance, repair, care, and improvement of public parks, buildings, grounds, fountains, reservations, propagating gardens, greenhouses, and the tourists' camp on its present site in East Potomac Park under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

Fifty-fourth. Placing and maintaining portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports, erection of stands, furnishing and placing of chairs, and services incident thereto in connection with national, patriotic, civic, and recreational functions held in the parks, including the President's Cup Regatta, and expenses incident to the conducting of band concerts in the parks.

Fifty-fifth. Hire of draft animals, with or without drivers at local rates approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and the purchase and maintenance of draft animals, harness, and wagons.

Fifty-sixth. Purchase, acquisition, care, and transportation of specimens for the National Zoological Park—in-

cluding travel for the procurement of such specimens.

Fifty-seventh. Revolvers, ammunition, uniforms, and equipment for National Zoological Park police, keepers, and assistant keepers.

Fifty-eighth. Care of alcoholics.

Fifty-ninth. Subsistence in lieu of salary for the employment of persons for the purpose of securing training and experience in their future vocations.

Sixtieth. Travel expenses and fees for visiting lecturers or experts in public health and related fields.

Sixty-first. Employment of consulting physicians, dentists, diagnosticians, therapists, other specialists, and veterinarians at fees to be fixed by the Commissioners.

Sixty-second. Compensation of convalescent patients and residents of institutions operated by the Department of Public Welfare to be employed in essential work as an aid to their rehabilitation at rates and under conditions to be determined by the Commissioners—but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as conferring employee status on patients and residents whose services are so utilized.

Sixty-third. Financial assistance for needy patients as determined by the Superintendent of Glenn Dale Hospital at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners.

Sixty-fourth. Fire prevention and protective services rendered at Glenn Dale Hospital under conditions to be determined by the Commissioners.

Sixty-fifth. Training school for nurses.

Sixty-sixth. Care and treatment of indigent patients in health institutions including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health and approved by the Commissioners.

Sixty-seventh. Relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents under rules and regulations made by the Commissioners.

Sixty-eighth. Maintenance pending transportation and transportation of indigent persons.

Sixty-ninth. Burial of indigent residents of the District.

Seventy. Temporary care and transportation of children while being transferred from place to place.

Seventy-first. Care of women and children in institutions, including those under sectarian control.

Seventy-second. Burial of children dying while beneficiaries under District Appropriation Acts.

Seventy-third. Maintenance of a suitable place of detention for children under 18 years of age arrested by the police on charge of offense against any laws in force in the District, or committed to the guardianship of the Department of Public Welfare, or held as witnesses, or held temporarily, or pending hearing, or otherwise.

Seventy-fourth. Supervision of students performing voluntary services for the purpose of obtaining training and experience in their future vocations.

Seventy-fifth. Care of boys committed to the National Training School for Boys by the courts of the District under a con-

tract to be made by the Commissioners with the Attorney General of the United States at a rate not to exceed the actual cost of each boy committed.

Seventy-sixth. Procurement of any item for examination or analysis for detection of adulteration or contamination of drugs and foods, including candy, milk, and other products for human or animal consumption or any other product or services whether or not for consumption which may endanger public health.

Seventy-seventh. Visits to any ward of the Department of Public Welfare who has been placed outside the District and the States of Virginia and Maryland when such visits are authorized by the Commissioners.

Seventy-eighth. Financial assistance and services to needy permanently and totally disabled residents under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioners.

Seventy-ninth. Minor construction of bridges.

Eighty. Installation and maintenance of parking meters.

Eighty-first. Repair, maintenance, and improvement of buildings and appurtenances thereto, and care of grounds.

Eighty-second. Installing and repairing water meters on services to private residences and business places as may not be required to install meters under existing regulations—said meters to remain the property of the District.

Eighty-third. Installing and repairing water meters on services and connections from the District water supply system for the direct use of any federally owned property used and occupied by any department or agency of the Government of the United States situated in the District.

Eighty-fourth. Fencing of public and private property designated by the Commissioners as public dumps.

Eighty-fifth. Operation, maintenance, repair, and protection of Washington water supply facilities and their accessories and maintenance of MacArthur Boulevard.

Eighty-sixth. Fluoridation of water.

Eighty-seventh. Permanent improvement of buildings and grounds—including purchase and installation of furnishings and equipment, and elimination of fire hazards—of schools, firehouses, hospitals, welfare institutions, and other District buildings.

Eighty-eighth. Purchase or condemnation of areas less than 500 square feet at the intersections of streets, avenues, roads, or alleys in the District.

Eighty-ninth. Acquisition by gift, exchange, purchase, or condemnation of supplementary land.

I want to thank my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, for his contribution. Since I have been a member of this committee and especially since I have served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I have always found the gentleman willing to cooperate and

to work with our committee on all matters pertaining to our capital city. I sincerely believe he joins with me in the belief that our capital city should be a model city.

I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to page 46 of the hearings. I know he will be interested in that portion which occurs at the bottom of the page. We have done this each year. Briefly I would say to the gentleman on page 46 the following appears:

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Tobriner, are there items in the budget presently before us contingent on the passage of authorizing legislation?

Mr. TOBRINER. Yes, sir; there are, amounting to roughly \$14,700,000.

Mr. NATCHER. Are there requests before us that constitute legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. TOBRINER. I do not believe there are.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina to know that on our committee we do not intend to legislate. On our committee we will not come to the House and recommend to the Members programs that are not authorized. As the gentleman knows, this budget when it was sent to us was \$16.7 million out of balance. \$14.7 million was the amount Mr. Tobriner mentioned in his statement that pertained to the general fund. That was authorized. It depended on the passage of legislation from the distinguished gentleman's legislative committee. And \$2 million, of the budget that was out of balance, pertained to the highway fund.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I just want to tell House Members that we have had perfect cooperation from his committee since he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations. I personally want to congratulate him on the fine job he is doing, which is possibly a thankless job. It is certainly a worrisome job at times. I want to congratulate him on being able to hold down these budgets as much as he has even though the cost of operating the District of Columbia has just about doubled in the past 7 years.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for his able presentation of this bill and ask him if I heard him correctly when he said that the District budget submission was \$16 million or nearly \$17 million out of balance when it came to his committee.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. Of course, this was an embarrassing matter as far as the committee was concerned, an unbalanced budget of \$16,700,000. I want the gentleman to know that today we are presenting a balanced budget.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman again on presenting to the Committee of the Whole a bill incorporating a balanced budget, especially in view of the fact that it was

out of balance some \$17 million when it was brought to the committee.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Do I understand correctly that one-third or more than one-third of the teachers in the District of Columbia are serving on a temporary basis?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. And I say to the Members of the House that this is a sad situation. Certainly it is not good—34 percent, I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, are in the temporary category. This simply means that they have not passed the necessary examinations, or they cannot qualify academically. That is not a good situation by any means. We have 5,207 teachers and one-third of them are temporary. That is no good.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman. It seems to me this is a sad commentary on the school system of the District of Columbia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky for a very splendid presentation of the District of Columbia appropriation bill for this coming fiscal year. I want to compliment him, too, for having brought to the Congress a balanced budget in this appropriation bill. I should like to ask one question regarding the crime situation and that has to do with the creation of the Police Cadet Corps. I understood the gentleman to say that the size of this corps initially will be limited to 25 young men and young women.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman said that in cases of emergency these young men and young women could be used for police work. Would it be the opinion of the gentleman that it would be rare indeed when youngsters such as these would be used for this purpose?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. It would have to be a case of extreme emergency. That would be the only time, because their ages run from 17 to 19.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is it not the intention of the committee in creating this Police Cadet Corps to have a feeder system to feed qualified personnel into the Police Department?

Mr. NATCHER. That is the main purpose of establishing the corps. We believe it will serve a worthwhile function.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the purpose is very good. Mr. Chairman, a question or two about the school system. The committee has been criticized to some extent for having reduced unduly the amount of money approved for capital outlay in these schools. I want to commend the gentleman because I think the committee has exercised caution and wisdom in examining each of these construction cases individually. I think the reasons the gentleman has set forth today are sufficient. When land costs as much as or maybe even more than the

building itself, then it is time to take a second look.

The question I have in mind is this: Can the gentleman tell us if the committee has information available generally as to the average cost per child per year in the District of Columbia for education?

Mr. NATCHER. I do not have that figure with me at this time, but I shall insert it in the RECORD at this point and furnish it to the distinguished gentleman. The per pupil cost estimated for 1963-64 is as follows:

Senior high school	\$482
Vocational high school	610
Junior high school	356
Elementary school	271

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman knows, unbelievable as it may be, we did not have a hot lunch program for elementary school children in the District until the last year. Will the gentleman elaborate a little bit on the progress of that program?

Mr. NATCHER. The members of our committee wish to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his interest in this program.

Before we started our investigation of the hot lunch program here in the District of Columbia schools, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], discussed this matter in detail with me, pointing out the fact that here we only had a very slight participation. At that time I will say to the gentleman from Iowa the participation was only 15.9 percent. Since that time, with the completion of the construction of buildings that were underway when we started our investigation, buildings that are presently underway, and in future plans, we are making arrangements for a hot lunch program in our school system in every possible way. I believe that before too long we will be able to report to the gentleman and to other Members of the House that participation has increased beyond 30 percent, and it will not be too long.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, there is not much which can be said after my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee finishes explaining a bill. I want to compliment him for the very thorough job which he has done on this bill. I further want to compliment him for his fairness to the people of our Nation's Capital, his fairness to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, and his fairness to the people throughout the 50 States to whom this Capital City belongs.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky and I share alike in the responsibility which we must assume, com-

mensurate with the authority given us, in funding the District of Columbia.

I believe we have come forth with a very fine bill. Every member of the subcommittee has had much experience qualifying him to sit and to judge the needs of the District of Columbia and how those needs are to be met. Each member participated in the hearings and therefore made this bill possible.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to also commend our chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who served for many years as chairman of this subcommittee, especially his scheduling of this piece of legislation. He scheduled this piece of legislation for consideration early in the year, in fact as the first bill on appropriations to be considered. In so doing the gentleman from Missouri has made it possible for the District government to make the most economical use of the money which we are providing them. It is highly necessary that this money be made available long before the fiscal year for which it is intended begins in order that planning, school buildings, schoolteachers can be cared for.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier there is not much more to be said. I have stated that I agree with my chairman. It is a good bill. It reflects a balanced budget. We are rapidly gaining on the shortcomings with which the District has been confronted. The pupil-teacher ratio will be brought up next year to the established standards of the United States; we are rapidly bringing our classroom needs up to what is considered to be sufficient. We are gaining as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I believe what we are doing for the schools of the District of Columbia is being reflected in the products we are producing.

I am happy to join with my chairman in sponsoring this bill and bringing the bill to the House for its consideration while in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, equal treatment has been given to the other departments such as the Fire Department, the Parks and Streets Department, the Police Department and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, there is not much more which I could say in regard to this bill. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman knows I have had a long interest in schools. I am a member of the District Committee, and as a member of the District Committee maybe I understand the importance of schools and the importance of the schools here in the District where the problems are especially present. I want to join with the gentleman from Indiana who has given consideration to this matter in his expressions, although I am somewhat bothered to know that you have cut out some 14 very important projects. I am one who has learned from experience, interviews, and contacts

with people here in the District of Columbia that we have one of the greatest superintendents of schools in the United States. He is completely honest, very thorough, and very dedicated. This does not begin to meet what he thinks is the need here. I am amazed at a Congress that will spend \$100 million for a building for itself, which many people feel is too much. We recently spent or authorized to be spent \$30 million for a cultural center. Now, I am not against a cultural center, but I am a little bit disturbed that you have cut out these projects that are important.

I want to say I may want to file some amendments to restore this. I hope that the Members who are on the floor and others will give serious consideration to this matter so that we can give the boys and girls in the District the same opportunity for education that they have in many, many areas of the United States where they have just as much reason for an education in these schools as they have out there.

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am not so much concerned about structural buildings in the District. I am more concerned about the quality of education. I am wondering if the gentleman could insert in the RECORD, if possible at this point, a statement concerning the number of people from the District of Columbia who have been able to qualify for scholarships? In reference to quality of education, from what I can gather there are not very many young people who graduate from District schools who can qualify for scholarship competition. If this can be provided it may serve as a rather important index as to the quality of education that we are making possible for the young people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his observations. I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio, as well as to the gentleman from Iowa, that I went to school once myself. I taught school for a few years. I am very much interested in school programs. I am interested in the education of the youngsters. The gentleman from Ohio has raised a question about the testing program and the achievements program. Mr. Hansen has been interrogated very thoroughly on that. He has a very adequate testing program. The testing program includes an aptitude test which determines the ability of the child, then the achievement test which also determines the achievement of the child.

May I say that since Dr. Hansen has been here those tests have shown great improvement in the teacher program. I ask him every year what the effects are, what the tests do, and what they show. The test program does show that we are improving our school materially. I would say that we are nearing the point where we are getting all we can get out of our educational program. May I say also to the gentleman from Iowa, you cannot buy education; a school building does not make a

school than a house makes a home. If the gentleman from Iowa will go back and check at home, he will find that if the District of Columbia used a commensurate amount of effort that they use in the great State of Iowa, they would not have a shortage of schoolteachers in the District of Columbia and they would not have a shortage of school buildings, either. If they would just add one period per day in the District schools they would have a lower pupil teacher ratio than in the State of Iowa, and if they added two periods per day they would still have a shorter day than in Indiana. These people who think all they have to do is assess the taxpayers and spend the money and they will have good schools just ought to go back to school, and learn a little more.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, one of the outstanding members of our committee [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for a job which has been done in a fine manner with a great deal of diligence and understanding of the problems of the District. It is a pleasure to work with him on this subcommittee, as it has been in the past.

I should like to mention two matters which the chairman mentioned and which I think bear repeating, because they are extremely important. One is the aid for dependent children of unemployed parents program. We have allowed \$310,375, which will carry the program for 6 months and will make a start in eliminating the problems which we presently have in the District and should not be tolerated any longer, namely, the fact that children are going hungry because of the fact that there is an employable parent in the home.

This is a program which has been in effect in 16 of the major industrial States. It is designed to care for children who are suffering because of the unemployment of their parents.

This program has built-in safeguards. It provides for the fact that the parent must make efforts to obtain work. It has provisions in it for work-training programs. It has provisions in it that parents must work with the U.S. Employment Service and make reasonable efforts to see that employment is available and obtainable. In my opinion, this will help to eliminate the "man-in-the-house" rule, which has done a great deal of harm to the people of the District of Columbia who depend on this type of welfare. I believe that people who must receive welfare should be treated like human beings, and with dignity and respect, as are all American citizens. The idea that because a person is impoverished, because a person is receiving welfare, the presumption should be that he is cheating, or the presumption should be that he is trying to get away with something, should not be tolerated here in the District of Columbia.

I believe we should have adequate checks to make certain that only qualified people receive aid. I do not think we should use some of the techniques

which I have heard are used, that investigators break into the house at all hours of the day and night and snoop around to see if they can find a male in the house. This then raises the presumption that there is an employable male in the house, and thereby prohibits people from receiving their welfare payments.

I think this program under the leadership of our chairman will put the District of Columbia welfare program on a sound basis. It has come at long last before this body, and I am delighted that the House is considering this legislation today.

Another item of major significance in the budget is the item dealing with the appropriation of money for 25 teachers for the instructing of mentally retarded children.

We have heard a great deal in the halls of this House during the past several years about the great problem in America concerning mentally retarded children and the fact that very little has been done by the Federal Government and by local and State governments to assist them. The Congress has seen fit to pass legislation dealing with this problem on a nationwide level and in the District of Columbia efforts are being made to make certain that we have these teachers available so that we can initiate this program and accommodate the mentally retarded children who are educable and who must be educated in a proper way.

This bill provides for 25 teachers. This number will be sufficient to train and educate the approximately 228 to 250 identifiable children who fit into this category and it will get us started on this program.

Mr. Chairman, these are two great items of progress, I believe, insofar as the District of Columbia government is concerned, and I urge the adoption of the legislation now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Fellow Members of the biggest school board in the world—and I address you that way because we are sitting as school board members today taking up valuable time of the Congress that could very well be handled by the people who live here and who, I think, would do just as adequate a job, if not a more adequate job, than we have been doing in legislating for the District.

I have some ideas about this, and this will be reflected in some legislation I will introduce later, that will create an elected school board for the District of Columbia, and then we can turn this problem over to the people who pay for most of the education here and thus give us time to attend to a lot of affairs that are of much more importance to the people of the United States and the people of the world than attending to school board affairs here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, on the whole, I should like to commend the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations under the very able guidance of the gentleman

from Kentucky for their work on the budget. The operating budget as requested remained almost as it was presented, and I am glad to note that and commend the gentleman for it. I do believe, however, there were needless cuts made in the request for new teachers. I see that for some reason music and art were discriminated against. The committee has cut the request for the number of new teachers by 34—21 of the new positions recommended by the cut of the committee were in the field of music and art. I think this is a regrettable situation. We in Congress had authorized some \$30 million for a new cultural center for Washington, D.C., yet, if this budget is accepted, it would be hampering the cultural development of the very people who should be given the opportunity to become culturally aware. There is a bit of inconsistency here that I think we need to note.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I wish to correct your statement. You said, "we" in the Congress voted some \$30 million for a cultural center.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Then I will say we authorized.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Authorized—and some of us did not vote for it, of course.

Mr. GROSS. That is the point—"we" did not—that is, I did not. I wish the gentleman would at least make an exception for me.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would be very glad to make that exception and I, of course, joined the gentleman on this—and not for the reason that I am against culture for I am very much in favor of a cultural center, but I just did not think the way we approached it was a proper way to approach it and, therefore, I was against it. But I did want to make the point that we did authorize the expenditure of some \$30 million for culture and then deny to the people who live here an opportunity to become culturally aware, as I said, or qualified to appreciate the culture which, I presume, will be revealed and seen in that cultural center.

I have emphasized again and again the need for better schools in the District of Columbia. I wish that each Member of the House would take the time necessary to visit the schools here. I did that almost a year ago. I can tell the Members that the conditions are a disgrace to the name of the District of Columbia.

As I indicated earlier, there is a top-notch administrator in the District. School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen has done as exceptional job under what can at least be described as very difficult circumstances.

The most glaring deficiency in this budget is the amount of money to be appropriated for capital outlay, for new schools and school additions. The amount budgeted is only \$11,968,000. This is nearly \$13 million below the budget request by the Commissioner. More incredible is the fact that it is \$23

million below the original request of the Board of Education.

The original request, according to the testimony—and this is my belief—was for a minimum figure. Members can see what a handicap this places on the school system here. All that is necessary for us to observe the inadequacy of this budget is a look at the projected shortage in capacity of school classrooms in 1966, if the original request for capital outlay were appropriated.

In fiscal year 1966, even with the approval of the original request, there would be a shortage of 422 classrooms in the elementary schools alone. There would not be room for 3,413 junior high school students and 393 senior high school students, plus a lack of room for 672 vocational high school students.

Mind you, as I have said, this would be the situation if there were an appropriation of the \$34 million requested originally. The present figure of \$11 million is approximately one-third of that originally asked for.

This being true, we can expect the situation in fiscal year 1966 to be 67 percent worse than calculated under the original request.

Gentlemen and ladies, how long are we to continue to neglect the school children in this District? The fact is that the figures I have given are all the minimum figures. We should do more.

Especially should we do more when we consider how liberal Congress is with appropriations for those outside the United States, under some of our foreign aid programs.

The real answer lies, I believe, in home rule, or in at least an elected school board with independent financial power, similar to the power of school boards in Davenport, Iowa; in Des Moines, Iowa; or in any other town in Iowa.

As I indicated earlier, I am working on a bill to give the District of Columbia Committee and the Members of Congress an opportunity to consider turning this important matter over to the people of the District, who I believe could do a much better job than we in Congress. This problem should be turned over to a school board, which no doubt would have a more direct interest in the school problems of the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Can the gentleman tell me what the pupil-teacher ratio is in the District of Columbia, in the senior high schools?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not know, except by comparison. I believe it compares favorably to the national average, and to that of the schools in Iowa.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me so that I may answer the question?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. The pupil-teacher ratio in the District of Columbia is 30 to 1.

Mr. SKUBITZ. In the senior high schools?

Mr. NATCHER. No. That applies to the elementary schools. It is a little different for the senior high schools.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I was under the impression it was about 1 to 25 in the senior high schools.

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. SKUBITZ. How does that compare with the schools in Montgomery County, which are considered to be among the best in the country?

Mr. NATCHER. It compares favorably with the figures in the schools in Montgomery County as far as the teacher-pupil ratio is concerned.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Can the gentleman tell me what the average number of classes is that the teachers teach in the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. The average number of classes I believe at this time is four.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Four classes in a school day of how many periods?

Mr. NATCHER. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] on that inquiry?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. A school day consists of four 40-minute periods, both laboratory and science, and so forth. That makes it a very short day. They do not even have that length of period. They probably have six periods a day, but the teachers do not teach every period.

Mr. SKUBITZ. They are teaching four periods on the average then?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I cannot say what the average is exactly, but I can say this: They have a powerfully short day.

I want to comment, if you will permit me, on one of your observations about the pupil-teacher ratio. This bill provides for bringing the pupil-teacher ratio exactly in line with the recommended average of all the accredited school organizations in the United States. That is based upon the anticipated increase in school population next year. If the school population increases by approximately 8,000 next year, as we anticipate it will, and they hire the teachers that we provide for in this bill, then the pupil-teacher ratio will be 25 to 1 in high schools and in grade schools 30 to 1. That is the recommended school standard by all accredited organizations I know of.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to say in response to that observation—and those are correct figures—that we are just getting abreast of our problem. You are not giving the school system a chance to get caught up for the past shortages and past neglects that have been partially our responsibility.

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. If the gentleman is interested in having more classrooms available for the teachers and for the pupils and bringing the pupil-teacher ratio down, let us say, to 20 in high school per teacher and 25 in grade school per teacher, all he has to do is to prevail upon this gentleman for whom

he has the highest regard, Mr. Hansen, who has done a good job, I think, to have one more period a day for the teacher and they will still be working a shorter day than your teachers work in the State of Iowa and the pupil-teacher ratio will be much better than the recommended standard.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First let me say that this will put an additional load on the teachers except in a few top schools. At the present time we know they are doing a good job and you cannot very well spend much more than 4 periods a day teaching. That is what the average is here.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee of the District of Columbia appropriations, I have enjoyed my work under the leadership of our outstanding chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Previous to my serving on this subcommittee, I have had some small experience in municipal government and when my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], mentions that our membership on the subcommittee has more than a passing knowledge of municipal government and its operations, I am inclined to agree with him.

My good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], has always been close to the school systems of his State; and Mr. WYMAN, the able Representative from New Hampshire, has had long experience as the attorney general of his State and is very knowledgeable of municipal affairs as is apparent from a perusing of the hearings on the District appropriation bill.

