

allies in American resolve and purpose. It would weaken resistance to Communist aggression and subversion the world over. And it would shake the free world coalition to its very foundations.

I am convinced that no one has yet come forward with the foolproof solution to the Vietnamese puzzle. The only thing that we know for certain is that there are no quick and easy answers.

In the absence of such a solution, I believe we have no choice but to support the course the President has charted—though recognizing, as we must, the gravity of the risks involved.

We can only hope that sooner or later the powers directing the Communist forces in Vietnam will be compelled to recognize the futility of their course of aggression, terror and subversion. Perhaps we may yet persuade the Communists by our determination, strength, and force that the road they are traveling will lead ultimately to their own destruction.

#### ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Irving Dilliard, and published in Chicago's American of June 13, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### TOPS IN POLITICAL FOOLISHNESS

(By Irving Dilliard)

A lot of nonsense is written and spoken about our system of government, but a special prize for political foolishness needs to be awarded to the current criticism of the Supreme Court because it handed down the "one-man, one-vote" decisions.

The basis of the argument runs like this: because the Supreme Court decided the reapportionment cases on the side of equal representation, the States have been thrown into a turmoil. Many legislatures are tied in knots. The Democrats and Republicans are wrangling at one State capital after another. Each party tries to outmaneuver the other for advantage. Meantime many pressing problems go not only unsolved, but unattended.

In some States special commissions are at work. In some States the matter is in the courts. In California the dispute over how the lines should be redrawn has reached such a pass that the State senate has even voted 27 to 12 to divide California into 2 separate States.

##### SOME REACT AS EXPECTED

Now isn't that just too bad. The adverse reaction to the one-man, one-vote decisions among some politicians is just what could have been expected. They want to keep things as they are, or to change them in their own favor, and to the disadvantage of the political opposition.

Many of them are not the least interested in equal representation. Indeed the more unequal the representation is in their favor the better they like it. And so they wring their hands and say what a misfortune it was that Chief Justice Warren and his colleagues ever put their foot in the "political thicket" of legislative and congressional redistricting.

In all honesty, does not the present situation prove how necessary it was for the Supreme Court to do just what it did? If there is all this weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth at the State capitals in the wake of the "one man one vote" decisions what chance did unorganized voters have to persuade the entrenched legislators from the underpopulated areas to vote to

reduce their own numbers and hence their own power?

##### INDEBTED TO TENNESSEE

The question answers itself. Here and there loss of seats forced reapportionment for Congress. But the State legislatures grew the worse out of line by the year. All the country owes a debt to the residents of Tennessee who took it as long as they could and then went to court.

And, we owe a debt to Kenneth Colegrove and his fellow Illinois citizens who fought a case to the Supreme Court nearly 20 years ago. They lost then, but they have the satisfaction of knowing that belatedly their position has been accepted in the Supreme Court as right.

The bleating about invading the domain of the States is unadulterated hooey. There would be no Supreme Court decisions or cases or even suits by citizens if the State legislators had been doing their constitutional duty all these years. A substantial number of States have already redistricted on the basis of fair population lines. Let the rest get busy and do likewise. If the States are so jealous of their authority, let them use it to guarantee equal votes to their taxpayers.

#### TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

##### ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 20. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 331); and

S. 32. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 332).

#### ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. SPARKMAN, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2149) for the relief of Mrs. Kwong Yeat Ying DockOn and her minor children, Helen, Earline, Benjamin, and Raymond DockOn, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] be ordered as a cosponsor of S. 2087.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 318, H.R. 8464.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8464) to provide for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures: Ephesians 2: 14: *For the Lord is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us.*

Almighty God, help us to learn the meaning of our days and may we see with a deeper insight and wonder that our beloved country has a distinct mission to break down the walls between us and to carve a new image in the arena of world history.

Give us a passionate involvement and attachment to the great spiritual reality that we all belong to the human race that is one in origin and destiny and that we are members of a universal fellowship of sympathy and service.

Gird us with wisdom and understanding to meet the wide-ranging issues and demands of mankind, bringing it new life, quickening it with a warmth of love and hope.

Grant that humanity may be truly a beloved community, having a sense of spiritual solidarity and a kinship, which adjusts human life, in all of its relationships to the ideals of our blessed Lord, in whose name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7750. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to

the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America, and for other purposes.

**DANIEL WALTER MILES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 204)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 4 p.m. on June 14, 1965, and said to contain H.R. 1867, an act for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles, and a veto message thereon.