The form and content of the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1965 is directly attributable to work and efforts of our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. They have been dedicated to the exhaustive job of balancing needed budgetary requests with expected revenue. Although this necessitated trimming some of the requests made by the District Commissioners, we have approved, and the full Appropriations Committee has ratified, a bill calling for \$338,205,200, an increase of \$25,089,538 over fiscal year 1964 appropriations.

I believe that this bill is fair to the Capital City and fair to Congress. This last year Congress was late in appropriating the needed funds due to the delay in granting additional obligatory authorization, but this year under the schedule set by our chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], we have every expecta-

tion of the District receiving its appropriation in time to begin the new fiscal year without being required to limp along on a continuing appropriation of the previous year.

There appears to be general agreement that this budget is a satisfactory one to the District Commissioners, the city, and most of the civic groups who have testified in support of it; and I sincerely recommend its adoption.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I asked the distinguished chairman of the committee to yield this time to me in order that I may propound a question to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] if the gentleman is available for such an interrogatory. In view of his criticism of what the committee here has done, which is not unlike his criticism of what the District Committee has done about the schools, what percentage of increase in the school budget over the 1964 budget would the gentleman suggest would have been proper to bring about his utopian school situation that he has projected?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not know what the percentage would be. I think what we should do is decide what the actual needs are. I am one who has a great faith, as I indicated earlier, in Superintendent Hansen. His record is not such as would lead you to believe he has been wasting the public money in the schools. He is generally considered to be a great superintendent and has a record of being thoroughly honest and conscientious. I have indicated what I thought it should be and I think that what they asked for, which was a minimum budget, and which he was asked to present, should be approved.

Mr. WHITENER. I am sure the gentleman has noted that the committee has approved over \$4 million more for the fiscal year than is in the budget for the current fiscal year.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I noticed that.

Mr. WHITENER. How much money does the gentleman suggest ought to be given?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The amendments which I intend to offer will call for an additional \$17 million at least.

Mr. WHITENER. I understood the gentleman was going to offer such an amendment. On what basis has the gentleman arrived at the figure of \$17 million as the figure which would bring about perfection in the District of Columbia schools?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In the first place I am not contending it will bring about perfection. I am saying that it will bring about the kind of improvement that I think is necessary and it will bring about what the superintendent of schools, in whom I have great faith, wants.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made some remarks about how wonderful it would be if we had an elected school board in the District of Columbia. Is the gentleman saying that

the present school board is not up to doing the job?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Certainly they do not have the responsibilities that our school boards ought to have. If they did we would not be wrestling with the problem today on the floor here.

Mr. WHITENER. That brings us right down to the meat in the coconut which the gentleman and I have discussed in the Committee on the District of Columbia. Is the gentleman seriously making the contention that if you had an elected school board in the District of Columbia the Congress of the United States thereafter would not be concerned with the finances of the public schools of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. They would have the responsibility to underwrite the cost of part of it, certainly. But the management of the schools, according to the terms of the bill that I shall introduce would be in the hands of the people here who would have the right to spend their own money from property taxes.

Mr. WHITENER. So the gentleman is saying that if you had this magical election of a school board here all the Congress would have to do would be just to receive the requests for money and then vote on those and would not have to, as the gentleman indicated, go to this trouble that we are going to now.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is not going to be quite as simple as that. I know what the problem is here.

Mr. WHITENER. Where is the money going to come from, whether the school board is elected or appointed?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Most of the money comes from the people in the District of Columbia, as the gentleman knows. I would like the people who live here to have jurisdiction over the money that they pay in taxes, so that they may make their judgments and we will make our judgments on what is determined to be our share of the load.

Mr. WHITENER. So the gentleman's proposition is that the school board, when it is elected, will have authority to appropriate the locally collected taxes without the intervention of Congress?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right.

Mr. WHITENER. But as far as the Federal payment is concerned, as to that part of the money, Congress would be bothered with it?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right. That would be our responsibility. And the amount of that would have to be determined, and I should hope it would be as a result of a very, very thorough study of this question.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman, that I know that everyone in the District of Columbia is appreciative of the great interest he has in the District. He has mentioned that he has been engaged in the school business. I agree with the gentleman that the schools may not be perfect here, but I would suggest that if a fair inquiry were made the gentleman would probably find that he could out in his district, as I could in mine, make the same contention and be just as concerned about the children in our own districts as he has been here. Having had extensive hearings on this matter,

as a member of the committee and chairman of the subcommittee, I cannot agree with the gentleman that the schools in Washington are as bad as he says they are. The superintendent of schools for the District of Columbia is a very estimable gentleman and I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the subcommittee of which I am chairman, as well as the full District Committee, have been a lot more cooperative with the superintendent of public schools here than has his own school board. I am sure that the same could be said of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. His subcommittee has always been generous in meeting the needs of the District schools.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity first to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the members of his subcommittee for the fine work that they have done on this budget. I wish also, unfortunately, to express my regrets with respect to one unfortunate cut which has been made in the budget.

First, Mr. Chairman, on the positive side I am delighted that the committee has approved the funds which were requested by the department of sanitary engineering, as I believe the chairman of the subcommittee called it milestone No. 4, with respect to the budget which now enables the department to complete the remaining elements of this so-called project "C." This would include construction of a major system of sewers from the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant to Washington, D.C., where a connection is to be made with the Dulles interceptor sewer. It also provides an outlet for the District of Columbia sewer upriver and contains elements to drain the Little Falls, Cabin John, and Rock Creek Valley areas. This, of course, never sounds too glamorous, but the completion of this program has a very real regional impact. It represents an impressive attack on the problem of water pollution and the result will be a substantial reduction in the pollution of the Potomac River. Thanks to the action of this committee we are going to have a cleaner Potomac River running through our Nation's Capital and, of course, incidentally along the shores of the free State of Maryland. Therefore, with respect to this important regional problem I believe the budget is an excellent one.

But with respect to another regional problem—and that is with reference to the funds for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments—I find myself again on the floor during this 88th Congress requesting that this committee reconsider its action with respect to the cuts that they have made in the request made by the District of Columbia government for its share of the cost of the budget of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. The request was for \$57,900. The amount of \$25,000 has been authorized. The cut represents a cut of \$32,900. Unfortunately, this will not be the entire cut of

the budget of the council of governments because this is only a cut in that share of the budget which is borne by the District of Columbia. The effect will be that with this reduction there could be an overall reduction of \$81,000 because the other communities may well reduce their portion of the budget by \$48,100. This means that these programs which the local governments in this metropolitan area have voluntarily combined together to undertake, because they felt this would be the cheapest way of doing these proposed studies or performing the designated functions, will suffer as a result of this action.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the bill will pass today, but I do hope that somewhere along the line in the legislative process the council of governments will be able to convince this committee of the urgency of these funds as it affects the entire operation of the council of governments and that the committee will see fit at the appropriate stage of the legislative process to return these funds to the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee upon its action here and upon the bill and report which they have brought to the Congress. However, I do have some personal criticism of the school plant. I do not pretend to tell the Committee on Appropriations what part of the plant should be repaired first or last, or what part should be replaced first or last. But I have my own personal impression of the schools which my children attend in the District and I compare the plant with similar junior high schools and high schools in Montana. When I do this I find that the plant in the District of Columbia is inferior. I would like to see it brought up to standard, not just for my children because they are not going to be here very long, but for the children yet to come.

I am sure that this committee will cope with this problem and that the chairman of the subcommittee will give his personal attention to the question of plant and equipment in order that all of the District of Columbia schools will in time, in the near future, come up to standards.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. There has been much said here today about the District schools. Someone mentioned how many scholarships have been won. If I may set aside a little modesty for a minute may I say that my daughter went to the District schools, and she won a national merit scholarship and in the last few years she has won Vassar's highest academic award. She started her schooling here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I think the gentleman's daughter is to be com-

mended. I realize that the scholastic standards in the District of Columbia could be high without the plant being improved, but I believe it would be much higher if the plant were improved. Personally, I am concerned because in many ways it has run down, and I make this comment because I am sure the committee has observed the same condition and they want to improve on it as best they can, and as funds are available for appropriation for this purpose.

I commend the committee for its very hard work, and I hope sincerely if the Senate were to appropriate a larger amount for plant and equipment that in conference the House might yield a little bit and agree to a greater proportion for capital improvements in the school system.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, it might be prudent to try to put some of these questions and answers concerning the educational facilities of the District in perspective. First, we must realize there are many educational problems in the District of Columbia that are not within the province of the school system itself. There are social and economic factors quite apart from the schools which have to be treated before we can get the kind of school system that we all may think is desirable. We have to remember, too, that nationwide, education is always in a state of development, as far as plants are concerned, as far as educational techniques are concerned and educational materials. The District is certainly not unique in this respect.

We must have people for guidance and counseling in the District. I do not believe there is a school district in the country which is completely adequate in that respect. There is an effort on the part of the School Board to meet building needs in an orderly procedure.

The school system of the District should be commended. The teachers of the District of Columbia should be commended for their implementing a track system which provides the flexibility necessary in each area.

In case anyone thinks that the system is totally lacking I should point out, for instance, that in the honors track in the District of Columbia, a student can take 4 years of Latin, 4 years of German, 4 years of French, 4 years of Spanish, and 2 years of Russian in high school. He can also qualify so far as analytical geometry is concerned and in integral and differential calculus. We have had graduates of the high school system in the District who have entered our finest universities as sophomores rather than as freshmen because of the enriched program that is provided. It is probably at the quite opposite end of the spectrum where we need greatest improvement—in the vocational training—which again is impossible without proper counseling.

It is important to emphasize we are doing better here, and it is proper that we commend both the faculty and the administration of the District of Columbia for the job they have done.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the requests submitted by the District were in line with the cost of the many services rendered the public through its agencies. A thorough study of the requests were considered by the committee. The treatment accorded the requests was in conformity with the economic values involved.

The budget estimates amounted to \$357,702,300 including an amendment of \$1,850,300. The appropriations recommended in this bill totaled \$338,205,200, a reduction of \$19,497,100 in the budget requests—but an increase of \$25,089,538 over the fiscal figure in 1964.

The Federal contribution amounts to \$40,720,000—\$37,500,000 to the general fund—same as 1964—\$2,047,000 to water fund, and \$1,173,000 to the sanitary sewage fund.

These last two allowances represent increases of \$123,000 and \$229,000, respectively, above the 1964 appropriations—the amounts are based on actual services to the Federal buildings and installations in the area.

The committee also approved \$20 million as a Federal loan for partial financing of the capital outlay portion of the budget. Also the amount of some \$1,400,000 for the highway fund and \$5 million for the sanitary sewage works fund—thus totaling \$26,400,000. The loan appropriation is \$7,100,000 above that of 1964—and \$12 million above the budget estimate. There are adequate balances in the present authorization to meet this increase.

The District is confronted with many problems that have been disregarded over the years because of the refusal of Congress to take a realistic view of the growth of the city and incident thereto, an increase in the demands of the services to be rendered to its growing population. Further, the tremendous increase in the erection of Federal structures and installations that increased the costs of services furnished by the District to these properties that were not properly considered in the light of adequate reimbursement to the District.

The District Commissioners have, under the most trying conditions, endeavored to carry out the responsibilities of their office. An increase in taxes was necessary—gasoline increase of 1 cent per gallon estimated to raise \$2 million for highway purposes—real estate taxes and other proposals to raise accumulative funds to meet the deficits.

The employees numbering 28,432 were increased by 750—although 11,021 were requested.

The severe crime problems, the school population, and welfare increases resulting in mounting costs—also the important factor of the general fund financing because of high current operating expenses. The committee recommended an appropriation of \$18,677,000 for these expenses—an increase of \$794,122 over 1964—yet \$734,000 below budget request.

The Executive Office appropriation of \$523,000—a decrease of \$569,400 from 1964. The Department of General Administration receives \$8,002,000—an

increase of \$443,627 over 1964—decreases were as follows:

Regulatory and miscellaneous agencies—about \$169,000 budget request to \$2,497,000 appropriation 1965.

The library appropriation \$3,816,000, for 1965—increase of \$337,605 over 1964. Increase for new books \$92,000 et cetera.

Department of buildings and grounds appropriated \$3,016,000—1965 reduction of \$225,000.

Public Safety—appropriated \$69,841—000 increase of \$3,069,340 over 1964.

Office of Corporation Counsel—\$1,155,000—1965 increase of \$89,477 over 1964.

Fire department 1965—\$15,692,600—\$330,070 over 1964.

Office of Civil Defense—\$129,000—1965 courts—\$7,228,000 increase of \$456,537—1964.

Department of Correction, \$8,995,000 increase \$591,093—1964.

Education—\$67,910,000 increase of \$4,049,407—1964—less \$697,000 requested. A total of 234 new teachers provided for, 268 were requested.

Parks and recreation, \$4,166,000—increase of \$509,995—1964.

Health and welfare, \$74,833,000—increase of \$4,306,952—1964. Includes public health activities, \$48,246,000; an increase of \$1,336,464—1964—and the Department of Welfare—\$25,865,000—increase \$2,746,645—1964.

Highway and traffic, \$13,573,000—increase of \$1,165,016 over 1964.

Sanitary engineering, \$21,750,000 appropriated.

Metropolitan police, \$283,000; expenses incident to inaugural of 1966—repayment of loans and interest, \$5,364,000.

Capital outlay projects, \$55,887,000—increase of \$9,350,500—1964.

The committee has endeavored to meet its obligations in making fiscal determinations in accordance with the important expansion needs to carry out the purposes of District government. The enormous sums needed and demanded by the District Commissioners for expansion of the school system both in personnel and buildings—the welfare for the unfortunate on relief and the many critical needs of the majority of the cities in the United States are self-evident. At least a new attitude has evinced itself in the committee deliberations. The results are at least exemplary of a new look at the problems of the city we love, our Capital of the United States. We must make further progress in the near future toward remedying the problems that confront the five Commissioners who have labored in this beautiful city.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL FUNDS

Federal payment to District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, out of (1) the general fund of the District of Columbia (unless otherwise herein specifically provided), hereinafter known as the

general fund, such fund being composed of the revenues of the District of Columbia other than those applied by law to special funds, and \$37,500,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1964), (2) the highway fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D.C. Code, title 47, ch. 19), including the motor vehicle parking account (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (Public Law 87-408), (3) the water fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D.C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), and \$2,047,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1964), (4) the sanitary sewage works fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (Public Law 364, 83d Congress), and \$1,173,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1964), and (5) the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (Public Law 85-515); and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$26,400,000, which, together with balances of previous appropriations for this purpose, shall remain available until expended, for loans authorized by the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 101), the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), and the Act of August 27, 1963 (77 Stat. 130), to be advanced upon request of the Commissioners to the following funds: general fund, \$20,000,000; highway fund, \$1,400,000; and sanitary sewage works fund, \$5,000,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for functions under this general head:

General operating expenses

General operating expenses, plus so much as may be necessary to compensate the Engineer Commissioner at a rate equal to each civilian member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, hereafter in this Act referred to as the Commissioners; \$18,677,000, of which \$375,000 (to remain available until expended) shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation, and \$179,200 shall be payable from the highway fund (including \$50,200 from the motor-vehicle parking account), \$26,100 from the water fund, and \$8,600 from the sanitary sewage works fund: *Provided*, That the certificate of the Commissioners shall be sufficient voucher for the expenditure of \$2,500 of this appropriation for such purposes, exclusive of ceremony expenses, as they may deem necessary: *Provided further*, That, for the purpose of assessing and reassessing real property in the District of Columbia, \$5,000 of the appropriation shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

Public safety

Public safety, including employment of consulting physicians, diagnosticians, and therapists at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners; purchase of seventy-six passenger motor vehicles (including sixty-seven for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year but not in excess of \$100 per vehicle above such limitation) of which sixty-eight are for replacement purposes; \$69,041,000, of which \$149,550 shall be transferred to the judiciary and disbursed by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia and \$3,434,800 shall be payable from the highway fund (in-

cluding \$112,000 from the motor vehicle parking account), \$3,000 from the water fund, and \$3,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of any funds from appropriations available to the District of Columbia may be used to match financial contributions from the Department of Defense to the District of Columbia Office of Civil Defense for the purchase of civil defense equipment and supplies approved by the Department of Defense, when authorized by the Commissioners: *Provided further*, That the Fire Department is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicles exceeds three-fourths the cost of replacement.

Education

Education, including purchase of fourteen passenger motor vehicles, including two for replacement only, the development of national defense education programs, and for matching Federal grants under the National Defense Education Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1580), as amended, \$67,910,000, of which \$678,895 shall be for development of vocational education in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended.

Section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended, shall not apply from July 1 to August 23, 1964, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the branches of the United States Government or by any department or agency of the District of Columbia government.

Parks and recreation

Parks and recreation, including the purchase, acquisition, and transportation of specimens for the National Zoological Park, \$9,769,000, of which \$25,000 shall be payable from the highway fund.

Health and welfare

Health and welfare, including reimbursement to the United States for services rendered to the District of Columbia by Freedmen's Hospital; and for care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health; and purchase of three passenger motor vehicles including two for replacement only; \$74,833,000: *Provided*, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed \$34 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed \$5.75 per visit, and the inpatient rate (excluding the proportionate share for repairs and construction) for services rendered by Saint Elizabeths Hospital for patient care shall be \$9.74 per diem: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the furnishing of medical assistance to individuals sixty-five years of age or older who are residing in the District of Columbia without regard to the requirement of one-year residence contained in District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, under the heading "Operating Expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital," and this appropriation shall also be available to render assistance to such individuals who are temporarily absent from the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the authorization included under the heading "Department of Public Health," in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Highways and traffic

Highways and traffic, including \$73,526 for traffic safety education without reference to any other law; \$250 for membership in the

American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators; rental of three passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Commissioners; and purchase of twenty-one passenger motor vehicles, including thirteen for replacement only; \$13,573,000, of which \$9,295,900 shall be payable from the highway fund (including \$674,100 from the motor vehicle parking account): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purchase of driver-training vehicles.

Sanitary engineering

Sanitary engineering, including the purchase of fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$21,750,000, of which \$7,248,400 shall be payable from the water fund, \$4,230,200 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$79,900 shall be payable from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund.

Metropolitan Police

Additional Municipal Services, Inaugural Ceremonies

Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies), including payment at basic salary rates for services performed on the day before Inauguration Day, Inauguration Day, and the first day thereafter, by officers and members of the police and fire departments in excess of the regular tours of duty (but not to exceed a total of sixteen hours overtime pay to any individual officer or member performing service on such days) with such overtime earned by firemen chargeable to the appropriation for operating expenses of the Fire Department, \$283,000.

Personal services, wage-board employees

For pay increases and related retirement costs for wage-board employees, to be transferred by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the appropriations for the fiscal year 1965 from which said employees are properly payable, \$1,118,200, of which \$75,400 shall be payable from the highway fund, \$103,400 from the water fund, \$68,500 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$700 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works funds.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned in compliance with sections 108, 217, and 402 of the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 103, 109 and 110), as amended; section 7 of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 619), as amended; section 1 of the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183); and section 4 of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 211), including interest as required thereby, \$5,364,000, of which \$2,213,000 shall be payable from the highway fund, \$1,173,000 shall be payable from the water fund, and \$291,000 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned in compliance with section 4 of the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, the Act of May 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 235), and payments under the Act of July 2, 1954 (68 Stat. 443); construction projects as authorized by the Acts of April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244), February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 91), May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 105), June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), and August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 666); including acquisition of sites; preparing of plans and specifications for the following buildings and facilities: Shaw Junior High School replacement, new junior high school in the vicinity of 6th Street and Brentwood Parkway Northeast, Wheatley Elementary School addition, Chevy Chase Branch Library, Engine Company Number 9 replacement, school and activities building at the Junior Village, shop building at the Cedar Knoll School, a juvenile facility and

Incinerator Number 5; erection of the following structures, including building improvement and alteration and the treatment of grounds: new junior high school in the vicinity of 16th and Irving Streets Northwest, Slove Elementary School addition, new elementary school in the vicinity of Wheeler Road and Mississippi Avenue Southeast, Truesdell Elementary School addition, Mildred Green Elementary School addition, new elementary school in the vicinity of 18th and E Streets Northeast, Raymond Elementary School addition, Ruth K. Webb Elementary School addition, West End Branch Library, McKinley Swimming Pool, Holly and Dogwood Cottages renovation at the District Training School and two street cleaning tool houses; \$901,000 for the purchase of equipment for new school buildings; to remain available until expended, \$55,887,000, of which \$6,750,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1965, \$13,155,000 shall be payable from the highway fund, \$2,383,000 shall be payable from the water fund, and \$11,026,000 shall be payable from the sanitary sewerage works fund, and \$1,680,000 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioners, and the funds for the use of the Director of Buildings and Grounds shall be advanced to the appropriation account, "Construction services, Department of Buildings and Grounds".

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided herein, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act shall be audited before payment by the designated certifying official and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the designated disbursing official without countersignature.

SEC. 3. Whenever in this Act an amount is specified within an appropriation for particular purposes or object of expenditure, such amount, unless otherwise specified, shall be considered as the maximum amount which may be expended for said purpose or object rather than an amount set apart exclusively therefor.

SEC. 4. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized or approved by the Commissioners, for allowances for privately owned automobiles used for the performance of official duties at 8 cents per mile but not to exceed \$25 a month for each automobile, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, except that one hundred and forty-three fifty for investigators in the Department of Public Welfare and eighteen for venereal disease investigators in the Department of Public Health) such allowances at not more than \$410 each per annum may be authorized or approved by the Commissioners.

SEC. 5. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for expenses of travel and for the payment of dues of organizations concerned with the work of the District of Columbia government, when authorized by the Commissioners: *Provided*, That the total expenditures for this purpose shall not exceed \$65,000.

SEC. 6. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

SEC. 7. The disbursing officials designated by the Commissioners are authorized to advance to such officials as may be approved by the Commissioners such amounts and for such purposes as the Commissioners may determine.

SEC. 8. Appropriations in this Act shall not be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the Public Utilities Commission requiring the installation

of meters in taxicabs, or for or in connection with the licensing of any vehicle to be operated as a taxicab except for operation in accordance with such system of uniform zones and rates and regulations applicable thereto as shall have been prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission.

SEC. 9. Appropriations in this Act shall not be available for the payment of rates for electric current for street lighting in excess of 2 cents per kilowatt-hour for current consumed.

SEC. 10. All motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (including watercraft) owned by the District of Columbia shall be operated and utilized in conformity with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 77, 78), and shall be under the direction and control of the Commissioners, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof, or direct the alteration of interchangeable use of any of the same by officers and employees of the District, except as otherwise provided in this Act. "Official purposes" shall not apply to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or in cases of officers and employees the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary, but only as to such latter cases when the same is approved by the Commissioners.

SEC. 11. Appropriations contained in this Act for Highways and Traffic, and Sanitary Engineering shall be available for snow and ice control work when ordered by the Commissioners in writing.

SEC. 12. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized by the Commissioners, for the rental of quarters without reference to section 6 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945.

SEC. 13. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the furnishing of uniforms when authorized by the Commissioners.

SEC. 14. There are hereby appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of judgments which have been entered against the government of the District of Columbia, including refunds authorized by section 10 of the Act approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 108): *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as modifying or affecting the provisions of paragraph 3, subsection (c) of section 11 of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended.

SEC. 15. Except as otherwise provided herein, limitations and legislative provisions contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be continued for the fiscal year 1965: *Provided*, That the limitation for "Construction Services, Department of Buildings and Grounds" contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be increased from 6 to 7 per centum of appropriations for construction projects: *Provided further*, That after June 30, 1964, the limitation of \$50 per diem for experts and consultants under the heading "Public Schools, District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961" shall no longer be applicable.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1965."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

If not, the Chair will receive amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there is in this bill any money for the so-called Cultural Center in Washington, D.C.

Mr. NATCHER. I should like to inform the gentleman from Iowa there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Is there any money in this bill for a mass transit program or plan?

Mr. NATCHER. I should like to inform the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that there is no money in this bill for the rapid transit system.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman again.

Do I understand that some submission was made to the committee for the construction of parking lots? Will the gentleman briefly explain that situation?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman from Iowa is correct. A request was made for \$31,000 to build a parking lot under the Southeast Freeway at approximately the corner of 2d Street. This request was denied. It was for 36 spaces for automobiles to be parked during the day, with meters. We had no testimony to the effect that it was necessary and further none to the effect that the meters would be read and that the parking facility would pay for itself.

Mr. GROSS. Probably if the parking lot had been erected under the freeway a good deal of the revenue would have been absorbed in lighting it throughout the night.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly correct. We considered all of that. For that reason, I want the gentleman to know, we refused this request.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the committee did just that. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10199) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 641, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9666) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] for 1 hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 641 provides for consideration of H.R. 9666, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act—75 Stat. 612—as amended. The resolution provides an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The period since the Peace Corps began in 1961 is too short to permit an evaluation of the long-range contribution of the Peace Corps to the development of the countries where it operates or to the attainment of world peace.

The accomplishments of the Peace Corps in attaining the more immediate and no less important objectives of establishing a better understanding with the people of other nations, of demonstrating the friendship of Americans toward their fellow men of distant lands, and of making a current contribution to the improvement of the daily lives of people in communities located in 46 countries justify describing the Peace Corps as a success.

The Peace Corps, on January 15 of this year, had 6,976 volunteers and trainees serving overseas in 46 countries.

H.R. 9666 authorizes the appropriation of \$115 million to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. The amount requested by the Executive will make possible an increase in the number

of Peace Corps volunteers from the level of 10,500 which has been provided for with the funds appropriated for fiscal 1964 to a level of 14,000.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1964 was \$95,963,971.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 641.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 641) will provide an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 9666, a bill to further amend the Peace Corps Act.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 53]

Alger	Gray	Murray
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Hansen	Osmers
Ayres	Harsha	Passman
Bass	Hebert	Philbin
Blatnik	Hoffman	Pillion
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Powell
Bruce	Hutchinson	Rains
Buckley	Jarman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carey	Johansen	Roberts, Ala.
Celler	Mich.	Roosevelt
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	St. Germain
Cramer	Kee	St. Onge
Diggs	King, Calif.	Steed
Donohue	Kluczynski	Teague, Calif.
Duncan	Laird	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards	Leggett	White
Elliott	Martin, Calif.	Wickersham
Finnegan	Mathias	Willis
Fogarty	Meader	
Fraser	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 641 will provide an open rule with 2 hours general debate for the consideration of H.R. 9666, a bill to further amend the Peace Corps Act.

Last year the House authorized \$102 million and the actual appropriation was \$96 million, which included \$3.8 million reallocated from funds left over from the previous year. This bill will authorize \$115 million which is \$19 million more than was actually appropriated last year. However, the actual appropriation for fiscal 1965 will be subsequently determined by the Appropriations Committee.

There are presently approximately 7,000 volunteers in the Peace Corps engaged overseas in 46 countries. It is anticipated that appropriated funds for fiscal 1964 will finance an increase in the number of volunteers to 10,500. It is anticipated that this year's appropriation will permit the agency to expand to about 14,000 volunteers by August 1965.

In December 1963 there were approximately 4,800 applicants and in January

1964 approximately 5,000. About one of nine applicants is selected.

The schedule of volunteers at work and in training as shown on page 4 of the report indicates that there are 3,386 individuals engaged overseas in a teaching capacity. A recapitulation of cost of the Peace Corps since its inception is set forth on page 6 of the report. The total amount appears to be a little more than \$179 million. The annual cost per volunteer is \$8,560.

Testimony before the Rules Committee is to the effect that the Peace Corps is continuing to render a satisfactory service involved in education, community development, cooperative movements, agriculture, health work, geology, public administration, engineering and in other fields. The only adverse comment which I will make at this time, Mr. Speaker, is simply a word of caution that if the tax cut bill passed last week is to become a reality and be successful, that we must use our every effort to stop increasing existing programs or starting unnecessary new programs. It is true the increase in this program is not tremendously large, but it will be an additional cost over and above last year's.

I know of no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker, and urge its adoption.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOW SEAWAY TOLLS NEEDED TO DEVELOP GREAT LAKES TRAFFIC POTENTIAL

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, I introduced H.R. 9796. By reducing the staggering financial burden now imposed on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the bill would help the seaway to keep tolls low and thus to build up traffic to levels envisaged at the time this farsighted project was authorized by Congress in 1954. Identical bills have been introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], H.R. 10183; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], H.R. 10184; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], H.R. 10185; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], H.R. 10186; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], H.R. 10187; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], H.R. 10188; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], H.R. 10189.

OBJECTIVES OF H.R. 9796 AND COMPANION BILLS

This proposal has two main objectives. First, it would change the stringent capital payoff and high interest rate provisions written into the 1954 Seaway Act so as to provide a more conservative method of capitalization for the Govern-

ment's investment and a safer way of assuring an adequate return on that investment. Second, it would require that tolls be set which, at full capacity operations and not at present traffic levels, will recover all costs as well as a return on the capital investment.

The present Seaway Act is being used by seaway opponents as a basis for demanding toll increases because it appears to require that from about the 1964 shipping season onward, toll revenues must cover not only all operating and maintenance costs but also an annual amortization of capital investment in addition to interest on the investment at nearly 3.5 percent per year. This financial burden was imposed by Congress in good faith but on the unrealistic assumption that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system would be physically complete and ready to accommodate ocean-going vessels from the first year of operation in 1959, and that within 5 years the seaway would have built up capacity traffic of around 50 million tons per shipping season. In fact, the seaway system was not physically ready in 1959, nor is it ready today. Great Lakes connecting channels were not dredged to full seaway depth until late in 1963, and none of the Great Lakes ports are even now ready to accommodate oceangoing vessels loaded to full seaway draft. In the fifth shipping season, ending in December 1963, the seaway achieved a traffic total of 31 million tons, an impressive 20-percent gain over 1962 but still a long way off from capacity traffic, which could be anywhere from 50 to 60 million tons.

Because present seaway traffic of 31 million tons is not yielding revenue sufficient to cover interest and amortization costs in addition to operating and maintenance expenses, seaway opponents are seizing upon the letter of the Seaway Act to demand that tolls be increased to raise revenues. This demand places

the seaway in a painful dilemma. If tolls are raised, traffic will fall, and the seaway may never be able to repay the Government's investment. If present tolls are retained or, as economic logic would dictate, reduced to encourage traffic, the seaway would expose itself to the charge that it was not adhering to the financial provisions of the law.

H.R. 9796 and its companion proposals would remove this dilemma. They would permit the seaway to set tolls which are best for maximizing its true traffic potential and, at the same time, assure recovery of the Government's investment as well as an ample return on that investment. My statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29—pages 1384-1385—and February 4—pages 1936-1937—discuss in detail how H.R. 9796 and its companion bills would achieve these objectives.

GREAT LAKES TRAFFIC POTENTIAL

There is a great untapped potential for added seaway traffic if tolls are kept low at the same time that harbor and port improvements are accelerated, the shipping season is lengthened to the maximum which weather conditions permit, and shippers are educated to the economies and advantages of using the seaway.

The size of this potential is indicated by a recent study of Great Lakes exports by Dr. Eric Schenker, associate professor of economics of the University of Wisconsin and chairman, Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners. According to Dr. Schenker, Great Lakes ports are shipping only about 6 percent of the manufactured exports produced in the Great Lakes area whereas, by comparison, the single port of Philadelphia accounts for 18 percent of the manufactured exports of a tristate hinterland area including Pennsylvania, Delaware, and half of New Jersey. Even after ad-

justing Great Lakes area export figures downward to take account of the seaway's shorter navigation season, Dr. Schenker finds that the Great Lakes area is sending only 7.5 to 9 percent of its manufactured exports out of Great Lakes ports. The full text of Dr. Schenker's study follows:

EXPORTS OF THE GREAT LAKES AREA

(By Eric Schenker, associate professor of the University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee), and chairman, Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners)

The most significant factor affecting Great Lakes foreign trade in the last 10 years has, of course, been the St. Lawrence Seaway. Officially opened on June 26, 1959, after 5 years of construction, the seaway climaxed over a half century of public discussion and political consideration. The seaway project itself consists of widening and deepening the existing ship channels, locks, and harbors to a minimum of 27 feet, and lengthening and widening the locks to 800 feet by 80 feet. As a result, since 1959 the Great Lakes ports have been made accessible to approximately 70 percent of the world's merchant shipping fleet.

It is still far too early to estimate the final impact of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the foreign trade routes of the United States. Improvements in the harbors of some Great Lakes ports have not been completed by the Army Corp of Engineers. More important, the routes do not adjust themselves overnight. The habits of shippers change only gradually, and accurate information about the relative advantages of the seaway is not immediately available, but is accumulated over time, with experience in using the seaway. The relative rate structures of alternative means of transportation also have to adjust to the new competition of the seaway, and this process is still going on; it can be expected to continue for some time.

Despite all these factors, however, the opening of the seaway has already brought about a significant shift in the foreign trade transport routes in the country. This is shown in table I, summarizing the relative shares of U.S. exports shipped from each of this country's four coasts in recent years.

TABLE I.—Shipping weight and value, U.S. waterborne exports, 1951-61, by area of origin

Year	United States		Atlantic coast		Gulf coast		Pacific coast		Great Lakes	
	Weight	Value	Weight	Value	Weight	Value	Weight	Value	Weight	Value
1951	103,294	10,113	47	61	19	25	13	11	20.4	2.9
1952	91,685	9,024	41	58	23	26	13	13	22.4	3.2
1953	71,756	7,829	34	62	25	23	14	12	27.4	3.6
1954	69,287	8,539	39	60	24	23	14	13	23.8	3.5
1955	100,206	9,459	49	63	20	22	12	12	19.5	3.4
1956	129,246	11,485	50	60	22	25	11	12	17.0	3.2
1957	147,671	13,267	50	57	24	27	11	13	14.6	3.2
1958	102,343	10,948	48	59	24	26	12	12	15.1	3.2
1959	96,576	10,776	38	56	29	27	14	12	18.9	5.3
1960	109,165	13,406	37	53	30	28	16	13	17.5	4.8
1961	113,860	13,913	35	53	31	28	16	13	18.0	5.7

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: "United States Foreign Waterborne Commerce," annual review.

The change in the traffic pattern between 1958 and 1959 is marked. The Great Lakes' relative share of exports increased by over 25 percent measured by weight, and by almost 67 percent measured by value. Moreover, while the relative share measured by weight has declined slightly since 1959, measured by value it has shown a further modest increase, rebounding from the slump in 1960.

Table I shows that, even with the seaway, Great Lakes exports are a smaller fraction of the total tonnage than they were as recently as 1955, but this fact should not be overemphasized. As the relative figures for weight and for value indicate, Great

Lakes exports are largely commodities of large bulk and low value. Analysis of the commodities entering into foreign trade shows that bituminous coal is annually the largest single commodity, by weight, for both the Great Lakes and the rest of the Nation. Great Lakes exports of bituminous coal have ranged from a high of 14,453 long tons in 1951 to a low of between 9,000 and 10,000 long tons in each of the years 1958-61; for the rest of the Nation exports have varied from 12,640 long tons in 1953 to 51,400 in 1957. If this highly volatile component of our export trade is excluded, the

downward trend of the Great Lakes share largely disappears, as shown in table II. It is worth noting that the increase in the Great Lakes relative share of exports between 1958 and 1959 is still about the same—just over 25 percent.

Bituminous coal may justifiably be discounted in measuring the effect of the seaway on trade patterns because an overwhelming share of the coal exported via the Great Lakes goes to Canada. Table III, even though it only shows that coal shipped from the Lake Erie ports to Canada, brings this out clearly.

TABLE II.—*Shipping weight of U.S. waterborne exports, 1951–61, excluding bituminous coal*

Year	United States	Great Lakes	Year	United States	Great Lakes
1951...	58,477	11.4	1957...	82,212	9.2
1952...	54,370	12.8	1958...	58,858	10.2
1953...	45,690	13.7	1959...	64,518	12.9
1954...	44,715	12.2	1960...	77,341	12.3
1955...	57,296	12.5	1961...	83,353	13.6
1956...	72,410	10.7			

Source: See table I.

As table I shows, the choice of a different unit of measurement will yield a strikingly different pattern of foreign trade. Which unit should be used depends upon the purposes of the study. In estimating the income generated by a port, the tonnage figures are

preferable. However, as will be shown in chapter 9, different kinds of commodities generate different amounts of revenue per ton; "general cargo"—the high value, small bulk commodities which require special handling in shipping—generates a much greater

revenue per ton than do the bulk commodities, such as bituminous coal. The Atlantic coast ports, as table I suggests, ship a far greater proportion of the Nation's general cargo exports than do its bulk commodities.

TABLE III.—*Bituminous coal shipments, Lake Erie ports to Canada*

[In thousands of short tons]

	1954	1958	1959	1960	1961		1954	1958	1959	1960	1961
Toledo...	3,403	3,932	4,909	4,844	5,923	Huron...	17	21	—	27	7
Sandusky...	1,462	1,497	1,859	1,602	703	Cleveland...	27	—	—	26	81
Ashtabula...	1,789	1,503	1,764	1,632	1,401	Total...	9,883	8,778	9,623	9,415	9,079
Fairport...	595	448	313	179	222	Total, all Great Lakes ports...	12,370	10,563	11,070	10,739	10,312
Erie...	806	464	286	194	243	Lake Erie ports' share of total Great Lakes ports (percent)...	80	83	87	88	88
Lorain...	1,151	533	242	648	338						
Buffalo...	340	127	207	101	—						
Conneaut...	293	253	43	162	161						

Source: Army Corp of Engineers, "Waterborne Commerce of the United States," pt. 3, calendar years 1958, 1959; U.S. Bureau of the Census, "United States Waterborne Foreign Commerce," annual review, 1960, 1961.

In a recent study, the "Impact of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the Upper Midwest," Professor Krueger estimated general cargo exports in 1960 as 7,814,000 short tons for the seven leading Atlantic coast ports, as compared to 1,149,000 for seven Great Lakes ports.¹ While Professor Krueger's definition of Great Lakes general cargo exports is not entirely suitable for this study,² redefinition changes the results only in detail. The definition of "general cargo" given by the Bureau of the Census is used in table IV. The figures exclude grains, soybeans, flax-

seed, and oil seeds, unmanufactured cotton, coal, coke, bulk petroleum products, limestone, sand, gravel, sulfur, mineral ores and concentrates, and all Department of Defense, special category and low value shipments.³ Table IV suggests that general cargo exports have doubled, approximately, as a result of the seaway, but that they are growing relatively slowly after that initial jump. The decline between 1960 and 1961, however, is more than accounted for by the slump in exports from the port of Detroit.

Detroit's exports of general cargo were dominated by "rolled and finished steel mill

products"; exports rose from only 4,000 tons in 1958 and 3,000 in 1959, to a peak of 170,000 in 1960, then fell to 52,000 in 1961. While a number of other commodities showed significant declines between 1960 and 1961, rolled and finished steel products accounted for 85 percent of the net decline.⁴

At this point in time, it is too early to tell whether 1960 or 1961 was the unusual year for this commodity. But even if the 1960 maximum proves to be the more typical figure, Great Lakes general cargo exports will still be small when compared with those of the east coast.

TABLE IV.—*General cargo exports, major Great Lakes ports, 1958–61*

[In thousands of short tons]

	1958	1959	1960	1961		1958	1959	1960	1961
Buffalo...	42	21	24	30	Milwaukee...	44	124	107	153
Chicago...	106	414	345	348	Toledo...	11	31	33	76
Cleveland...	45	62	81	60	Total...	282	781	941	893
Detroit...	33	98	305	141					
Duluth...	1	21	46	85					

Source: Army Corps of Engineers, "Waterborne Commerce of the United States," 1958–61.

The small size of the Great Lakes ports' general cargo traffic stands out even more clearly when exports via the ports of the region are compared with its manufactures

of export commodities. A 1960 Commerce Department study, as shown in table V, estimated the value of exports manufactured in each State, making such a comparison possible.⁵ The 1960 exports manufactured in the Midwest may be most easily compared with the 1961 exports shipped via the Great

Lakes ports, as assembled by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry Research and Statistics Division, since what is important is the relative magnitude, not the precise figure. For the purpose of this comparison, "Midwest" States include Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, the Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, and Kentucky.⁶

¹ These figures differ from those used by Professor Krueger primarily in that those in table IV include wheat flour and animal feeds, and exclude scrap iron, flaxseed, and ores and concentrates, for Canada as well as overseas. There are some other, relatively minor, differences.

² U.S. Department of Commerce, "Value of Exports of Manufactured Products, by Region and State, and by Major Product Group: 1960" (Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, Bureau of International Programs, 1962).

³ Two classifications which also showed large declines were "vegetables and preparations not elsewhere classified," and "iron and steel semifinished products."

⁴ The reasons for choosing this definition of "Midwest," and for the subsequent modifications of it, will be given in detail in ch. 6; these States roughly correspond to the areas in which the Great Lakes ports have shipping cost advantages over other ports.

⁵ Anne O. Krueger, "The Impact of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the Upper Midwest," (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1963).

⁶ Ibid. p. 15: "General cargo totals were derived from individual port commodity statistics by taking total export traffic in the port and subtracting major bulk items (grains, soybeans, petroleum and gasoline, iron ore)." Professor Krueger also excludes exports to Canada, apparently because these would not be affected by the seaway.

⁷ Bureau of the Census, "Domestic Movements of Selected Commodities in U.S. Waterborne Foreign Trade" (Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1959) p. 3.

TABLE V.—Manufacturing establishments reporting the export of products in 1960; the number of these establishments, their employment and reported exports, compared with total manufacturing exports, by region and State

Geographic region and State	Establishments reporting exports			Total manufacturing, exports and estimated regional and State totals	Geographic region and State	Establishments reporting exports			Total manufacturing, exports and estimated regional and State totals
	Number of establishments	All employees annual average	Value of exports reported			Number of establishments	All employees annual average	Value of exports reported	
United States, total	7,496	5,699,981	Millions \$9,792.4	Millions \$15,454.3	South Atlantic—Continued	89	74,485	\$213.3	\$338.3
New England	721	482,036	551.8	1,013.7	Virginia	71	58,489	125.3	156.1
Maine	29	16,271	14.5	37.5	West Virginia	93	103,162	128.0	391.8
New Hampshire	36	18,166	30.3	54.7	South Carolina	27	27,353	30.4	121.8
Vermont	24	11,161	15.5	28.1	Georgia	82	54,502	107.0	230.8
Massachusetts	319	204,495	224.4	435.2	Florida	55	29,028	85.1	158.8
Rhode Island	63	28,066	22.2	65.9	East south central	309	208,795	324.9	587.3
Connecticut	250	203,877	244.7	385.9	Kentucky	89	57,660	102.2	178.4
Middle Atlantic	1,894	1,443,530	2,271.2	3,506.1	Tennessee	107	76,413	132.0	220.1
New York	685	573,331	888.1	1,417.4	Alabama	78	60,946	54.4	109.2
New Jersey	505	296,404	587.2	897.0	Mississippi	35	13,776	36.1	77.0
Pennsylvania	704	574,095	795.7	1,189.5	West south central	397	222,032	938.2	1,243.3
East north central	2,500	2,084,340	3,119.5	4,503.8	Arkansas	31	13,225	29.2	50.7
Ohio	785	628,666	921.5	1,299.4	Louisiana	73	41,371	192.0	254.1
Indiana	312	310,259	310.2	483.6	Oklahoma	51	19,966	65.5	98.9
Michigan	487	482,960	646.5	898.7	Texas	242	147,470	651.3	836.6
Illinois	666	464,430	971.1	1,407.8	Mountain	67	46,386	97.6	177.3
Wisconsin	250	198,025	270.0	411.4	Montana	1	(1)	(1)	3.9
West north central	438	294,334	378.6	764.0	Idaho	10	2,065	8.4	15.6
Minnesota	107	75,354	92.5	176.4	Wyoming	1	(1)	(1)	7
Iowa	101	84,987	121.4	243.0	Colorado	21	19,130	28.2	48.4
Missouri	154	85,101	91.5	193.0	New Mexico	4	378	11.3	26.5
North Dakota	1	(1)	(1)	2.4	Arizona	12	12,635	12.8	29.3
South Dakota	3	(1)	(1)	7.4	Utah	13	9,724	32.0	45.8
Nebraska	24	14,093	14.5	41.9	Nevada	5	1,639	4.6	5.4
Kansas	48	30,729	56.7	96.6	Pacific	624	500,228	1,264.3	1,994.2
South Atlantic	546	412,822	845.8	1,655.0	Washington	86	95,276	393.7	582.8
Delaware	25	12,267	14.4	28.4	Oregon	43	19,428	50.8	87.1
Maryland	102	92,012	138.4	216.9	California	490	385,524	809.7	1,302.6
District of Columbia	2	(1)	(1)	7.7	Alaska	1	(1)	(1)	4.0
					Hawaii	4	(1)	(1)	15.5

¹ Withheld to avoid disclosing figures for individual companies.

NOTE.—Figures may not add because of rounding. The \$9,800,000,000 in exports reported in this survey were made by establishments with 100 employees or more and exporting \$25,000 or more in 1960. Based on a census company survey covering 1958, these establishments account for substantially all shipments known to the manufacturer to be destined for export. The \$5,600,000,000 in exports not reported in the survey would be accounted for chiefly by products shipped through wholesalers, independent export houses, etc., and by small manufacturers.

The exports shown in this table are in f.o.b. plant values. The total value at port is estimated at \$16,898,000,000, and exceeds the 1960 Census Bureau's totals for manufactured foodstuffs, semimanufactures and finished manufactures by some \$300,000,000. Figures given here include exports to Puerto Rico, bunker sales of fuel to foreign vessels.

The value of the Midwest's manufactured exports was \$5,446 million in 1960; the value of manufactured exports shipped via the Great Lakes ports was \$327 million in 1961. Great Lakes ports, in other words, shipped about 6 percent of the exports produced in the Great Lakes area. By contrast, the ports on the Delaware River (primarily Philadelphia) shipped \$301 million worth of manufactured exports in 1960, while its hinterland of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and half of New Jersey produced \$1,666 million worth of such exports. Philadelphia's share was about 18 percent, three times that of the Great Lakes ports.

This comparison, striking as it is, understates the situation; it is surely too favorable to the Great Lakes. On the one hand, Philadelphia is about halfway between the two major general cargo ports of the east coast (and of the Nation), New York, and Baltimore. Its cost advantages in its assumed hinterland are likely to be very small. Further, the western part of Pennsylvania, including Pittsburgh, is in fact in the hinterland of the Great Lakes ports; Pittsburgh itself lies in the hinterland of Cleveland. Including this heavy-industry area in the Philadelphia hinterland drastically overestimates that port's potential exports.

On the other hand, the Great Lakes ports' hinterlands are understated in the above enumeration. This is obvious in the case of Erie, Buffalo, Oswego, and the other Great

and certain other adjustments developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in their study of direct and indirect employment attributable to exports.

The national total figures were prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based largely on census export data and census "bridge" tables on export and industry classification systems.

Regional and State distributions of exports, not reported directly by manufacturers, were estimated by the Office of Business Economics and the Bureau of International Programs, U.S. Department of Commerce, in order to account for local origin of all manufacturing exports. The figures reported by manufacturers are from a survey conducted by the Census Bureau of plants with more than 100 employees included in the annual survey of manufacturers.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Lakes ports in New York and Pennsylvania; these ports surely draw traffic primarily from their own States. If we exclude these ports' \$14,900,000 of exports from the estimates, then about 5.75 percent of the remaining Great Lakes area's export production is shipped via Great Lakes ports. But, as stated above, the Pittsburgh area actually lies in the Cleveland hinterland, rather than in that of Erie. Cleveland also is the cheapest port of export for nearly all of West Virginia. The hinterlands of various other Great Lakes ports include the northern half of Tennessee, if not more; and much of Colorado (including Denver), Wyoming, and Montana. If we allow for these areas, by adding the value of manufactured exports for all of West Virginia and one-half of Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana, the total production in the Great Lakes area is \$6,334 million, of which the area's ports ship about 5.1 percent.⁸

Whichever hinterland is used in the measurements, the point is the same. There are several reasons for the predominance of east coast ports in this country's general cargo exports. Most obvious is the seasonal nature of shipping via the Great Lakes; the St. Lawrence Seaway is only open between 8 and 9 months of the year. A rough allowance

for this factor can easily be made, however, by assuming that these exports are produced at an even flow during the year. On this basis, at least two-thirds of the area's exports would be ready for shipment during the seaway shipping season, or between \$3,630 and \$4,222 million, according to the 1960 Commerce Department study. The Great Lakes ports are still shipping only between 7.5 and 9 percent of this potential traffic.

Rather than enter into a detailed discussion of other factors tending to limit the Great Lakes' shipment of exports, it is convenient to defer consideration of them to chapter 6, where they will be discussed in connection with the port of Milwaukee. However, before then, we shall analyze the other side of Great Lakes foreign trade, imports; and then summarize the total foreign trade of the region.

"NEUTRALISM" MEANS DEFEAT IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

⁸ As stated in the previous footnote, justification for including these areas in the ports' hinterlands will be given in ch. 6.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, I took the floor of the House to point out the dangers inherent in suggestions that neutralization be considered a solution to the current conflict in South Vietnam.

The suggestions had come from North Vietnam, from France's President de Gaulle, from some American newspapers and even from our own legislative halls.

On that previous date, my deep concern was that such expressions from respected Americans and American press organs would have a debilitating effect on the morale of the South Vietnamese people, and thereby adversely affect the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that my worst fears have, indeed, been realized.

Recent news reports from South Vietnam have emphasized the concern and consternation which have greeted calls for neutralization emanating from the United States.

In a story to the New York Times, which appeared Monday, Correspondent Peter Grose reported:

What Premier Khanh and members of his Government seem to regard as their most pressing danger is the impatience and despair among Americans and that this could lead to a withdrawal of the large-scale military aid that has supported the country's anti-Communist war effort for over 2 years.

In the same story, Grose also stated that:

Statements favoring a neutral solution in Vietnam made by influential Americans, including Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, have contributed to demoralization here that diplomats are looking to Mr. McNamara to dispel.

In Sunday's New York Times, Columnist James Reston, in an article entitled "The Blabbermouth Approach to Vietnam" had this to say:

Meanwhile, the majority leader in the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, seems to have been siding publicly with President de Gaulle of France on negotiation of some vague policy of neutralizing Vietnam, and while this was not done with the approval or even the prior knowledge of the administration, it is hard to convince anybody in Saigon or elsewhere abroad that such a casual relationship exists between the administration and its chief spokesman in the Senate.

Mr. Reston concluded his observations by commenting on:

THE NEUTRALIST DANGER

The most dangerous and likely immediate prospect is not that the Communists will win the war in South Vietnam or that the United States will carry the war to North Vietnam, but that in the atmosphere of rumor, confusion and intrigue in Saigon another coup d'état, the third in 100 days, will bring in a neutralist South Vietnamese Government that will order us out and negotiate a settlement that will leave the Communists free to take over.

This would be almost as bad for the West as a military disaster. We could not impose our presence on a South Vietnamese Government that didn't want us, and with U.S. power out of Vietnam, the situation would really, in the President's phrase, "go to pot." The Communists would be free to expand in southeast Asia almost at will.

Other newspapermen have made similar observations. In a story which appeared in the Washington Post on February 22, Keyes Beech, Chicago Daily

News Service correspondent, pointed out the adverse effect of "neutralist" suggestions:

[From the Chicago Daily News Service, Feb. 22, 1964]

ANTI-RED CAUSE IN VIETNAM PERILED BY U.S. INCONSTANCY

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON, February 21.—Perhaps the gravest threat to the anti-Communist cause in South Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia today is not Communist guns and terrorism but American inconstancy.

This was underlined today by Saigon's reaction to Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's apparent acceptance of French President de Gaulle's premise that the war here cannot be won and the only solution is to neutralize all southeast Asia.

MANSFIELD's statement strengthened a growing body of opinion among Vietnamese and Americans here that the United States is sick of this war and is looking for a way out.

Officially there was no reaction. Privately and unofficially, reaction ran the gamut of clichés from shock to dismay to anger.

"Of course it wasn't the Senator's intention to give aid and comfort to the Communists and undermine Vietnamese and American morale," said a top American official. "But that's exactly what he did. And he couldn't have done a better job if his speech had been written in Hanoi."

Over a beer in the Bar Cintra, an American helicopter pilot with a Purple Heart was heard to say, "If we are going to throw in the towel, then I'd just as soon go home now instead of next month."

That MANSFIELD was expressing his personal views rather than speaking for the Johnson administration was a distinction that most Vietnamese and Americans failed to draw.

This was especially so in view of MANSFIELD's position as Senate majority leader and the background knowledge of this area that he has acquired through frequent visits.

There was even a suspicion that he was speaking with White House sanction when he quoted President Johnson's comment on De Gaulle's neutralization proposal: "If we could have neutralization of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam I am sure that would be considered sympathetically."

American officials here made two major points to rebut a neutralization solution:

1. The war in South Vietnam admittedly is not going well, and after two changes of government in 3 months, political stability is lacking. But the situation is by no means hopeless, and Vietcong capabilities are still limited. The new Government headed by Gen. Nguyen Khanh still has to prove itself. But, on the other hand, it is moving in the right direction.

2. Neutralization simply is not possible except on Communist terms, which means surrendering all southeast Asia to Chinese Communist domination. Besides, Communist North Vietnam has already made it abundantly clear that it will not accept neutralization.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the adverse effects which American suggestions of neutralization have had in South Vietnam, damage has been done elsewhere.

In Thailand, Government officials are watching this country carefully to determine whether the will of the United States to resist Communist aggression in Southeast Asia is wavering. Any U.S. moves toward neutralization in South Vietnam are sure to cause serious repercussions in United States-Thai relations.

We cannot give way—or appear to give way—before the expansionist policies of Communist China. Instead, we must

make our stand in Vietnam, as long as the freedom-loving people of that nation ask our assistance in fighting communism.

Neutralization is no solution; neutralization means defeat. Let us not allow fancy rhetoric or a narrow view of our national interest blind us to that fact.

To me our course in Vietnam is clear. We must stay and assist the South Vietnamese defeat the Vietcong, no matter how long the fight, no matter what the commitment of resources.

In conclusion, I wish to commend the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday written by Zbigniew Brzezinski, noted expert on communism. Dr. Brzezinski presents cogent arguments on how and why neutralization of South Vietnam would be a U.S. defeat and a handover to Peiping:

"NEUTRAL" VIETNAM A CHINESE BACKYARD: NOTED STUDENT OF COMMUNISM SAYS DE GAULLE SUGGESTION WOULD BE U.S. DEFEAT AND HANDOVER TO PEIPING

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

President de Gaulle's recent press conference has had at least one benefit: it has forced us to rethink our purposes and our methods in southeast Asia. Now we have to decide whether we are going to pull out of South Vietnam or whether we will reaffirm our determination to stay.

Should we decide to get out, we may choose to neutralize South Vietnam as a transitional face-saving device. It is hard to believe that a political realist like General de Gaulle had any other purpose in suggesting it except to extricate the United States from a region which, as he has stated, he considers to be primarily a responsibility of China.

Indeed, I strongly suspect that De Gaulle has concluded that the United States is neither capable nor has the will to stay in southeast Asia. In keeping with his geopolitical concepts, involving a demarcated world dominated by several major powers, he feels that to stabilize the situation in southeast Asia, the area must be handed over to the Chinese. "Neutralization" is a gracious way of doing this.

DISARMING APPROACH

His approach bears a striking resemblance to his handling of the Algerian problem. Knowing full well that neither the French people nor the French army would swallow a flat statement to the effect that France must abandon Algeria, De Gaulle successfully obfuscated the issue by a number of misleading pronouncements while steadily edging toward the Evian agreement.

His suggestion that the United States agree to the neutralization of southeast Asia is very much on the same order. He realizes that a flat proposal that the United States disavow its previous commitments would create a furor in America and would not further his objectives. "Neutralization" sounds more acceptable.

Conceivably, he takes neutralization seriously. In that case, he is unrealistic. It can be flatly stated that neutralization of southeast Asia is not a politically viable alternative. In our age, the only successful cases of neutralization involve Finland, Austria, and Yugoslavia. In all cases, the country neutralized rested between two major and cohesive power blocs.

INTERNAL VIABILITY

Each side realized that a move against the neutrality of the states concerned would precipitate countermoves from the other side. Furthermore, both in the Austrian and in the Finnish cases, domestic Communist subversion had been suppressed by the governments concerned. Hence there was in-

ternal political viability of the sort that does not exist in South Vietnam or, for that matter, elsewhere in southeast Asia.

Yugoslavia became neutral after having been expelled from the Communist camp. Its new neutrality was successfully maintained with American aid and came to be stabilized precisely because on the one hand Yugoslavia was faced by a homogeneous Stalinist bloc and on the other, in Italy and Greece, by NATO. Furthermore, Tito was in charge of a united Communist state. He did not have a "South Yugoslavia" to conquer, like Ho Chi-minh.

Last but not least, these states were neutralized not as a result of internal Communist pressure and military aggression and in the wake of repeated American commitments to defend them, which then had to be disavowed. The very fact of past American commitments to defend southeast Asia, which now would have to be disavowed for the sake of the so-called neutralization, would further weaken the conviction of the parties involved that their neutrality was protected by the balanced antagonism of two equally determined blocs.

Neutralization of South Vietnam today, even if accompanied by a formal neutralization of North Vietnam, would be nothing less than an American defeat. Furthermore, it would leave southeast Asia without any countervailing political force to that of China. In effect, it would transform that area into a Chinese political backyard.

A ROW OF DOMINOS

As a result it is certain beyond question that there would be immediate political instability in Thailand, whose northeast is already exposed to insurgency and whose politicians are already fearful that American commitments are not to be trusted. Malaysia, until 2 years ago an area of Communist insurgency, would be certain to fall, and the collapse of these states would have a direct impact on the present insurgency in Burma.

The collapse of the small southeast Asian states would not only benefit China politically and economically but it would be likely to have further unsettling effects on India and Indonesia. One cannot predict precisely what would happen—but it is clear that stability is not to be sought through neutralization.

The thesis that the area is doomed inevitably to come under Chinese domination simply ignores India, in whose stability the West has an interest. It bears a striking resemblance to the argument made often in the late 1940's to the effect that Europe could not be maintained against the powerful Russia. Just as the aggressors have been contained in Europe and countervailing forces have been developed, so in Asia the Chinese should and can be contained, thereby giving a breathing spell to the emerging and developing nations.

ANTI-RUSSIAN POLICY

There is a further dimension to all this. The rapid expansion of Chinese influence, achieved primarily because in southeast Asia China did persist in revolutionary war of the sort which the Soviets had considered dangerous, would immeasurably increase Chinese prestige within international communism and place the Soviet leadership under enormous pressure.

In fact, through failure to respond we would be cooperating in an international refutation of the Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet leadership, I believe, would be tempted to emulate the Chinese example, since otherwise the international Communist movement would be likely to follow the Chinese lead. The effect of the policy of neutralization would be an escalation of international tensions.

One may also add that the loss of South Vietnam would be likely to have a very

negative impact on the American domestic scene. It would reawaken extreme right-wing claims that there has been a new betrayal, and it could result in a new wave of extremism in 2 or 3 years from now.

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BURKE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the fourth annual American Legion Washington National Conference is being held this week. National Commander of the Legion, Daniel F. Foley, will direct the executive sessions of the 1,200 top legionnaires from 54 American Legion departments. Mr. Foley, from Wabasha, Minn., is the brother of Eugene Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Honorable John Foley, formerly a Member of Congress from Maryland. Mr. Foley is to be commended for the excellent work he has performed in his present capacity and, as a tribute to this performance, he is to be awarded the "Lantern Award" on April 19, 1964, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Boston, Mass. This award, which has national significance, is made annually by the Knights of Columbus, and is given to one who has made an outstanding patriotic contribution in his particular field of endeavor. This will be the eighth annual award and each year a different occupational field is selected. Past recipients include Richard Cardinal Cushing, House Speaker John W. McCormack, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, and J. Edgar Hoover.

In attendance at this conference is Thomas E. Abely, present Commander of the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts. Mr. Abely, a constituent of mine from Canton, Mass., was elected at the June 1963 convention at Quincy, Mass. His administration has been featured by a highly successful seminar at Boston College in Legion affairs, the establishment of the first department newspaper, and a memorial mass for our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross in Boston during December 1963. Commander Abely, a native of Winthrop, Mass., was a military intelligence operative in the U.S. Army from 1943 to 1945. He is a graduate of Northeastern University, an employee of Dun & Bradstreet in Boston and has made his home in Canton since 1941. He was responsible for the success of the annual dinner for National Commander Daniel F. Foley held on February 29, 1964, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Boston.

In line with the conference this week and being a Legionnaire, I would like to pay tribute to the American Legion.

It is safe to say, I think, that the American Legion and the American way of life are closely tied, in many vital respects. None more so, however, than the

extent to which both are inextricably tied to the fate, the future, and the progress of democracy itself.

We Americans have a great deal to take pride in and a great deal to be thankful for, so far as democracy is concerned. Through hard work, perseverance and native intelligence, we—that is to say, our ancestors—established a remarkable Nation on this continent, capable of surpassing all others in the fields of commerce, industrial production, and technological skills. In all this, we have every right to pride. We must, however, give additional credit to sources other than ourselves. For we have, in fact, been blessed with the greatest of luck, in the history of our political development.

In the first place, there has never been a case in which our political leaders have sold us down the river, for the sake of personal gain. That has been the fate of many republics—not ours, however. Nor has our military leadership ever, in our history, moved to take control of the country. That is another way in which democratic-republican government has been killed off, time and again, in other lands. Yet we, thank heaven, have been spared that calamity.

One of the reasons for our good fortune in these regards, I believe, is that our Armed Forces have been so closely identified with the people themselves. That is to say, there always has been, in our civilian population, a large contingent of military veterans with the power to influence governmental policy. Not professional soldiers, but civilians with military experience, they therefore can understand military needs without distrusting democratic institutions. This body of Americans, far from threatening the democratic fabric of American life, have bolstered it, in every respect, throughout the span of our national existence.

It is therefore an additional blessing, from the national point of view, that American veterans have seen fit to organize, the better to serve their interests and the interests of the Nation, combined.

As the largest of veterans organizations, the American Legion has taken the lead in this regard, and in so doing has won for itself a place of high standing in the eyes of the American people and all other people of good will familiar with its undertakings.

The history of the American Legion, from the time of its formation, in Paris, in the year 1919, through 45 years of peace and war, has been one of devotion to God and country. In the minds of those who founded the organization, were a number of ideals, uppermost of which were these:

First. Creation of a fraternity based upon firm comradeship born of war service and dedicated to a square deal for all veterans, particularly the disabled, their widows and orphans.

Second. National security for America, including a universal military training program for the prevention of future world conflicts.

Third. Promotion of a 100-percent Americanism and the combating of

communism, nazism, fascism, socialism, and all other foreign isms.

Yes, those were the prime goals, the first objectives; and yet, with the passage of time, many more purposes came to mind and many more avenues of service opened up before the eyes of the forward-looking American Legion leadership. Concern for the national economy; concern for child welfare, the overall legislative program of Congress, and so on: all became issues in which the American Legion took a strong and vital interest.

As a result, the Legion has come to stand as a strong and able adviser and consultant for all persons interested in promoting the national welfare.

With the great expansion of membership that followed the close of World War II, and the further increase as a result of opening its ranks to honorably discharged veterans who served during the Korean conflict, the American Legion looks forward to continuous useful contribution to American life. It will continue to shape its plans and adhere to the principles set forth in the Preamble to the National Constitution to the end that the American Legion always may be rightfully referred to as, "The best insurance policy a country ever had."

NEED FOR COMPETITIVE BIDDING ON NAVY PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. 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. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the prices paid for a Navy rocket launcher and power supply dropped to one-third the former price when competitive bidding was recently forced. As a matter of fact, the former noncompetitive price of about \$6,500 went all the way down to \$1,993 when the Navy was forced to scrap a sole source procurement and get competition.

This sole source cancellation came just 8 days after my first formal inquiry into the case—and about 7 weeks after I first heard about the case from a source inside the Navy Department.

My Navy informant first alerted me to this impending waste of tax money in early June 1963. There was, he said, underway in the Navy Department Bureau of Weapons a purchase of a rocket launcher identified by the technical nomenclature of LAU-7 and a power supply to activate it known as the PP-2315.

Past history showed this equipment to have been developed by two manufacturers, I was told. Douglas Aircraft Co. developed the launcher and produced it, without competitive bidding, at a cost of about \$4,500 each. The Bemus Watch Co. developed and produced the power supply at a cost of about \$2,000 each. The development was paid for by the Government.

Now, this naval employee told me, there was another procurement on the

rails and ready to roll. But, he said, there was no need for a sole source procurement. The Government had bought and paid for plans and specifications. There was no great urgency, and it was felt the price would drop dramatically if competitive bidding were allowed.

I only wish I could tell the Members of the House the name of the individual who came to me with information designed to save the taxpayers money. I cannot, since this person was guaranteed anonymity by me.

I could not even tell the Navy the identity because, as shall now be shown, an attempt was made to cooperate with the Navy when such information reached me in the past to no avail.

On November 14, 1963, I received a letter from Rear Adm. Charles Curtze, then Acting Chief of the Bureau of Ships. It referred to information I requested—a request, incidentally, that stemmed from inside information received from the Navy Department.

Admiral Curtze's letter said, in part, and I quote:

It is surprising to me that such tentative planning information, which, to the best of my knowledge has not been announced, should be known outside the Navy Department.

I was impressed by Admiral Curtze's letter and felt perhaps we could work together to clean up some of the procurement abuses in the Navy. What better course could there be than to work together with the head of a bureau? In that spirit, I wrote Admiral Curtze the following letter on November 15, 1963:

DEAR ADMIRAL CURTZE: Thank you for your letter of November 14, 1963, and for the information transmitted on the AN/SQS 26 sonar equipment. I am at present studying this documentation, and it appears to me to be a very intriguing case.

I was particularly impressed by the last sentence in your letter. I think if you sat here on Capitol Hill, you would be appalled more than surprised at what is going on in your command. Admiral Curtze, I do not seek out this information; it seeks me out. Dedicated Navy employees, who apparently are fed up with what goes on in some of your procurement sections and who cannot stomach any more, call me on the telephone daily. They tell me to "look here" and "look there." Truly, if I followed up every lead, neither your office nor mine would get anything else done.

When these calls come to my attention, I am always careful to point out to the caller that the Navy has administrative remedies for grievances and agencies to handle complaints of sloppy, inefficient work. The responses I get, I am sure, would shock you, although they have long since failed to shock me. They do, however, add to a growing disgust with some of the purchasing policies of the Navy.

My study of procurement was started over 2 years ago. Frankly, I had no idea of just how far it would go. I fully expected to find out that the Navy, Army, and Air Force were efficient, orderly and frugal in buying goods for our military defense. My disappointment has been doubled by what I have consistently uncovered.

To demonstrate my willingness to cooperate at all levels in order to get a more efficient, less costly procurement system, I stand ready to telephone your office the next time I get a complaint from a Navy Department employee. I shall tell you the name of

the complainant and the nature of the complaint, but only if:

1. My communication will be regarded by you as totally confidential.

2. I am permitted to sit in on every single meeting with this individual.

3. I am permitted to interrogate those who are involved in the complaint.

4. All answers and questions are taken down in writing so that everyone—including you and me—will be on the record.

5. The identity of this individual will be protected, and this individual will be protected from reprisals or retaliatory action in the future.

6. The case is prosecuted vigorously and those in the wrong—if they are, indeed, proved to be so—are given their just deserts.

Very truly yours,

EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel my request was unusual. I simply wanted to guarantee the immunity of any Navy employees who, in a genuine desire to be helpful, came to me with information on procurement abuses.

Some of my conditions were highly negotiable. In short, I was trying to be helpful and find an avenue of mutual accord down which the Navy could proceed with me to uncover a few polecats in the woodpile.

On December 17, 1963, I received an answer to my letter, this from Rear Adm. W. A. Brockett, Chief of the Bureau of Ships. I ask unanimous consent to insert his letter at this point:

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: In your letter of November 15, 1963, to Rear Adm. Charles A. Curtze, you offered to tell "the name of the complainant and the nature of the complaint," the next time you "get a complaint from a Navy Department employee." Your offer was subject to several conditions which do not appear feasible to me and which I cannot accept.

I am, of course, interested in learning of any improper practice within the Bureau of Ships, since as Chief of Bureau, I am responsible for the Bureau's operation. In the event you advise me of a complaint, even though anonymous, as to improper practice within the Bureau of Ships, I will certainly have such complaint investigated, with a view toward corrective action.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BROCKETT.

It should be apparent by now that it is next to impossible for me to disclose my sources. Without protection they would not come to me and what I consider to be a valuable pipeline of information would dry up. It also should be apparent that a Navy employee is taking his future into his own hands when he says anything that might possibly rock the boat.

Just such inside information as I am speaking about came to me in June, 1963. My informant said the purchase was all ready, and he predicted there could be a dramatic savings achieved if someone would act.

It took me a period of weeks to check with technical sources in the electronics industry. They told me, without reservation, that the equipment could be made by any reliable manufacturer and saw no reason for a continued sole source purchase by the Navy.

On July 30, 1963, I wrote the Navy to start my study of this case. By this time I had been told that the contract documents were almost ready for signing. My

letter of July 30, 1963 to Secretary of the Navy Korth follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In connection with the LAU-7() launcher and the PP-2315/A power supply, please advise me what disposition was made of BuWeps Control No. 4770-63 and 4771-63. Also, will you please supply me with a single copy of each of these procurement documents.

Please identify the BuWeps engineer who has cognizance over the procurement of this equipment, giving me his name, rank or grade and room number.

Also arrange to supply me with a photostat copy of U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., memorandum dated May 31, 1963, from code 5522 to code 405 BuWeps making a report on investigation of PP-2315/A power supply failures. Your early attention to this request will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress.

Nine days later I received my answer. It answered my past questions and told me where to look for more information. Here is the answer I received:

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of July 30, 1963, to the Secretary of the Navy, in which you request certain information on the LAU-7() launcher and the PP-2315/A power supply.

The requests for proposals issued under our control numbers 4770-63 and 4771-63 have been canceled. A copy of each is attached in accordance with your request.

Mr. Lee Morgan, GS-14, room 1W64, has engineering cognizance over the launcher. Mr. William Burch, GS-14, room 1W64, has engineering cognizance over the power supply. It should be noted, however, that the procurement of these items is not handled by the technically cognizant engineers, but rather by our production and contracting groups. Mr. Richard S. Chambers of our Aircraft Production Division is responsible for establishing the requirements and initiating the procurement action.

I am also attaching a copy of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., memorandum dated May 31, 1963, which you requested.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. HINES,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Deputy Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons.

From close contacts in both the electronic industry and the Navy, I learned that, at one time, a contract had already been given to one of the two sole source firms for its signature. This would not have been a binding contract until the Navy had signed it in any event, but it was quickly called back in when the sole source procurement was canceled.

On September 26, 1963, a competitive purchase plan was issued for both of these equipments. Mr. Speaker, that IFB was so complicated that a Philadelphia lawyer might have to enlist the aid of a Washington lawyer to understand it.

Mr. Speaker, there was every reason to believe that this purchase could be made at a dramatic saving to the taxpayer if industry was fully informed. Seeking to aid manufacturers and to help them help prove—again—the desirability of responsible competitive bidding, I wrote to the 260 firms listed on the Navy Department bidders list for this equipment, both transmitting information and asking pertinent questions. The information I sent was unclassified but was not of a generally circulated nature.

On January 31, 1964, when competitive bids were opened, the former rocket launcher price of \$4,500 each paid under noncompetitive conditions dropped to \$1,040 each, and the former sole source power supply price of about \$2,000 each went all the way down to \$953. As a matter of fact, there was a bid for the power supply that was \$100 less, but in making the bid set so complicated, the Navy made it impossible for this bidder to get the power supply contract. Thus, the Navy, thanks to its own inefficiency, will still be paying \$100 more for each power supply than really necessary. Here is the transcript of bids, showing the dramatic results.

Navy Purchasing Office, 600-254-64—opened, Jan. 31, 1964—LAU-7, launcher + PP-2315 Power Unit

LAU-7, guided missile launcher, to be in accordance with military specification MIL-L-22520A(Wep) dated May 25, 1962, and with amendment No. 1, as modified in the invitation. Quantity 2,612 units, approximately, plus bids required for approximately 2,092 units of the PP-2315/A power supply per Mil-P-22621A(Wep) as modified, also bids on 2,558 units of the LAU-7/A launcher including the PP-2315/A power supply as a single package price. (Prior awards LAU-7/A to Douglas for about 250 units at \$4,500; plus awards to Bennis for PP-2315/A at an approximate price of \$2,000—last negotiated by NAFI with all materials Government-furnished to Bennis for \$501.

	Launcher LAU-7	Power unit PP-2315/A
Name of firm bidding IFB 254-64 and terms offered:		
1. Varo, Inc., 2201 Walnut St., Garland, Tex., D. R. Taylor, general manager, Electronic Products Division, Broadway 6-6141(214), submitting 2 sets of quotations, otherwise unexplained here—Varo's 2d quotation under this invitation	\$1,040.00 1,058.00	\$953.00 970.00
2. Bogen Electric Manufacturing Co., 100 Pennsylvania Ave., Paterson, N.J., W. L. Guttenberg, vice president, dial 201 LA 5-2200.	1,297.00	1,450.00
3. Talley Industries, Inc., 455 East McKellips Rd., Mesa, Ariz., telephone 602 WO 4-2981, A. Stamatakis, vice president of administration.	1,301.70	1,457.81
4. Missile Systems Corp. of Texas, Emtex Division, 1000 West Crosby Rd., Carrollton, Tex., W. W. Upfield, vice president, CH 7-1761.	1,479.69	1,490.36
5. Sperry Farragut Co., Division Sperry Rand, Bristol, Tenn., Earl C. MacCormac, vice president, works manager, phone 615-968-1151.	1,510.50	1,248.89
6. Weston Instruments & Electronics Division of Daystrom, Inc., Archbald, Pa., M. S. Dell'Aglio, director of contracts, phone 717-876-1500.	1,535.00	1,170.00
7. Nortronics Division of Northrop Corp., Marine Equipment Department, 77 A St., Needham Heights, Mass., L. M. Chattler, vice president, manager, 617-449-0400.	1,545.80	1,404.20
8. Hughes Aircraft Co., Aerospace Group, El Segundo Division, Post Office Box 90515, Los Angeles, Calif., E. M. Boykin, vice president, 213 Orchard 0-1515.	1,569.00	1,181.00
9. Standard Armament, Inc., 631 Allen Ave., Glendale, Calif., Curtis Correll, sales manager, Victoria 9-1314.	1,585.22	1,638.25
10. Raytheon Co., Lexington, Mass., J. G. Stobo, vice president, G.M. Missile Systems Division, phone 617-862-6600, making 2 quotations—Raytheon 2d quotation here.	1,687.00 1,851.00	1,448.00 1,611.00
11. Consolidated Diesel Electric Corp., 880 Canal St., Stamford, Conn., 203-325-2261, J. I. Davis, vice president—And other bids: Burton Manufacturing Co., Linchon, Emerson, Arvin, Entwhistle, Bennis at \$2,112.84 and \$1,345.24; and others from Electronic Specialty, Edo, Allied Ordnance, Westinghouse, Midway, Model, Bendix Red Bank, General Electric, ITT San Fernando, Sargent Fletcher, Decitron, and more. One interesting figure is the \$873 power supply bid from Burton: Burton Manufacturing Co., 7922 Haskell Ave., Van Nuys, Calif., 91406, M. N. Lompart, president, telephone 213-781-8910.	1,810.00	1,445.00 873.00

Speaking again of the low bids, Mr. Speaker, the price dropped to less than one-third the sole-source price when competitive bidding was forced. It is a sad testimony to the economy and efficiency of the Navy that this economy had to be forced and prodded, however.

The only way to control the cost of Government is by dealing in specifics, by naming people, dates, places, and items. The President prefers to control the cost of Government by turning the lights off in the White House. I think it can best be done by turning the lights on the waste in the Defense Department so the people can see the finagling that squanders their tax dollars.

In that regard, it is necessary that the person who had the sole-source tracks laid out for this rocket launcher be identified. His name is Richard Chambers, and he is in the Navy's Aircraft Production Division. He is the man chiefly responsible for this Navy-made mess.

It was Chambers who had this buy set up to go sole source in the first place and who would have wasted 225 percent of the taxpayers' money but for the fact that someone looked over his shoulder. As I have said, there was information that the contracts were already drawn up before I made my first formal inquiry,

although I will not be surprised if this is denied.

It was Chambers who caused to be issued such a complicated bid document.

This is an example of the inefficiency and slipshod work that has been going on unchecked for years under the sacred-cow protection of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, but for information given me from inside Navy, and but for help from the electronic industry, here is another case where the taxpayers' pocket would have been picked and more tax dollars flushed down the drain.

This is just another polecat chased out of the woodpile. There are thousands more, enough for all Members of Congress, if they could only find time to spend on the project.

FEDERAL TAX ON GAMBLERS A BIG FLOP

Mr. FINO. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, after 12 long years, we find that the 1951 Federal tax

on gamblers is still a big flop. This tax has failed miserably not only as a revenue producer but as a gambling stopper as well.

When Congress imposed this \$50 stamp and 10 percent tax, which the Supreme Court in 1958 interpreted as governmental recognition of gambling in the United States, it was then believed that it would pump into our Treasury at least \$400 million a year based on estimates that the gamblers' annual take was \$4 billion a year.

The sad story is that after 12 full years, gamblers have paid into the coffers of our Treasury only \$86.9 million out of their multibillion-dollar illicit earnings. This is a far cry from the \$5 billion which Uncle Sam should have collected since 1952 under the old estimates of gamblers' earnings. Further proof that this law is a farce is evidenced by the fact that only about 10,000 persons have admitted being gamblers by buying their stamps and paying their Federal wagering tax.

Mr. Speaker, reports from the McClellan committee show that gambling in this country has grown into a \$10 billion a year tax-free monopoly from which the underworld crime syndicates line their filthy pockets with \$10 billion a year. Now, if this Federal wagering tax was at all effective it would pump into our Treasury at least \$1 billion a year. The results show otherwise.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for our American taxpayers to understand the double role played by our Government. While we assume a sanctimonious attitude about gambling, we tax gamblers, gambling winnings, and admissions to racetracks and yet refuse to accept the obvious.

If we stopped all of this doubletalk hypocrisy and really faced the fiscal facts of life and if we recognized the normal gambling spirit of the American people and capitalized on it through a national lottery, we would not only help solve the ever-growing gambling problem in the United States but we would also transfer at least \$10 billion a year from the underworld into our own Treasury—for the public benefit.

What are we waiting for?

URGE RATIFICATION OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, more than a dozen years have passed since the Senate was asked to confer its advice and consent to the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. I rise again to appeal that the United States commit itself internationally to what has long been principle and law in this country.

This is a vital matter that should no longer be delayed. I urge that the sense of this House be expressed in support of Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention by adoption of my resolution—House Resolution 591.

Sixty-seven states have now ratified and acceded to the treaty provisions.

The Government of the United States, along with 20 other nations, signed the convention 2 days after it was unanimously approved by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1948. It came into force on January 12, 1951, as between ratifying states.

The intent of this agreement is unambiguous. The contracting parties, confirming that genocide is a crime both in peace and war, undertake to prevent and punish it. Article I defines genocide as the intent to destroy, in whole or part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.

Acts within the context of the definition are: killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Conspiracy, public and direct incitement, and the attempt to commit genocide are punishable.

It must be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the bulk of the offenses associated with genocide are already punishable under our criminal law. Our undertaking under this treaty would not fundamentally create new law.

At the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in early 1950, some persons of the legal community leveled a stanch and, at times, impassioned attack. First, let me say that I am not against this Nation undertaking international commitments. Much of the criticism resulted from a faulty interpretation of the treaty's provisions. Opponents claimed that the Genocide Convention would abrogate constitutional and sovereign rights.

I cannot agree. For the most part, we are merely giving international sanctity to nationally recognized crimes. We are extending the law created at Nuremberg to cover acts committed during peacetime. We are attempting to prevent, forever, the wholesale slaughter of human beings.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have heard a few respected authorities claim that under this agreement, the United States obligates itself to intervene wherever the practice of genocide may arise. Nothing could be further from the truth, though I am not personally rejecting the value of such a provision. On the contrary, the language of the treaty does not authorize a unilateral guarantee. The form of implementation is clearly laid down and restrictive.

Article 6 provides that domestic courts shall exercise primary jurisdiction. An international tribunal may be established, at some later date and with the agreement of the contracting parties. It would be highly desirable for an international court to try offenders of international law, but I doubt very much that the ratifying powers will ever consent to this procedure, considering their historical reluctance to grant the World Court, and other institutions, appropriate authority.

Concerning the fulfillment of the treaty's commitment, disputes between contracting parties with regard to acts of genocide, and State responsibility, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice. That is to say, another State can allege before the International Court that an act of genocide has been committed by some other state.

Although national courts have jurisdiction to prosecute cases occurring within their national borders, the Hague Court can entertain complaints entered by one state against another.

There is nothing unusual about this. International tribunals of one sort or another have been deciding international disputes since the 17th century. If we undertake to comply with the provisions of the treaty to prevent and punish the crime of genocide, then there should be no reason to fear the proper execution of that undertaking. History teaches us that most agreements are but scraps of paper unless there is established, by mutual consent, adequate machinery for implementation.

Concern has also been voiced that this agreement could be used by other nations to interfere, vocally or otherwise, in our racial situation.

This covenant has nothing to do with racial or minority discrimination. It does not aim at the denial of human rights to individuals. It relates exclusively to mass extermination, the intent to destroy thousands of people precisely because of their race, national origin, or religion.

Nothing like this has ever occurred in this country. In fact, our constitutional system makes it quite impossible.

Moreover, genocide is characteristically incited, condoned, or directed by governments, and not by individuals acting on their own.

There are others who have contested that the Genocide Treaty will impose a great new body of law, and that this encumbrance will complicate the relationship of the States and the Federal Government under the Constitution. The States will allegedly be deprived of a vast field of criminal jurisprudence.

We all know that Federal and State courts exercise concurrent jurisdiction in many areas of criminal law. Just because a new offense has been added to the relatively small list of international wrongs does not mean State authority is diminished.

Constitutionally, the courts of this Nation are obligated to enforce international law. The law of nations is part of our law. Treaties duly signed and ratified according to our constitutional procedures become the supreme law of the land. The power to define and punish offenses rests with the Federal Government.

It has been our experience that both customary and conventional international law is adopted into the system of jurisprudence. This, of course, is essential for the proper conduct of foreign relations.

The Genocide Convention carries the proviso that States will enact legislation providing for effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide acts. This is a necessary article of implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to refute the most common objections raised against the Genocide Convention. There are some people of isolationist persuasion who have read things into this treaty which are not there. Fear and ignorance are at the root of their folly.

This Nation cannot in good conscience stand for international norms of morality and good will, and then reject this treaty. Its provisions are in perfect concert with the principles of law and justice which lie at the base of our way of life.

Is it realistic for our citizens to fear the application of an international undertaking of this nature? Certainly not. If any nation possesses a record clean of wholesale, arbitrary coercion, that nation is the United States.

It should be the declared purpose of this Government to further the cause of international law. The need for preserving and extending a body of law, applicable to all States, is even more pressing today as the past colonial possessions enter the family of nations as equals. We must do all in our power to spare them the errors and atrocities of a former period.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the security and peace of the free world does not merely depend upon blunt military strength. It will likewise depend upon our ability to exert a worldwide compliance with well-established customary, and codified, law. The Charter of the United Nations itself, which outlaws force and threats of force, is an all-important cornerstone of this developing law.

The Genocide Convention contributes to the growth of universal legal practice. I do not shy away from the obligations which this might entail. Sovereignty is not surrendered in freely agreeing to comply with a set of generally accepted rules. Government is in itself a complex of commitments. And in the act of deciding to observe certain rules, we are intrinsically exercising the sovereign prerogative.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation join with others in condemning the monstrous crime of genocide. Surely this should not overly tax our prejudices, our sensitivities, our imperfections.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should reopen hearings on the Genocide Convention forthwith. I urge my colleagues to give this matter long and serious thought. With your permission, I am appending the official text of the treaty to my remarks, so that Members may read the document at their leisure.

TEXT OF THE CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE

The contracting parties,

Having considered the declaration made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its Resolution 96(I) and dated December 11, 1946, that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations and condemned by the civilized world;

Recognizing that at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity; and

Being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international cooperation is required;

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided.

Article I: The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article II: In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent birth within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article III: The following acts shall be punishable:

- (a) Genocide;
- (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
- (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
- (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
- (e) Complicity in genocide.

Article IV: Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, or private individuals.

Article V: The contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

Article VI: Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

Article VII: Genocide and the other acts enumerated in Article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition.

The contracting parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force.

Article VIII: Any contracting party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III.

Article IX: Disputes between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

Article X: The present Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall bear the date of December 9, 1948.

Article XI: The present Convention shall be open until December 31, 1949, for signature on behalf of any member of the United Nations and of any nonmember State to which an invitation to sign has been addressed by the General Assembly.

The present Convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

After January 1, 1950, the present Convention may be acceded to on behalf of any member of the United Nations and of any nonmember State which has received an invitation as aforesaid.

Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article XII: Any contracting party may at any time, by notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations, extend the application of the present Convention to all or any of the territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations that contracting party is responsible.

Article XIII: On the day when the first twenty instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited, the Secretary General shall draw up a proce-verbal and transmit a copy of it to each member of the United Nations and to each of the nonmember states contemplated in Article XI.

The present Convention shall come into force on the 90th day following the date of deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification or accession.

Any ratification or accession effected subsequent to the latter date shall become effective on the 90th day following the deposit of the instrument of ratification or accession.

Article XIV: The present Convention shall remain in effect for a period of 10 years from the date of its coming into force.

It shall thereafter remain in force for successive periods of 5 years for such contracting parties as have not denounced it at least 6 months before the expiration of the current period.

Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Article XV: If, as a result of denunciations, the number of parties to the present Convention should become less than sixteen, the Convention shall cease to be in force from the date on which the last of these denunciations shall become effective.

Article XVI: A request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any contracting party by means of a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary General.

The General Assembly shall decide upon the steps, if any, to be taken in respect of such request.

Article XVII: The Secretary General of the United Nations shall notify all members of the United Nations and the nonmember States contemplated in Article XI of the following:

- (a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions received in accordance with Article XI;
- (b) Notifications received in accordance with Article XII;
- (c) The date upon which the present convention comes into force in accordance with Article XIII;
- (d) Denunciations received in accordance with Article XIV;
- (e) The abrogation of the Convention in accordance with Article XV;
- (f) Notifications received in accordance with Article XVI.

Article XVIII: The original of the present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

A certified copy of the Convention shall be transmitted to all members of the United Nations and to the nonmember States contemplated in Article XI.

Article XIX: The present Convention shall be registered by the Secretary General of the United Nations on the date of its coming into force.

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarians are perhaps the best fighters among all of the rugged peoples of the Balkans; their checkered history proves that they always are ready to make the supreme sacrifice for freedom and independence.

They have played a prominent part in the turbulent history of southeastern Europe. During the Middle Ages they had one of the most powerful and flourishing states in the region, a nation which wielded tremendous influence. Late in the 14th century the Ottoman Turks invaded the Balkans and subdued all of the peoples there. Bulgaria was one of those brought under the rule of the sultans.

From 1396 on—for nearly five centuries—the indomitable Bulgarians did everything in their power to oust the Ottoman overlords from their homeland. Time and again, particularly in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, they staged revolts in the hope of freeing themselves. Unfortunately, all of their efforts ended in the loss of many thousands of innocent lives. But the Bulgarians were undismayed by their failures and continued the seemingly endless struggle. As the Greeks and Serbians secured their freedom early in the 19th century, Bulgarians were encouraged by their success and fought the Turks with greater determination. Convinced of the rightness of their cause, they vowed to be free from tyranny. Their first good chance came in the 1870's.

The year 1875 was a year of terrible turmoil in the Balkans; peoples still under the domination of the Turks were increasingly troublesome to them. The Bulgarians were heading the movement. The issue attracted the attention of Europe, and the statesmen of the great powers, including Russia, showed a keen concern for their fate. Czarist Russia in particular was apprehensive of the dread danger threatening the Balkans and was prepared to fight in their behalf. In the following year—1876—the Turks, anxious to teach a lesson to those rebelling against their rule, massacred many thousands of the Bulgarians; some say as many as 20,000. This event aroused the great powers and spurred them on to further involvement in the Balkan political struggle. The entire diplomatic machinery of the great powers was put in motion for the purpose of restraining the Ottoman sultan and securing some measure of liberty for the Bulgarians. But the obstinate Sultan remained unconvinced; he was unwilling to even listen to them. Though it seemed that the issue might have to be decided by force, the powers, as a group, proved unwilling to go that far.

Russia alone, among the great powers, was prepared to do this. After several months of abortive deliberations, conferences, and negotiations, when it was clear that no united action would be taken, Russia took the matter into her own hands by declaring war in the spring of 1877 on Turkey.

It has often been said that this was one of the few wars which the Government of czarist Russia waged ostensibly for the good of other people. However

one may look at it, it was that war which freed the Bulgarian people from the Ottoman Turks. Early in 1878, when there was no doubt about the outcome, when, in fact, the Russian forces were within sight of Constantinople, the Turks sued for peace. On March 3 of that year a preliminary treaty of peace was signed at San Stefano, a suburb of the Turkish capital.

This treaty provided for the separation of Bulgaria from the Ottoman Empire and the creation of a new Bulgaria within its historic boundaries. Subsequently, however, this treaty was modified and—under pressure from Great Britain—it was altered to provide a much smaller nation which was still to be under the suzerainty of the Sultan for many more years. But that historic March 3, the day of the signature of the treaty of San Stefano between Russia and Turkey, marks the birth of modern Bulgaria and the freedom of the Bulgarian people.

Many world-shaking events have taken place since 1878, and the fate of the Bulgarian people has often been thrown into the whirlpool of world politics. They were involved, much against their will, in the First World War. Being on the losing side, they suffered heavily. During the interwar years they did well under their own government as masters of their own destiny.

Today Bulgaria, the once free home of a free people, is a large Communist-dominated prison camp for its inhabitants. There they suffer under Communist tyranny and cherish the hope that they will regain their freedom. On the observance of their liberation day we all join with them in that hope.

INCOME TAX CUT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, President Johnson, flanked by congressional leaders, signed the income tax cut just 6 hours after the Congress had acted.

The President called the tax cut an "expression of faith in our system of free enterprise—a reliance on private rather than more Government spending." In his tax bill statement he said:

We could have chosen to stimulate the economy through a higher level of Government spending. Instead we chose tax reduction—and at the same time we reduced Government spending.

He continued, and I quote:

If American enterprise responds to this new opportunity with increased investment and expansion * * * then the Federal Government will not have to do for the economy what the economy should do for itself.

Mr. Speaker, the ink was scarcely dry on the bill the President signed when the city of Los Angeles was informed that the Federal Government would appropriate \$90 million if the city would sub-

stitute the Federal Government for private enterprise.

Here is what happened: The Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, after serious consideration of all factors involved, and basing its judgment upon a study made by a world-famous engineering firm, had negotiated an agreement with a private company to wheel power without cost to the Federal Government from Bonneville Dam to the city of Los Angeles. This private company would not buy or sell; it would simply wheel the power. A letter of intent was signed by the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles and by this private company.

Thursday, February 27, 1964, the department of water and power reversed its action. It was stated that the Federal Government would erect this line at a cost of \$90 million and that the city of Los Angeles should place its reliance not upon private enterprise but upon the Federal Government.

Here you have the spectacle of the Federal Government saying, in effect:

We will put this burden on the backs of the taxpayers if you will reverse your well-considered business arrangement with private enterprise.

This action is a complete reversal of the President's expression of faith in our system of free enterprise and a reliance on private rather than more Government spending. It would establish such a precedent for public spending that it would make a mockery of the President's attempt to stimulate our economy.

Let us support the President's program and let the word go out to the country that we of this Congress mean to support the President's plan for stimulating the economy by private spending.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, an article which was quoted frequently during the recent debate on the so-called civil rights bill was one by Edward F. Cummerford, of the New York bar, "Civil Rights and Civil Wrongs."

The Shreveport Journal recently printed excerpts from that article in an excellent editorial "Must America Accept the Terrible 'Equality' of Slavery?" which I commend to all Members and particularly the Members of the other body as they begin considering this unconstitutional bill.

MUST AMERICA ACCEPT THE TERRIBLE "EQUALITY" OF SLAVERY?

Are the people of America about to lose the cherished liberty for which their Founding Fathers fought and died?

Is the Congress of the United States about to plunge the people of this great Nation into the terrible "equality" that is slavery?

These are questions raised by Edward F. Cummerford, of the New York bar in an article, "Civil Rights and Civil Wrongs,"

appearing in the February issue of the American Bar Association Journal.

"While no decent person will defend racial or religious hate," Mr. Cummerford writes, "it does not follow that every possible action taken to eliminate them is either good or necessary."

Indeed, he argues, the drive to wipe out so-called discrimination and bias may ultimately lead to the destruction of individual liberty.

With the most punitive civil rights legislation in the history of America now being pushed in the Senate, Mr. Cummerford's acknowledgment of the fact that the men and women of America stand in danger of being reduced "to the level of dehumanized automatons," as in George Orwell's novel, "Nineteen Eighty-Four," is prophetically ominous.

"In general," Mr. Cummerford writes, "nations lose their freedom in one of two ways. The first is by violence, either from within or from without; bombs, machineguns, and the like do the job. The second is far more subtle and insidious; this is the slow, gradual process of evolution. By stages, freedom is chipped away and so gradually that few are aware of the real meaning of the process until it is, perhaps, too late. As each little bit of freedom is taken away, the highest and noblest motives are given and the 'best people' in the land give their wholehearted approval. Their intentions may be of the very best, but of such is the greatest superhighway of them all constructed."

Citing regional antibias laws which have been used in various sections of the country to impose the will of a minority upon the people as a whole, Mr. Cummerford suggests that such a pattern soon will be followed throughout the United States if the pending Federal civil rights legislation is enacted.

Under the regional laws, Mr. Cummerford points out, discrimination is usually outlawed in such areas as employment, housing, public accommodations and resorts, public transportation, and sometimes education. About half the States, and some municipalities, now have such laws, many with enforcing agencies.

"Invariably," Mr. Cummerford says, "these agencies begin their work in an unobtrusive manner but with the passage of time they often become increasingly aggressive, seeking more powers, asking broader areas in which to operate, and harsher punitive measures for alleged offenders. Some have stated very candidly that if enough complaints are not filed to keep them busy, they will go out searching for examples of bias. Frequently, they query employers as to the proportions of races and creeds in their employ; they scrutinize employment applications to see if there are any questions deemed discriminatory; they scan advertising by hotels and resorts to ferret out language that might be a subtle cloak for bias. These commissions, in short, seem to view their scope as ever widening."

Mr. Cummerford, who has practiced law in New York City since 1946 and who received his education at Fordham University, continues as follows:

"Almost with each passing day, new and strange events are reported in connection with the inexorable drive to wipe out bias. Private property is seized and held by mobs; sit-in demonstrations are conducted in State capitol buildings, city halls, board of education properties, and the like.

"Racial pressure groups dictate to private employers what the racial makeup of their payrolls shall be, and to school boards what the racial makeup of the student body shall be. Crude pressure is exerted against private clubs because of their membership policies, and threats are heard to abolish them altogether.

"What is most distressing about all of this is that those elements in the community

which should be the most responsible—the press, the clergy, educators—yea, even the bench and bar—view these examples of mob action as something good, and even give them their full support and encouragement. One cannot avoid wondering if they have reflected on the proposition that if a mob can take over a lunch counter because it dislikes the policies prevailing within, it can, by the same token, take over a church or a publishing plant or a university which has incurred its displeasure."

Noting that "new and strange concepts are being infused" into the American system of jurisprudence, Mr. Cummerford observes, "What is more alarming is that they are being accepted, passively and unquestioningly by most of our populace. Liberty is being subordinated to 'equality.' A type of absolute egalitarianism riding roughshod over personal privacy and individual freedom has become the order of the day. Matters that formerly were well within the realm of personal choice and decision are now branded as criminal or tortious, with the punitive police power of Government standing by. Private business and social dealings now must contend with the Government as an uninvited third party, overseeing and checking what private citizens do and even how and what they think."

In a warning which should strike to the hearts of all free men and women in America, now that our very liberty is at stake in the Halls of Congress, Mr. Cummerford declares:

"When bureaucrats not chosen by the people can warn us to obey the 'spirit' of laws or face penalties; when a Federal district judge can sit as the absolute overseer of a local community's affairs; when school-teachers are muzzled and coerced; when our citizens cease to be free individuals and become merely 'ethnic groups' to be manipulated according to some sociological dictum; when our law and our courts become merely the extensions of the sociologists' workshops; when Government can invade the hearts and minds of men to search out their subtlest motivations and innermost thoughts; when all of these things come to pass in our land of the free, it is high time we ask ourselves just where we are headed."

"The most significant recent developments center on proposed Federal legislation in this field. If such laws were to be enacted the National Government would be given jurisdiction and powers in areas never previously regarded as coming within its ambit. The erosion of State and local authority would be tremendously accelerated."

"The hour is late. We may be, even now, in the twilight of our liberty, standing on the very threshold of the type of era envisioned by Orwell. When liberty is taken from some, it tends ultimately to fade for all. When that dreadful day arrives there no longer will be any need to argue about discrimination for we shall all be joined together in the terrible equality that is slavery."

The American Bar Association Journal deserves much credit for presenting Mr. Cummerford's scholarly warning against the dangers confronting American citizens today in the infamous civil rights legislation pending in the Senate.

Americans in all walks of life—lawyers, ministers, educators, businessmen, industrialists, bankers, laborers, and housewives—should flood the Senate with protests.

It should be the prayerful hope of all citizens that we should be spared the terror of a police state such as that embodied in the civil rights bill.

CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW THE DRAFT

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently my distinguished colleague in the Senate, Senator KENNETH KEATING, proposed a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the draft.

Mr. KEATING's bill would authorize a definitive investigation, by both civilians and members of the Armed Forces, of problems concerning the draft. Mr. KEATING was joined by several other Senators, including Senator JACOB JAVITS, in the introduction of his proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that our draft laws need serious study and I heartily support Senator KEATING's idea. We need a review of our use of manpower, and we need to know how the draft fits in with our educational and military needs in future years.

Last year, I supported a proposal to reduce the draft extension to 2 years, from the present 4. I felt adoption of the amendment would force a review of the current situation.

Today, I am introducing a bill similar to the one proposed by Senator KEATING in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to give it their careful consideration.

FOREIGN POLICY—THE RISKS OF IRRESOLUTION

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, American foreign policy is giving the impression to the world that the United States is weak and uncertain of its goals. While our foreign policy must be flexible to meet changing situations around the world, there is a big difference between flexibility and indecisive leadership.

On policies toward South Vietnam and trade with Communist nations, the United States has made conflicting statements and taken contradictory stands that have encouraged a feeling around the world that the United States is weak. Noticed by the Communist world, this indecisiveness of American foreign policy strategy is stimulating Communist subversion and aggression throughout the far corners of the world.

The tragic lessons of the past must not be forgotten. Lack of U.S. firmness in dealing with world affairs resulted in the loss of many countries to communism immediately after World War II. Last May, in Milford, N.H., I emphasized these thoughts as follows:

We must not let our aspirations for peace be interpreted, as they have in the past, as weakness. Nor can we permit firmness to develop into unbridled belligerency. Theodore Roosevelt expressed this well. "We should speak softly and carry a big stick."

If we are to preserve peace, we must maintain a posture of unquestionable strength and firmness. History shows clearly that weakness and indecision invite attack and lead to war.

I would like to call to my colleagues' attention an editorial, "The Risks of Irresolution," which appeared in the March 2, Wall Street Journal which echoes the thoughts of my Milford speech. It is a thoughtful and penetrating analysis and deserving of careful and concerned consideration.

THE RISKS OF IRRSOLUTION

With communism presenting a variety of faces today, it is natural and necessary for U.S. policy to be flexible. It also inevitable that the attempted flexibility should produce considerable confusion.

Nettled by criticism of seemingly contradictory policies, Secretary of State Rusk has undertaken to clarify Government thinking. There are three main objectives, he said in a speech last week: To prevent the Communists from extending their domain and make it tough for them to try; to achieve agreements which might reduce the danger of war; and to encourage evolution within the Communist world toward national independence and open societies.

This means a sterner policy toward Cuba and Red China than toward Soviet Russia at the moment. It means one attitude toward Yugoslavia, not formally part of the Soviet bloc, and another attitude toward Czechoslovakia. It means a favorable response to a Rumania beginning to want more contacts with the West. It means force to try to prevent the Communists from extending their domain in southeast Asia.

To some critics, the objectives are mutually inconsistent and the upshot close to appeasement. But a good many people, ourselves included, would not quarrel with the objectives; after all, international communism is in disarray, and it makes sense to exploit it while resisting aggrandizement. What bothers a lot of people is that the implementation of the policies often seems inept or worse.

So we are tough with Castro's Cuba at least in an economic sense. But the policy hasn't evicted the Soviet arms and men. Nor has it kept Cuba from selling a lot of sugar in the world and thus being able to make trade deals with our allies. The pitiful U.S. exercises in retaliation against those allies only make the Government look foolish.

The greatest power on earth should have had the skill to prevent or cut out this cancer and stop it from spreading through the hemisphere. That is not only hindsight; many have been saying it all along. As it is, Cuban policy violates the first objective cited by Mr. Rusk; the Communists emphatically have extended their domain, smack up against the United States.

Vietnam is another sad case of performance falling far below policy. Year by year we have been drifting deeper and deeper into this ugly war without, it now seems plain, ever having a realistic strategic plan for winning it—even in the limited sense of causing the Red guerrillas to cease their attacks.

The result is that the United States is said to be confronted now with the choice of pulling out or expanding the war to North Vietnam. Yet so irresolute has our effort thus far appeared that the talk of tougher tactics isn't especially convincing to the enemy. The Kremlin, in one of its better flights of hypocrisy, feels free to solemnly warn the United States against any such action.

Admittedly a decision to carry the war closer to the enemy would be a grave one. It risks intervention by the Red Chinese and

perhaps by Russia as well. It could cost many more American lives. For logistical and other reasons, it might not be successful. Given the indifference of many South Vietnamese, it may not be worth it; withdrawal might prove the better part of wisdom. But at least attacking the enemy's privileged sanctuary would be something decisive.

What is intolerable is a strategy of drift. What is incredible is that the United States has managed to create such an impression of weakness that the Communists, whether in Latin America or southeast Asia, figure they can pursue their aggressions with impunity.

That is the crux of the matter. The disunity in the Communist world is far more the result of its internal contradictions than any exploiting we have done. The agreements we have made with the Communists have not perceptibly advanced peace; they are still on the warpath, busily extending their domain.

And a major reason the U.S. objectives aren't being reached is that flexibility too frequently looks like flabbiness.

THE REPUBLICANS OFFER SMALL BUSINESS FULL COMPENSATION UNDER URBAN RENEWAL—THE ADMINISTRATION OFFERS ONLY A CONSOLATION PRIZE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican housing and urban renewal bill offers small business full compensation for firms forced to relocate, whereas the administration housing and urban renewal bill offers only a consolation prize to small business firms forced to relocate. The difference between the Republican approach and the administration approach are deep and striking.

In a statement presented to the Special Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives the National Federation of Independent Business called on the Congress to provide just compensation to business firms forced to relocate because of the Federal urban renewal and housing program and other Government construction projects.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall include the significant statement of this matter which was presented to the House Special Housing Subcommittee by George J. Burger, Jr., assistant to C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business. This is the first nationwide survey made by a national small business organization. It covered 4,020 independent businessmen in 46 cities in 34 States. The survey was made at the request of Henry Krevor, chief counsel, Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, House Committee on Public Works.

The findings in the survey show that there is support for liberalized compensation, however, it extends only to tangible items like machinery, equipment, fixtures, and moving costs which are readily verifiable. It is most impor-

tant to note that the survey shows little support for payments for intangible items such as living costs, and lost income which are not so easily verifiable. The Republican housing and urban renewal bill—H.R. 9771, H.R. 9772, H.R. 9785, H.R. 9955, and S. 2566—providing, as it does, for full compensation payments in eminent domain proceedings, concerns itself with the tangible items called for in the National Federation of Independent Business survey. The administration housing and urban renewal bill, however, offers only a \$1,500 consolation prize to these businesses unable to relocate in a year's time. Because of the intangible nature of this payment, which would go to displacees whether it was needed or not, 60 percent of those interviewed in the survey oppose payment of compensation to displacees unable to relocate if that is the only ground for awarding compensation.

It is clear that small businessmen are more interested in continuing in business than in existing on a dole. Two other findings of the survey were: first, there is a great need for improved informational procedures for the benefit of firms affected by these programs; and second, there is a need for major improvement in the laws and procedures involved in these Federal urban renewal and housing programs. The Republican housing and urban renewal bill meets these needs squarely by improving these laws and procedures, particularly in terms of just compensation to small independent businesses forced to relocate from an urban renewal project area, and includes requirements to aid small independent businessmen for the very first time in any major housing and urban renewal legislation. Such just compensation should have been provided from the very beginning, for it is most unfair that small and independent business is being forced to bear the major costs of these housing and urban renewal programs.

It ill behooves this or any other administration to make propaganda speeches about deep concern felt for the Nation's 4½ million small independent businessmen, and woo them during election years, and then pay only part of the real value of property taken from them under eminent domain proceedings during the course of Federal urban renewal projects, and other Government construction projects.

It is significant that this vitally important survey conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business reached many of the same conclusions of an independent study made by Brown University, which was financed by the Small Business Administration. I would call your attention to the comment by Dr. Basil G. Zimmer, professor of sociology at Brown University and the author of the study to which I refer. Dr. Zimmer has written me saying:

I feel that it is a shame—actually almost a disgrace—that the Federal Government would continue to spend millions of dollars on urban renewal without providing significant funds for objective outside appraisals of the consequences of these programs. There are few problems in modern American society more in need of research.

I find it both incomprehensible and unconscionable that this administration resists and ignores such an independent and significant study as the one made by the National Federation of Independent Business, as well as a study such as that made by Brown University which was paid for by tax funds.

I include the statement by George J. Burger, Jr., assistant to C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, for the information of my colleagues and in the hope that President Johnson and the administration housing officials will give it a thorough study.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, JR.,
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL
FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, HOUSE COM-
MITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

ADEQUACY OF COMPENSATION PAID TO FIRMS
FORCED TO RELOCATE OPERATIONS DUE TO
GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

On behalf of the members of the federation, I am pleased to present to your subcommittee this analysis of the survey which we made last year on the above indicated subject among a representative cross section of federation members.

First, however, let us make one point crystal clear: While this analysis presents the considered opinion of many of our members on the problems involved in forced business relocations, and details many individual experiences, it does not determine the position of the federation on proposed legislation. Such determination is made only through mandate polls. We have not polled our members on the various bills before your subcommittee, and therefore can be neither for nor against any of them.

We do believe, however, that the opinions expressed in this analysis of our survey, and the experiences reported, will materially assist the members of your subcommittee in making decisions on the bills before you, when and where necessary.

We made this survey during July of 1963, at the request of Mr. Henry Krevor, chief counsel, Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, House Committee on Public Works. The questions asked were based on a series of proposed queries which Mr. Krevor furnished to us.

To keep this survey, which was a special project, within manageable proportions, we limited coverage to 4,020 of our then 195,000 members. Selection of areas covered (46 cities in 34 States), was based on a list of cities, submitted by Mr. Krevor, cities which had either recently undergone urban renewal projects or were in the formative stages of one of these projects. It was based also on geographical considerations. Members covered were located in all parts of the Nation (introductory section of report—copy available at our Washington, D.C., offices, Washington Building).

The listing of occupations of the 511 federation members who responded to the survey (pp. 2-6 of the report) shows we achieved a true cross section of our own membership, which in turn is a true cross section of all American smaller, independent business and professional people.

The fact that our coverage was limited to cities involved in urban renewal indicates replies were from knowledgeable people. The fact that among our respondents were those who had been compelled to move and had completed their moves, those who were faced with the prospect of having to relocate, those left behind in fringe areas, and those whose operations had not been disturbed indicates that a balance was achieved between what might be called special interest and general public interest. Actual

signed copies of the responses underlying this survey are, available for your subcommittee's inspection at our Washington, D.C., offices. And now to the survey:

I

It is quickly apparent that independents involved in these projects have not been, and are not being, fully compensated for their losses, and that the projects are very costly to them.

For instance, of the 28 reporting members who were forced to move due to urban renewal project, 25 (23 of them from inside the construction area, 2 from outside the areas) gave details of their experiences. Of this number:

Ninety percent reported having to spend sums ranging from \$350 to \$175,000 for remodeling or otherwise rehabilitating their new properties.

Eighty-four percent reported additional costs for purchase of replacement properties (sums involved ranged from \$6,000 to \$60,000), and for new rentals (costs of which represented increases ranging from \$50 to \$250 more per month).

Sixty-three percent reported having to undertake additional expenses (above normal advertising, promotions, etc.) to reestablish their operations, in sums ranging from \$300 to, in one case, \$175,000.

Forty-eight percent reported losses in value of furniture, fixtures, and equipment, ranging from \$500 to \$10,000, for which they were not compensated and which they could not move.

Forty-four percent reported having had to spend sums ranging from \$175 to \$50,000 in addition to allowances made, for their costs of moving to new locations.

Twenty-four percent reported losses ranging from \$200 to \$2,000 for which they were not compensated in value of furniture, fixtures, and machinery which they were able to move to their new locations.

Despite these costs, 84 percent said that the amount of compensation received had not compelled them to retrench. One independent, however, reported having had to close down following relocation, and here is his story in brief:

"Truck service company located outside the construction area. Moving expenses did not exceed Government allowances. Rented property at old location, and did not indicate any increase in rent cost at new location. Suffered no loss in value of furniture, machinery, fixtures able to move to new location. Business income decreased \$5,000 since relocation. Forced to liquidate."

Interestingly, 32 percent expect their incomes to decrease in amounts ranging from \$2,000 to \$20,000 a year in their new locations, while 60 percent expect their income either to remain the same or increase (in amounts ranging from \$2,000 to \$50,000).

Seventy-six percent reported being able either to find the financing needed for their moves, from external sources or internally. Sixteen percent said they had not been able to secure all the financing they needed.

Next, of the 26 reporting members who were faced with the prospect of having to move—20 gave details of their expectations, 2 (their stories later) are being forced to close down, and 4 gave no details.

Eighty-five percent expect to pay more for their new property (in sums ranging from \$10,000 to \$50,000) and to pay more rent than presently in their new locations (in sums \$75 to \$300 monthly).

Sixty-five percent anticipate additional expenses (above normal advertising, other promotions, etc.) ranging from \$475 to \$15,000 in reestablishing their operations.

Fifty percent expect to have to expend sums ranging from \$1,000 to \$40,000 to remodel or rehabilitate their new properties.

Fifty percent expect to suffer losses for which they will not be compensated, ranging from \$500 to \$10,000, in the value of furni-

ture, machinery, fixtures, and other equipment which they will not be able to move to their new locations.

Thirty-five percent expect to suffer losses for which they will not be compensated, ranging between \$250 and \$2,000, in the value of furniture, machinery, fixtures, and other equipment they will be able to move to their new locations.

Thirty percent anticipate moving costs above their allowances ranging between \$500 and \$5,000.

Twenty-five percent say that the amount of compensation received from Government will cause them to retrench operations (35 percent take the view they will not be forced to retrench).

Interestingly, 50 percent expect their incomes to increase in their new locations (30 percent expect a decrease), while 35 percent do not expect the need to relocate to force them to close down.

Perhaps significantly, there were a much greater number of answers in the "I don't know" category among firms facing the prospects of moving than among the firms who had moved. This may have been due to the fact that projects in their areas hadn't matured sufficiently. On the other hand, it may have been due to the fact that informational services in connection with these projects are not as effective as they should be. In this connection, one businessman observed:

"Advance information for proper planning seems to be the most important phase of this problem. Government projects do not start overnight. An orderly readjustment would be less expensive and possibly advantageous for many businesses. Time lost in controversy over values could exceed the value of compensations received."

Now as to the two firms who are being forced to close down:

The first is a motel located on a road that is being bypassed by a new superhighway. Briefly its story is as follows:

"Located outside planned construction area. Estimates \$150,000 moving expenses not compensated by Government. Owns property: estimates would be required to pay \$45,000 more for new property than will receive for old property. Estimates \$75,000 loss in value of furniture, machinery, fixtures and other equipment that might move to new location. Estimates \$65,000 loss in value of furniture, machinery, fixtures and other equipment that could not move to new location. Expects relocation to decrease his income. Estimates would have to spend \$150,000 in remodeling at new location. Estimates would have to spend additional \$30,000 to reestablish operation. States will have to close down operation because of requirement to relocate, at loss of \$15,000 a year."

"(Note.—This motel located on road that will be closed down in favor of a new superhighway.)"

The second is a public warehouse. Briefly, its story is as follows:

"Business liquidated. Building has been on highway plans, shown to public for 9 years. Since business involved public warehousing the condemnation publicity hurt the trade, since the public normally expects acquisition in 2 or 3 years. Firm's income went down rapidly due to publicity. Its final low income was the main factor used against it when it demanded a fair price (which, the former operator said, 'We did not get')."

Of the 25 firms located in the fringe area, 60 percent (chiefly in retail service trades) reported losses in income ranging from \$2,000 a year to a flat \$100,000 (some put it in percentages ranging from 5 to 20 percent). 28 percent reported their incomes unchanged, 8 percent said it was too early to tell, and 4 percent (a home builder-attorney) reported increased income. Obviously, taken as an average, firms located in the fringe areas suffer a great loss in income.

II

Now, how and to what extent do these independents, and their fellows who have not been directly affected, feel that present compensation processes should be changed, if at all? It is significant to see how the responses vary, and how the opinions of the different groups vary within each general response. For instance:

The most heavily favorable vote came in answer to the question whether laws affecting compensation should be changed. Strongest support for a change came from those not directly affected, followed by those in fringe areas and those facing need to move. Weaker support came from those who had completed their moves.

The second most heavily favorable vote came in response to the question whether changes should provide payment for moving costs, in full. Equally strong support for the proposed change came from those in fringe areas and those facing need to move. Slightly less support came from those not directly affected. Those who had moved trailed the rest.

An equally heavily favorable vote came in response to the question whether the change should provide payment for the loss of value in machinery, furniture, and equipment not movable to the new location. The percentage response was the same as that in the paragraph above. Strongest support for this came from those not directly affected, followed by those facing need to move, then those in fringe areas, and finally those who had completed their moves.

Fourth most heavily favorable vote came in response to the question whether changes should provide payment of all costs of setting up in new locations that are in excess of amounts recovered from sale (of) or loss in value of machinery, equipment, fixtures, etc. Those facing need to move led the approval parade here, followed in order by those in fringe areas and those not directly affected. Those who had completed their moves split 50-50 on this one.

Fifth most heavily favorable vote came in response to the question whether the change should provide payment to renters and owners of property. Those in fringe areas were strongest in their support, followed by firms faced with the need to move. Firms not directly appointed trailed in support by 9-13 percentage points. Firms who had already moved trailed by 15-19 percentage points.

Sixth most heavily favorable vote came in response to the question whether provisions for compensation should be the same in all Government construction programs. Here again those facing need to move led the approval parade, followed by those in fringe areas. Those not directly affected split 50-50. Firms which had already completed their moves voted heavily against this.

Seventh most heavily favorable vote (approaching the 50 percent favorable point) came in response to the question whether maximum and minimum amounts of compensation be developed, announced publicly, and be paid out in relation to losses due to projects. Firms facing the need to move split 70-30 on this, followed by those in fringe areas, and by those not directly affected. Sixty percent of those who had moved either opposed or had no opinion on this one.

Slightly over half responded unfavorably to the question whether, if compensation is paid to both owners and renters, it should be paid to both on equal basis. A slight majority of those in the fringe areas favored this one. Those facing need to move, and those not affected, each split equally. Almost 60 percent of firms which had made their moves opposed it.

Sixty percent responded unfavorably to the question whether the change should provide payment for reestablishing good will (advertising, promotions, etc.) at the new locations, or cost of good will if they have

to buy a going concern in the new location. More than half the fringe area firms favored this. All other of the three categories opposed it, heaviest opposition coming from those who have moved and those not affected.

Almost 60 percent responded unfavorably to the question whether the change should compensate for costs of moving independents in fringe areas who are not physically forced to move, but who do so because of loss of business. More than half the fringe area firms favored this. Firms faced with need to move and those not affected were opposed. Strongest opposition came from firms who had made their moves.

Over 60 percent opposed payment of compensation to independents who lose their livelihood because of inability to reestablish in new locations. Firms faced with the need to move split 50-50 on this. Those in fringe areas and those who had already moved opposed it. Those not affected were most vehement in opposition.

A slightly greater percentage opposed payment of compensation to firms near a project who lose income due to the project. A little over half the firms in fringe areas favored this. About 65 percent of firms faced with the need to move and of the firms not affected, opposed it. About 75 percent of the firms who had already moved opposed it.

It appears clear that a significant pattern emerges from the foregoing: that there is support for changes in compensation for "tangibles," and opposition to changes in "intangibles." For instance, you can see, touch, and feel a bill for moving costs—but who can say how much future income is lost by a firm compelled to close down? You can measure with a reasonable degree of certainty the loss in value of furniture, fixtures, and equipment that can and cannot be moved to a new location—but how do you measure with an equal degree of certainty how much a firm in a fringe area has lost due to the construction project? In the same vein, how do you measure with any degree of accuracy the value of goodwill?

Let it not be thought, however, that those who responded to the survey were indifferent to the plight of those compelled to close their operations, and of those who lose income in the fringe areas. For instance:

As to compensation for loss of livelihood, one member commented: "On a declining scale with assistance at training, and as needed to steer toward a new trade." Another said: "These losses should be proven by comparison of past and present records of total business, expenses, etc." A third commented: "The only ones who should be compensated would be the very small places with a neighborhood following. Such should at least get as much out of their businesses as if they were to sell them, but I don't see how the Government can take the responsibility of lifetime compensation."

As to payment of compensation for loss of income by those in fringe areas, one member stated: "Compensation should be given only in the form of assistance to improve their operations only." Another commented: "The principle is good, however, proof of such losses may be difficult to administer."

As to payment of moving costs for firms leaving fringe areas, one member stated: "A manufacturing business forced to move from a fringe area would be in for an expensive adjustment. However, moving would be less mandatory in a fringe area since the location of the manufacturing plant is usually not critical. In the case of a retail or service business catering directly to the public, a large construction project can prove a boon or a catastrophe." A second commented: "A committee should be empowered to find facts and compensation made for damages. This committee to be one-third landowners, one-third local service

clubs, and one-third government agencies involved." A third said: "Perhaps income from several years at new location could be averaged and compared with average income at old location, and this be used as basis for comparison to determine loss. Perhaps above a certain figure payments could be made in the form of something like a depreciation allowance."

Neither let it be thought that those who approved greater compensation for losses in value of furniture, fixtures, and equipment that can and cannot be moved, for moving costs and costs of setting up in new locations wanted a "blue sky" approach to be used. For instance:

As to the question whether compensation should cover loss in value of furniture, fixtures, and equipment that cannot be moved to the new location, one member stated: "Even though I have answered 'Yes,' this might result in unenforceable legislation except through the establishment of special claims courts to evaluate losses and compensation." Another said: "Only if it would have to be replaced." A third stated: "(Only if) not already written off."

As to question whether compensation should cover all costs of setting up in new locations in excess of amounts that have been recovered from of, or loss in value of machinery, equipment, fixtures, one member said: "(Only) to maintain equivalent operations as before, but policed to prevent excess gains." A second commented: "If they don't try to set up on a much larger scale than before." A third commented: "It is only fair to expect help in relocating, that is, in difference in cost of land, increase in cost of building. Salvage value should be taken into consideration." A fourth said: "Only on the basis of equipment equal to the old location—not a new, more expensive setup." On the other hand, one commented: "It is rarely possible to replace comparable facilities without paying much more for them than is received for the old."

As to the question of moving costs, one member commented: "The Government should pay only for removing. Such things as advertising, good will, loss of potential profits are nebulous and open the door for graft as well as Government control. Many areas are degenerating and some would go broke anyway. Depreciation is liberal enough for replacing equipment."

A second significant pattern emerges from the votes on these questions: support for changes was weakest among firms which had completed their moves. One might speculate that this was due to the fact they might feel: "We've made our way through relocation under current allowances. Others should be able to do so." This might be true but for one fact: They did support some of the changes, and in some of the changes they opposed, the other groups joined them. This emphasizes a matter which we mentioned earlier, the need for adequate information for all affected by development programs.

III

And now, let's take a further look at some of the relocation problems, experienced and hypothesized, by those who answered the questionnaire.

One businessman speculated (commenting on compensation for renters and owners) "We can only make statements in the light of how the loss of our building might affect us. In our own situation, for instance: We own our own building and conduct a small garment manufacturing business which could be operated in any location which might be centrally located and easy for our help to reach. However, we are (my wife and I run this business as a team) at retirement age now but will continue to operate the business as long as our health permits. However, we plan on this building, which is on an arterial street, to become our prime

source of income when we retire. If this building were taken from us and we were not adequately compensated we could suffer considerable hardship. There must be other cases similar."

Another who had already moved and was experiencing some difficulty, commented: "Our situation was due to urban renewal project—2½ years have passed and still no real progress in redevelopment of that area. Why must premature moves be necessary? Our business was only 1½ years old at the time and it worked a real hardship on us. Under normal conditions our move was imprudent and premature, but we had no choice."

Another who had already moved (a renter) said: "Prior to remodeling of the office interior, inquiry was made to the landlord whether or not our office will be forced to move in the near future. The reply was that he didn't think so. With the go-ahead statement our company invested about \$3,000 in remodeling of the interior. All the expenses involved in this improvement were lost due to eviction. Nothing could be recovered."

Another who had already moved stated: "Relocation has caused me to purchase and use two additional pieces of transportation due to the fact that my business is a service that must be performed on the customer's premises. This is additional overhead that had not been considered by the Government and so far since relocating (2 years ago) I haven't been able to increase my volume of business to compensate for this added overhead and I have suffered a decrease in volume."

A businessman facing prospects of having to move said "We are in an old structure with rentals included (apartments). We were in the right of way of a proposed freeway, which we favored, but whose location has been shifted, but now we may be involved in a new underpass project, or street reconstruction, possibly both, both of which we are for. But, our location is very important, as an extremely potent competitor is ideally situated to take nearly all of our dropin trade if we move more than a block or two. Dropin trade used to be a very small part of our business, but it is now over one-half of it and increasing. This is a very difficult business to develop in a new location. Our outside business over the phone would tolerate a fairly long move without loss—the amount depending on whether we change phone numbers, and to which exchange if to a new exchange. Our "purchase of property" arrangements are a family affair and quite involved as far as compensation would be involved. (This location 31 years and we are known by our location.) We would be unable to obtain property or rental of a store within our "zone" at anywhere near the "overhead" we have at our present location, therefore, a complete change in our mode of operation may be required. We believe any business should be helped to recover from losses caused by construction, helped even if there is an improvement of status, but we are against cash payment in the form of a "dole" as this principle of compensation can be too easily abused by a "smart wise-guy" businessman and his lawyer. In addition to compensation for direct losses there needs to be help at finding a suitable location and in getting low cost financing for any improvements that may be needed to reestablish the business at a level at least as good as the original operation was."

Another facing prospects of having to move, commented: "There is a tendency on a Federal and State level to appraise property considerably lower than going rate, thus forcing condemnation. Aside from being costly to owners, Government usually winds up paying considerably more than owners would have accepted through negotiation.

Some officials have frankly admitted that condemnation takes them off the hook."

A businessman in a fringe area had this to say: "Apparently most of the problem is caused by failure to require Government officials (employees, actually, regardless of grade) to consider the rights of all citizens and negotiate with them in good faith before completing a design of construction. Further, in dealing with these people, city, State, or Federal, I find most of them inexperienced or lacking in ordinary logic, common law, and understanding of what makes this country go. To give an example, as a recession measure in 1958, the Federal Government supplied the funds to build a four-lane freeway 2 miles long in front of my place of business. As they excavated the whole 2 miles 5-feet deep and then filled back about 3 feet, I couldn't tell what was going on until it was a 'fait accompli.' I had a nice front (auto parts business), I ended with no access from the front. A 6-foot bank in front of my parking area. The roadbed on a 20-degree angle whereas it had been level; a long island in the freeway which compels people coming from one direction to make a circuitous two-block drive to get in and I was virtually out of business for 5 months in 1959. What has this cost me? I don't know. I made \$40,000 net in 1962 but it was the hard way—70, 80, and 90 hours a week. My property value ruined after an original \$40,000 investment and 8 years of hardest labor."

Another in a fringe area said: "We are located in the center of the block directly across the street from the new Federal courthouse and office building. Our additional cost is due to demolition of the private garage and parking space where we kept our trucks and maintained customer parking. We were forced to rent additional property for parking at \$100 a month and probably will be forced to move because of the increased value of property in the area and increase in rent when our lease expires."

One businessman comments, interestingly: "We expect to be benefited by the flood control project. Certain areas of our city are flooded every year, but the location of our business only when there is a major flood. The deepest water stood from 27 to 40 inches in lower floor. There is where we have most and heaviest equipment and mill supplies, etc. We would in no way be entitled to compensation on account of the project, but feel many will. It is a great undertaking to move, even though it entails no real financial loss."

Another businessman speculated: "If the factors controlling income received in a business change, naturally it is usually over a period of time, and the businessmen should be able to take these factors into consideration either to adjust them in his present location or to plan to move to another location. However, when the Government redevelops it is usually a total upheaval in the vicinity having immediate and total consequences, and the businessman has absolutely no control over what happens. He is at the mercy of a Government edict, and for this reason I think that the Government must pay compensation for their actions. The small businessman is usually in an older district because he doesn't have the financial resources to locate in the newer, more modern, and more profitable locations. When the older districts are redeveloped and new apartments and stores are built in these areas the small businessmen located in these areas must stand by and see financier-backed businesses take over because he, himself, cannot afford to open up these high rent locations. He also cannot always move into another older, low cost business district because they usually have their own established firms. So it comes down to this: His place of business is taken over, he cannot get a job because of his age, he has no unemployment com-

pensation, or sufficient funds to keep him for any length of time, so he ends up as an unemployment statistic and eventually on relief rolls."

IV

What further suggestions did our members have? Let's take a look at a few of these:

One said: "There should be some consideration given business as to first choice on renting or buying property in a redeveloped area that is still suitable for the same type of business at the same price they were bought out at. Many businesses simply move completely out of the area and are lost for tax purposes."

Another said: "Since residents of property are offered comparable living facilities, or the refusal, other occupants (nonresidential such as businesses uses) should have the same offer. Costs of relocating, loss of productive time, wiring, and other installations that cannot be moved, as well as downtime and actual moving expenses should be part of the appraisal of the value of the moving, as well as the actual value of the premises. If the benefit to the people as a whole is established, then the property owner occupant should not be forced to sacrifice more than any other citizen to make the improvement possible. A fair market value for the property plus a fair evaluation of the moving and reestablishing of the business operating the way it was operating in the old or current premises should make up the selling price allowable to the person who has to move to make way for any civic improvement—freeway, redevelopment, etc."

Another: "I do think the Government should be realistic in all appraisals and watch out for the deceit and fraud practiced by persons with insider information on project locations, whereby some people make a lot of money."

Another: "The compensation for reestablishing a business should have a reasonable relationship to the comparable costs for the business establishment in the original location, based on prior records of the business concerned."

Another: "I think the Government should compensate the businessman if he is forced to move from an established location. If the law is too liberal, however, a great number of businessmen are going to take advantage of a given situation, and try to make money by charging the Government with all sorts of costs and losses. Compensation, and other adjustments due to Government projects should be based on Federal income tax reports prior to the project and after the project went into effect. This is the only true yardstick whether the move by a business to another location was detrimental or perhaps quite beneficial to the business. A situation of this nature will occur to a great many of the businesses along U.S. Highways 36-40 in Denver, Colo., after Interstate 70 will bypass the main business arteries in Denver in approximately 15 months. We have formed a merchants group, just to work out plans how to minimize the loss of business due to the new highway. These projects naturally affect small businesses to a much larger extent than heavy industry, or large companies."

Another: "This [compensation] should be open negotiation and handled on a business-like basis. Naturally, there will be differences and there will be those on both sides trying to take unfair advantage. Some form of arbitration can be worked out on these few. I believe 99 percent can fairly negotiate so that small business will not be hurt."

Another: "This is a very touchy problem and about every project has a different effect on business. I think every locality should have a locally appointed seven member board of independent businessmen to

judge what to do about these situations, then approved by the U.S. Government."

Another: "Fair market value should be paid for properties taken over, based on value prior to the determination that such properties need to be purchased for the Government project. The period for determining fair market value should be at least 6 months prior to final determination of the project."

Another: "Actual losses should be paid in full. Intangibles should be considered, but weighed carefully. A system of impartial, knowledgeable referees to arbitrate these matters might be useful."

Another: "No blanket law should cover all cases. Real estate boards or arbitration boards should be used to determine losses. Provisions should be built in to protect the Government (taxpayers) against opportunists."

Another: "What is just compensation? Man owns plant and has for many years. Plant has been maintained and modernized. He should be compensated not on assessed value or even appraised value but on actual cost of equal facilities. If the Government did not require his moving, he could go on for many years without such expenditure. Why must he be put to added costs without compensation. However, if he moves to another city or State which furnishes plant free and even tax free, some penalty should be forthcoming to compensate community he leaves for loss of payroll, etc."

What about damages to areas not immediately adjacent to area of construction? Sometimes blasting, etc., alters rock formations even miles from area, causing settling that otherwise would not have occurred. Many other factors, such as traffic flow, are also altered far from project. Some relief should accrue.

To sum up our findings in this survey, they show:

1. Relocation is a very costly process for many independents. Many experience losses for which they are not adequately compensated.

2. While compensation is judged inadequate, a majority of those who have moved report that it was not a factor in compelling business retrenchment.

3. There is support for liberalized compensation; however it extends only into the areas of tangibles—items like machinery, equipment, fixtures, moving costs, et cetera, which are readily verifiable, and not into the area of intangibles—items like living costs, lost income, et cetera, which are not so easily verifiable.

4. While there is support for liberalized compensation, there is also strong insistence that this be provided with strict safeguards for the public purse.

5. Despite the difficulties encountered by those who had completed their moves and those left in fringe areas, and despite the difficulties anticipated by those facing the need to move:

(a) A significant number (60 percent) of firms which had completed their moves reported income as great as or greater than that in their old locations, as against 40 percent of those left behind in the fringe area.

(b) Three of the 79 firms in these categories reported having to close down their operations—one because of seemingly poor redevelopment planning, one because of diversion of a highway necessary to its trade, and one for reasons that are not clearly indicated.

6. There is, seemingly, a great need for improved informational procedures for the benefit of firms affected by these programs.

7. While there is some criticism of the concepts—chiefly urban redevelopment and ARA, chief criticism is over the need for improvement in the laws and the procedures involved in them.

DOMESTIC BEEF SITUATION GROWS STEADILY WORSE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past four months, while the domestic beef situation has grown steadily worse as a tremendous volume of foreign beef products flowed into this country, the administration has been asking us to avoid the introduction of legislation to establish limitations. Furthermore, we have been asked not even to talk publicly about the matter lest we upset our balance of trade with Australia, or endanger our negotiating position with the Common Market.

We were assured the voluntary negotiations then being conducted with Australia and New Zealand would produce a remedy for the problem. The negotiations have concluded, but the results are a long way from the cure. Moreover, they are a slap in the face of the American cattle industry.

It has become quite clear that unless beef imports from these two countries, plus the tons of beef products coming to Florida ports from Latin America are curtailed, our domestic cattle industry faces a multimillion dollar loss.

While we are standing here today a flotilla of ships is approaching the United States from Australia loaded down with more than 30 million pounds of beef. This is equal to 72,545 head of cattle. This means American producers must retain this number of cattle on their ranches, resulting in increased costs, in the loss of labor for handling, slaughtering, and butchering. In short, it means a multimillion dollar loss to the Nation's economy.

Today, I have introduced a bill to limit beef imports to half of the 5-year average prior to December 31, 1963.

This will offer prompt relief to our domestic producers while still maintaining the United States as a fair market for foreign producers.

We are well aware of the value of the favorable balance of trade, but we cannot stand by and watch our American cattlemen go down the drain. Unless we take immediate action this may happen.

The time for action is now. Every day we delay costs our cattle producers untold thousands of dollars.

ARTICLE CHARGES U.S. AGENCIES PENETRATED BY REDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I addressed the House and commented on the article which appeared in the Monday, March 3, 1964, New York Journal-American. It points

out charges which certainly should be investigated so the American people can know the truth in this important matter. It is no secret that the State Department has been working hard to conjure up the picture of Soviet Communists as "mature" and "responsible" world leaders who are gradually shaking off their rough ways. Our foreign policy is based on an unreal appraisal of our sworn adversaries and as a part of this effort, the American people have been deluged with propaganda. The Journal-American article presents a direct contrast to the pie-in-the-sky approach of the State Department and it should be thoroughly aired by a congressional committee which would be free of the built-in restraint of alibing on its own failures.

The Journal-American article concerns one Michal Goleniewski, a defector from the Soviet secret police, who has proven a valuable informer in the past but, according to the story written by Guy Richards, has many further stories to tell concerning Red penetration of our State Department and even the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Goleniewski received the following endorsement last year when the Congress passed a private bill providing for his naturalization:

His services to the United States rate as truly significant. * * * He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk.

I include at this point in the RECORD the committee report and the public law which accomplished Mr. Goleniewski's naturalization:

SENATE REPORT NO. 437, CALENDAR NO. 417,
88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary (to accompany H.R. 5507).)

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5507) for the relief of Michal Goleniewski, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization, and to exempt him from the provisions of section 313 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 40-year-old native and citizen of Poland, who has been admitted to the United States for permanent residence and is employed by the U.S. Government. He was a member of the Communist Party in Poland before his defection in April 1958. His services to the United States are rated as truly significant.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated May 15, 1963, to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the case, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1963.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (H.R. 5507) for the relief of Michal Goleniewski, there is attached a memorandum of infor-

mation concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary.

The bill would waive the provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act which prohibits the naturalization of aliens who were within the subversive classes during a period of 10 years immediately preceding the filing of a petition for naturalization. The bill would also grant the beneficiary sufficient residence and physical presence in the United States for naturalization and permit him to file a petition in any court having naturalization jurisdiction. The committee may desire to amend line 3 to reflect the beneficiary's correct given name as Michal.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

"MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES
RE H.R. 5507

"The beneficiary, Michal Goleniewski, a native and citizen of Poland, was born August 16, 1922, in Nieswiez. His wife, Irmgard, is a native of Berlin and a citizen of Germany. They are now living in the United States. The beneficiary's education was all in Poland: in 1939 he graduated from the Gymnasium; he completed 3 years of law at the University of Poznan, and in 1956 he received a master's degree in political science from the University of Warsaw. He enlisted in the Polish Army in 1945 and was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in 1955, which rank he held until coming to the United States in 1961. He is now employed as a consultant by the U.S. Government.

"The beneficiary's one prior marriage terminated in divorce in Poland in 1957. He married Irmgard Kampf in 1961. Both the beneficiary and his present wife are permanent residents of the United States, having been lawfully admitted as of January 12, 1961.

"Mr. Goleniewski was a member of the Communist Party of Poland from January 1946 until April 1958, when he defected. Without the enactment of H.R. 5507 the beneficiary will not be eligible for naturalization prior to 1968.

"The Immigration and Naturalization Service has been advised that the contributions made by Mr. Goleniewski to the security of the United States are rated by the U.S. Government as truly significant. He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk. He continues to make major contributions to the national security of the United States. * * * His primary motivation in offering to work with the Government has been and remains his desire to counter the menace of Soviet communism. * * *

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (H.R. 5507) should be enacted.

[Private Law 88-59, 88th Cong., H.R. 5507, Aug. 28, 1963]

AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF MICHAL GOLENIEWSKI

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Michal Goleniewski, lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, shall be held to be included in the class of applicants for naturalization exempted from the provisions of section 313(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as such class is specified in section 313(c) of the said Act, and that Michal Goleniewski shall be considered to have met the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316(a) of the said Act, and his petition for nat-

uralization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

Approved August 28, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, in viewing our foreign policy operations and internal security we can only appraise that part of the iceberg that appears above the surface. Even a cursory examination of what we know has transpired casts doubt on the wisdom of State Department policies. At a time when we are told we can "do business" with the Communists—even extend them credit on wheat sales—what does the record disclose? Have they stopped their subversion here and abroad? Of course not. Consider only a few of the 1963 subversion highlights that come to mind:

July 1: The State Department ordered Gennadi G. Sevastyanov, a Soviet Embassy cultural attaché in Washington to leave the United States for attempting to recruit a Russian-born employee of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency as a Russian spy.

July 2: The Federal Bureau of Investigation arrested four persons and charged them with conspiring to spy for the Soviet Union. Ivan D. Egorov, a personnel officer at the United Nations, and his wife, Aleksandra, were arrested in New York and later sent back to the Soviet Union in return for two Americans held by the Russians. Also arrested were a Washington couple using the names of Robert and Joy Ann Balth.

July 19: A Federal court jury in New York convicted Navy Yeoman Nelson C. Drummond of conspiracy to commit espionage for the Soviet Union. He received life imprisonment.

October 10: The Defense Department disclosed that SFC Jack E. Dunlap, a former clerk-messenger for the National Security Agency, had sold secrets to the Soviet Union over a 2-year period before committing suicide last July.

October 29: The FBI arrested an American electronics engineer and a chauffeur for a Russian trading agency on spy conspiracy charges. Two Soviet diplomats were arrested and then released because they had diplomatic immunity. A third Soviet diplomat was named in charges filed by the FBI but he was not apprehended.

No wonder the public is concerned about the double standard of the State Department and the laxity in our internal security. Testimony of Michal Goleniewski is the part of the iceberg that is below the surface and judging by how bad the exposed part is it is high time that we delve into the recesses and see what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the Monday, March 2 article entitled "U.S. Secret Agencies Penetrated by Reds," and the Tuesday, March 3 article entitled "Probe Four U.S. Envoy in Red Spy Sex Net." It is interesting to note that the official line will probably be that Michal Goleniewski is emotionally unstable and irrational. This was what they said about Paul Bang-Jensen.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 2, 1964]

U.S. SECRET AGENCIES PENETRATED BY REDS

(By Guy Richards)

A defector from the Soviet Secret Police has informed U.S. officials that Moscow has placed active cells in the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department in Washington and overseas.

The Red defector, a high-ranking operative in Russia's KGB, is sure that the cells

are still operative in the two highly sensitive Government agencies.

He and his wife have been living in a modest apartment not more than 30 minutes from Times Square. He has been given a new name and identity especially fabricated to blot out his past and help him blend into the American scenery.

He has named names. He has provided Washington with details of what looms as a greater scandal than the famous Alger Hiss case. Here are some of his shattering disclosures:

Approximately \$1.2 million of CIA funds in Vienna recently was passed secretly along to the Communists—one-third to KGB (the Soviet Secret Police), one-third to the Italian Communist Party and one-third to the American Communist Party.

Three American scientists with access to defense secrets are working for the KGB. They have ties to others in the same category whose identities are unknown to him. But he has clues to a number of them.

KGB has been able to infiltrate all American embassies in important cities abroad and "every U.S. agency except the FBI."

Little, if anything, has been done to run down or clean out the KGB men on American payrolls though he fed the facts and exposures on them to the CIA starting as far back as 1960.

Instead of having his information used for the cleanout job he came here for, he charges, he has been thwarted by amateurs and Stalinists in the CIA and even kept from communicating his plight to responsible higher officials here.

These allegations have been made by a former high executive of both the Russian and Polish secret police organizations. He had his own plane. He was free to fly all over Europe and did.

He is Michal Goleniewski, 41, a husky and handsome Polish-born agent who resembles the Hollywood prototype of the suave, lady-killing spy. He's credited with breaking the Irwin N. Scarbeck spy case in Warsaw in 1961. The CIA is on record in Congress as endorsing these observations:

"His services to the United States are rated as truly significant. * * * He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk."

Though he has yet to testify on espionage matters before any committee of the Senate or House, which he wants to do, and which many legislators want him to do, his case has become the center of one of the biggest behind-the-scenes battles ever to rear up in the jurisdictional area between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

In the tussle over him things have happened which seem incredible in a democratic nation.

A congressional subpoena was virtually smuggled to him—then mysteriously quashed. A letter he wrote to a Congressman was intercepted. An Army colonel who visited him was later hounded and investigated.

Michael Goleniewski might still be living in unheralded torment if a Cleveland, Ohio, Congressman hadn't scented a slightly fishy odor in a routine office proceeding.

The time was last summer. The scene was Capitol Hill, in the office of the chairman of the House Immigration Subcommittee. Sitting at his desk was white-plumed, bespectacled, Ohio Democrat, Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, a graduate of Princeton and Harvard Law School, and a good friend of the late President Kennedy.

By his side was a man from the CIA. The latter showed the Congressman a report and proposed bill which would bestow on Michael Goleniewski the benediction of U.S. citizenship. The former KGB agent's truly significant services were duly chronicled in the report. It stated, in part:

"The beneficiary, Michael Goleniewski, a native and citizen of Poland, was born August 16, 1922, in Nieswiez. His wife, Irmgard, is a native of Berlin and a citizen of Germany. They are now living in the United States.

"The beneficiary's education was all in Poland: in 1919 he graduated from the Gymnasium; he completed 3 years of law at the University of Poznan, and in 1956 he received a master's degree in political science from the University of Warsaw.

REPORT COVERS HELP TO UNITED STATES

"He enlisted in the Polish Army in 1945 and was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in 1955, which rank he held until coming to the United States in 1961 (after breaking the Scarbeck case). He is now employed as a consultant by the U.S. Government."

After a brief digression, the report continued:

"Mr. Goleniewski was a member of the Communist Party of Poland from January 1946, until April 1958, when he defected. Without the enactment of the H.R. 5507 (the proposed bill) the beneficiary will not be eligible for naturalization prior to 1968.

"The Immigration and Naturalization Service has been advised that the contributions made by Mr. Goleniewski to the security of the United States are rated by the U.S. Government as truly significant.

"He has collaborated with the Government in an outstanding manner and under circumstances which have involved grave personal risk. He continues to make major contributions to the national security of the United States. * * * His primary motivation in offering to work with the Government has been and remains his desire to counter the menace of Soviet communism."

GIVES VIEWS TO CIA MAN

This report and the bill it was designed to expedite had one primary motive. It was, in the words of a congressional aid, "to wipe out the past of a Polish citizen and create 'a man who never was,' an American citizen with a new name, a new identity and a new status, free to find a new life here."

Representative FEIGHAN was thoroughly aware of the purpose of the report. He was sympathetic. A man with a long record of fighting subversives, and often stubbornly independent of the executive branch, he is known for his special dislike of being turned into a rubberstamp by any Government agency.

He expressed his views to the CIA men. He said he was shocked at the amount of detail presented about Goleniewski. He said he had heard reports about the KGB defector, but had never laid eyes on him. He remarked he didn't like to promote any legislation on a pig-in-the-poke basis and concluded with the request:

"I'd like to see the live body."

His request was carried back to higher CIA officials. There were several days of dickering and phoning back and forth between CIA and Congress.

This bore light on two horizons of growing importance in security matters:

(a) The fact that the executive branch controls CIA, State, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, and FBI—all the intelligence-gathering agencies—and jealously guards its rights to run out all adverse criticism of these units performance.

(b) The personal situations of defectors vary greatly. Some, like Yuri Nossenko, have been publicized. Some have not. Some bring adverse criticism of American operations. Some do not. Some have families behind the Iron Curtain whose safety is endangered by publicity here. Some don't.

Goleniewski had his wife with him. He also had plenty of adverse criticism to deliver about U.S. operations.

On the ticklish issue of whether he should be allowed to see a Member of the legislative

branch, the wheels began to whir in the heavily guarded CIA Building in Langley, Va., 12 miles outside Washington.

SECRET SESSION SET ON THE HILL

It was finally decided that the answer had better be affirmative if Representative FEIGHAN's cooperation was to be obtained. The Congressman was duly notified it was OK.

That brought another big decision, this one in Congress. It was considered advisable that a subpoena from a congressional committee be sent with Representative FEIGHAN just in case it seemed proper—and Goleniewski thought so, too—for the latter to appear before a secret session on the Hill.

A subpoena was prepared. An appointment was set for several days later in New York.

Interviewed yesterday, after this reporter had checked facts from many sources over a 10-day period, Representative FEIGHAN said:

"From the very beginning my main concern was for the safety of this man (Goleniewski). Everything else seemed secondary. I still have the same concern."

Representative FEIGHAN made the trip from Washington to New York with two congressional aids. They landed at La Guardia Airport, and drove to an apartment building like a thousand others on Long Island.

A LASTING IMPRESSION

The handsome Pole made an impression that one has described as everlasting—I'll never forget it.

Sweet, harried looking and pregnant, his wife was in attendance part of the time. But all the time, striding energetically back and forth in the apartment, the former KGB bigshot painted the picture of what it feels like to flee the KGB only to find nothing coming from his leads and his liaison man with the CIA a Stalinist.

Bit by bit he unloaded the charges spelled out at the beginning of this story.

His trio of listeners were so shocked that they never got around to talk about the subpoena. Not one of them regarded the Pole as warped or biased. All knew that the CIA had been greatly served by him. They were staggered.

On his return to Washington, Representative FEIGHAN immediately arranged an appointment with CIA Director John A. McCone. He told him everything he had heard and urged him to look into the situation and correct it. Mr. McCone said he would.

One of the other men decided to make a return visit to Goleniewski. He brought the subpoena along (it was not from any committee to which Representative FEIGHAN belongs) and he also brought some Foreign Service rosters to enable him to interrogate the defector more explicitly.

VERY EAGER TO TESTIFY

This congressional aid obtained a second and more searching interview with the Pole. The latter also expressed his eagerness to testify in an executive session of any appropriate congressional committee. The subpoena was served.

A date and time was set for Goleniewski's appearance before the congressional committee. Representative FEIGHAN felt assured that whatever was wrong would soon be smoked out on the Hill.

But instead of that appearance, a man from the CIA arranged to have a key member of the committee involved vacate the subpoena and cancel the date. Another CIA man is reliably reported to have pressured the Army to investigate the subpoena server with a view toward charging him with making use of information gained on active duty (he was then on inactive duty), and for masquerading as an intelligence officer.

The Army was wrong on both counts. The aid didn't get the information on active duty, and he is an intelligence officer.

Word was quietly passed from somewhere that Mr. Goleniewski had flipped his lid and

was becoming unreliable—so CIA doesn't think it worthwhile for him to appear before the legislative branch.

Asked about this yesterday, Representative FEIGHAN said:

"That's utterly ridiculous. The man seemed worried, and even excited, but his mind is in excellent shape. I was impressed by everything he had to say."

So were the two others.

Representative FEIGHAN added that "I cannot deny my role in bringing this case to the attention of Mr. McCone, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency."

Up to the moment, however, it doesn't seem to have done much good.

Though Goleniewski has been moved elsewhere to keep the Russians guessing, he has yet to tell his story to Congress. He has yet to see any real results, he says, from what he came here to tell us. He has yet to enjoy many of the blessings that reverted to him in theory when he obtained his American citizenship a few weeks ago. The bill got a fair wind from Representative FEIGHAN and his associates.

TREATMENT WON'T ENCOURAGE OTHERS

From the viewpoint of Goleniewski, the joys of his American liberation must seem oddly constrained. He is a prisoner of the executive branch of our Government in a way few other citizens have been. He is more confined, more incommunicado, than he ever was before he bolted.

From a reporter's viewpoint, he seems to be a battered casualty of a war as savage and devious as the cold war. It's the war now raging in the upholstered jungle where different agents of our Government are stalking—and frequently opposing—each other.

One thing is sure. His plight is poor recruiting bait for more KGB defectors. Already two have been murdered or inexplicably killed after they arrived here. The mental ordeal to which Goleniewski has been subjected on this side of the Atlantic could ultimately prove to be the more refined kind of homicidal retribution. It leaves no evidence whatsoever.

The CIA? A spokesman said there would be no comment on the matter.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Mar. 3, 1964]

PROBE FOUR U.S. ENVOYS IN RED SPY SEX NET—
STORY IN JOURNAL-AMERICAN SPURS ACTION

(By Guy Richards)

Four American diplomats came under new and hastily organized congressional probes today after a high Soviet defector named them as Russian collaborators lured by beautiful Polish girls into a classic fall from grace.

The four, along with a fifth diplomat later allowed to resign, were drawn into the Soviet net in the espionage hotbed at Warsaw, Poland's capital, the defector charged. Ten U.S. Marine guards at the U.S. Embassy there also were trapped into collaborating with the Russians after clandestine affairs with Polish girls, the defector said.

Nor was that all.

SEDUCED BY AGENTS

While the diplomats were being blackmailed by the Polish girls, a handsome Soviet secret service agent bent on collecting information, managed to seduce the wife of an American Foreign Service officer.

And so gay and lax was the ambassadorial life in the lush Polish capital, the defector asserted, that while the American cats were out playing Soviet intelligence mice pilfered the Embassy's safe combinations, and probably made off with the Embassy cipher essential to decoding secret messages.

All that and more was under close scrutiny today as Congress turned its investigative spotlight on U.S. security leaks around the world.

QUICK ACTION

The investigations, marked by hurriedly scheduled hearings by several congressional committees were spurred by exclusive revelations in yesterday's New York Journal-American.

The disclosures came from the Soviet defector, 41-year-old Michal Goleniewski, who bared the existence of "cells" of the KGB—the Soviet Secret Police—in Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department, both in Washington and in U.S. Embassies overseas.

Goleniewski, still in a CIA hideout, made these other startling revelations:

Three American scientists with access to classified material were KGB agents.

About \$1.2 million of CIA funds in Vienna was secretly passed along to the Communists.

All important embassies and agencies of the United States "except the FBI" had been infiltrated by at least one KGB operative.

Amateurs and Stalinists in the CIA have blocked Goleniewski's efforts to make his leads and information effective.

All told, then, several hundred U.S. employees around the world will come under the target sights which Goleniewski directly or indirectly, is going to provide Capitol Hill.

THREE HUNDRED RISKS

They will include 300 persons already tabbed as "grave security risks" who are still on the State Department payroll.

But the four diplomats cited by the defector, one a high-ranking KGB official, will draw first scrutiny for a very special reason.

They could provide a two-way look at the job yet to be done—a look inside the State Department as well as a look abroad. The latter would be via our once spy-riddled Embassy at Warsaw.

It is reasoned that a close scrutiny of the Warsaw case of 1960-61 would show how the four diplomats and the Foreign Service officer's wife were compromised; and how, later, after their exposure, they were saved by a magic wand waved from the State Department's command post in Foggy Bottom.

VITAL EMBASSY

Warsaw is an important Embassy for several reasons, but mostly because it is where the United States maintains direct contact with the Ambassador of Red China.

Goleniewski, it can now be revealed, was a stip—a stay-in-place—in those days. He had sent a few messages to the CIA indicating he wanted to defect. He was told to stay in place, that he would be more useful as he was.

This imposed an additional worry on him—but the information he produced was sensational. It was a CIA ten-strike.

Of the five diplomats named by Goleniewski, one was allowed to resign. Everyone else in the case was simply shuttled elsewhere.

At a different time, Goleniewski fed in information which led to the arrest, conviction and sentence of Foreign Service Officer Irvin N. Scarbeck.

NEW CAREER

Shortly thereafter—though the CIA didn't want him over at the time—Goleniewski delivered himself up in West Germany. So ended his life as a KGB official with his own plane, able to fly anywhere he wanted in Soviet-bloc countries. And so began his career as a man leveling his finger at a roster of KGB agents on American payrolls.

The fact that he has been kept from testifying in secret before a congressional committee also was revealed by this newspaper yesterday. But nobody seems to know by whom.

PART OF RECORD

The story yesterday provoked U.S. Representative JOHN MILAN ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and sponsor of a recent bill calling for an investigation of the State Department, to say:

"I will have your story put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow."

"It demonstrates once again how the State Department is a privileged sanctuary riding out waves of criticism with arrogance and contempt for public opinion and the elected representatives of the people.

"Its record is one of failure and deceit. The time has come for a thorough house-cleaning."

Representative ASHBROOK said he hoped to be able to get Goleniewski to testify in secret before the Un-American Activities Committee. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee also has its eyes trained on the KGB defector.

FARLAND IGNORED

The Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress can be counted in on the act. They have perked up their interest in the recent flops of CIA and State abroad; especially the bumbling of both agencies in ignoring the counsel of our former Ambassador to Panama, Joseph S. Farland.

For months before his resignation last summer, Ambassador Farland had called the turn—and filed reports on—the widespread sabotage and revolutionary plots of Castro agents throughout the Caribbean, including Panama.

In the February 25 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Farland is quoted as follows:

"When I arrived home in August and the State Department circulated its customary notice to appropriate agencies listing returned ambassadors available for consultation, a man in the White House went to work.

"His name is Ralph Dungan. On whose authority he acted I do not know. But Mr. Dungan phoned the various agencies, including the Pentagon, that I was not to be invited for consultation."

ANOTHER QUOTE

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also quotes Mr. Farland as having been taken in hand on an earlier visit to Washington in the late fall of 1962 by Edwin Martin, then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs.

"Mr. Martin," Mr. Farland reported, "literally ordered me to have no contact with top CIA executives and any congressional leaders."

And Congress now is going to page Mr. Martin and Mr. Ralph Dungan, the mystery man who phoned from the White House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRUCE (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), beginning March 2, for indefinite period, on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. CHENOWETH, for balance of week, on account of official business with the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

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. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. NELSEN), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. NELSEN), for 30 minutes, Wednesday, March 4, 1964; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KILBURN and to include certain letters and statements.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. LINDSAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NELSEN) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. GLENN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. DINGELL.

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. 473. An act for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1237. An act for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kayo Fujimoto Howard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1597. An act for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotini Dimanopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1966. An act for the relief of Glenda Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1978. An act for the relief of Lillian P. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Francesco Mira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1985. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Cacciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1986. An act for the relief of Hattie Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9640. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 721. An act to amend section 124 of title 28, United States Code, to transfer Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton Counties from the Galveston division to the Houston division of the southern district of Texas.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 28, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8171. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 1964, 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:

1773. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Army as a result of awarding without competition a contract for overhaul and modification of aircraft engines; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1774. A letter from the President, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of Boys' Clubs of America for the year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9032. A bill to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control; with amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2040. An act to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to House Calendar.

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. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1203. A bill for the relief of Johanna Gristede; with amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2215. A bill for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2747. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. W. Gwin, Sr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Witold A. Lanowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6034. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6136. A bill for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6473. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6839. A bill for the relief of Helen J. Googins; with amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6267. A bill for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son; with amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6883. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7346. A bill for the relief of Cornelius Van Nuis, doctor of medicine, U.S. Public Health Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8201. A bill for the relief of Maj. Jack J. Shea, U.S. Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faye E. Russell Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8532. A bill for the relief of Ivan D. Beran; without amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8936. A bill for the relief of Leonard M. Dalton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9280. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Kent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9678. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Geyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9959. A bill for the relief of Harold A. Saly; without amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10078. A bill for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180). 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 Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10222. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10223. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10224. A bill to establish a system of loan insurance to assist students to attend institutions of higher education and postsecondary vocational schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 10225. A bill to prohibit interference with the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 10226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund to the States of certain taxes on distilled spirits and wine destroyed by fire, casualty, or act of God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10227. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10228. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake and Potholes Reservoir on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 10229. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10230. A bill to extend to State public assistance programs approved under titles XIV and XVI of the Social Security Act the special matching provisions presently in force with respect to certain Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10231. A bill to increase the rate of pension and the income limitation applicable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 10232. A bill to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 10233. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 10234. A bill to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10235. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 50 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10236. A bill to require that imported meat sold to the ultimate consumer be identified as such; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10237. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 10238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gilda Rosa McDaniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 10239. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Mourikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 10240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayse Cakiroglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 10241. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 10242. A bill for the relief of Gerald St. John; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 10243. A bill for the relief of Nicola Aliferi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10244. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Soued and Elie Soued; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 10245. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Arsenia Senires and her daughter, Milagros Senires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 10246. A bill for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U.S. Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 10247. A bill for the relief of Daniel Augusto da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

736. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold J. Wittenbauer, mayor, Borough of Dumont, Dumont, N.J., requesting support of the Gallagher bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

737. Also, petition of Kazys Simenas, chairman, American-Lithuanians, Norwood, Mass., relative to the liberation of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

738. Also, petition of Junsho Oshiro, mayor, Nishihara-Son, Okinawa, for early solution of the problem of pretreaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

739. Also, petition of Eiharu Nakamura, Naha, Okinawa, for expeditious solution of the problem of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

740. Also, petition of Terutake Oyadomari, Nishihara-Son, Okinawa, for early solution of the problem of pretreaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Outstanding Military Editor Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although military expenditures consume the major part of our Federal budget and have for many years, there are relatively few full time good military analysts available on daily newspapers, magazines, radio and television networks and other media.

One of the most independent, courageous, and honest reporters for many years has been Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, who regrettably retired on February 1, 1964, as military affairs editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Over a period of many years I have often had occasion to deal with highly technical, confidential, and controversial matters with General Phillips and basically, without exception, he was a straightforward, hard working, honest reporter.

The readers of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch will truly miss the analytical independent thinking and writing of General Phillips and we in the Congress will also be the poorer. I hope that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch will obtain the highest class replacement for General Phillips because his shoes are very difficult ones to fill.

I take this occasion to pay my respects to a retired military officer who after retirement became an outstanding journalist. The absence of his writings will

weaken the dialogue which those of us are engaged in as to how to improve America's military strength.

Bulgarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 85 years ago the people of Bulgaria attained their independence after centuries of domination by the Ottoman Empire.

For 66 years the Bulgarian people maintained their independence and developed their nation.

In September 1944 Soviet armies invaded Bulgaria and established a Communist puppet government. This Communist government was imposed by Soviet bayonets and the people of Bulgaria lost their independence. The last legitimate link to their independence was broken in 1946 when King Simeon was expelled from the nation by the puppet Communist regime.

The Bulgarian people are captives of communism—a fate they share with millions of other captives behind the Iron Curtain.

However, the spirit of independence, the desire for freedom, and the determination to persevere in the face of centuries of Ottoman rule inspired the Bulgarian groups in exile wage a relentless struggle against the Communist oppression of their homeland. The people of Bulgaria silently and effectively main-

tain their aspirations for legitimate independence. In Bulgaria itself they lack freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of political activity. In their hearts they steadfastly look forward to the day when their country will be free from the yoke of communism.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on this day we salute the people of Bulgaria, recognizing their steadfastness and their desire to wage a victorious struggle against the Communist regime which dominates them. Bulgarian Liberation Day is celebrated throughout the free world in a manner that cannot be celebrated in Bulgaria itself.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1964

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, February 24, 1964, marked the 46th anniversary of the establishment of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. I join with the millions of friends this cause has in the free world to commemorate this event with deep reverence.

Americans of Estonian origin or descent reaffirm and adhere to American democratic principles of government in observing their independence day. Let this tribute signify that the Republic of Estonia is by no means a forgotten nation in the hearts and minds of those in the free world who cherish freedom to make their own decision, live their own