Respectfully yours,  
RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 1867, for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles.

This legislation would authorize the payment of \$1,000 to Daniel Walter Miles, of Brockton, Mass. The payment would be in full settlement of Mr. Miles' claim against the United States under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 for compensation for certain property losses in the Philippine Islands during World War II as a result of Japanese bombing raids.

Mr. Miles' claim was evaluated by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the orderly procedures authorized by the Congress for the handling of such claims. There is no indication that the Commission failed to give this claim an adequate hearing or to follow the established procedures as it considered the case. In fact, the record shows that as the result of an appeal from the original decision, the Commission reconsidered the claim and rejected it a second time.

Mr. Miles was afforded still another opportunity to have his claim reviewed under Public Law 87-846 enacted in 1962 which, in effect, provided for further consideration of certain Philippine claims. However, he failed to file a claim under that statute prior to the deadline of January 15, 1965.

Under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, awards aggregating almost

\$500 million were paid in settlement of those claims found to be meritorious from among the more than one million claims filed. Many thousands of awards were made in amounts substantially below those sought by the claimants, and some 91,000 claims were denied in their entirety.

I can see no basis for going behind the settlement made by the Commission in this case. The record here contains no evidence which was not known to and considered by the Commission.

Under these circumstances and at this late date, to set aside the judgment of the Commission would entitle other disappointed claimants under that program to seek similar relief through private legislation. The result could be the reopening of this vast claims program, a result which I strongly believe to be neither desirable nor justified. If the bill did not lead to this result, it would have the equally undesirable and unjustified effect of granting preferential and discriminatory treatment to Mr. Miles.

For the foregoing reasons, I cannot approve H.R. 1867.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 1965.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There was no objection.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966**

Mr. MILLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. HALL. 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. 137]

Ayres	Hébert	Passman
Bonner	Holland	Pike
Bow	Huot	Pirnie
Bray	Ichord	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Keith	Resnick
Chamberlain	Lindsay	Rivers, Alaska
Clawson, Del	Love	St Germain
Corman	Macdonald	Stafford
Dingell	Mailliard	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Ala.	Vivian
Findley	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Fisher	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson,
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Charles H.
Hagan, Ga.	Moeller	Zablocki
Harvey, Ind.	Morton, Md.	

On this rollecall 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966**

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

**CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 513)**

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6767) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 46, 47, 50, and 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 12, 14, 24, 30, 31, 36, 38, 41, 42, 44, 48, 49, 51, and 54, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$49,080,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$105,846,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$34,513,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,445,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$32,366,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$26,177,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "one hundred and three passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-four shall be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$84,377,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,883,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$71,680,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,838,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,980,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,134,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,077,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,452,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,134,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$36,689,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "one hundred and nine"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 7, 28, and 35.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN REIFEL,  
JOSEPH M. McDADE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CARL HAYDEN,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
(except amendment No. 40),  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
KARL E. MUNDT,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers of the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

##### *Public land management*

##### *Bureau of Land Management*

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$49,080,000 for management of lands and resources

instead of \$46,080,000 as proposed by the House and \$52,080,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for soil and moisture conservation to be used for soil treatment, watershed management, and vegetation restoration in the Bureau of Land Management Districts in the States. Of this increased amount, \$120,000 will be available for administration of the expanded program.

##### *Bureau of Indian Affairs*

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$105,846,000 for education and welfare services instead of \$105,761,000 as proposed by the House and \$106,448,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is to provide funds to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe for maintenance of law and order.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$42,796,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate instead of \$42,756,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$34,513,000 for construction instead of \$32,855,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,296,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$700,000 for the construction of the Lower Two Medicine Lake Dam on the North Fork of Two Medicine Creek; \$400,000 for an agency office building on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota; and \$558,000 for a school at Dunsheith, North Dakota.

Amendment No. 6: Removes Wyoming from the restriction on the acquisition of land outside of Indian Reservations.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The House conferees will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 8: Eliminates Senate language providing \$450,000 to the Tularosa New Mexico School District No. 4.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$17,445,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of \$16,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,605,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$320,000 for the construction of a road from Crystal, New Mexico, to connect with an existing road to Navajo, New Mexico; and \$225,000 for the improvement of 16 miles of roads on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona.

The conferees are in agreement that in addition to the direct appropriation of \$4,520,000 for general administrative expenses, \$1,615,000 of program funds will be available for general administrative expenses.

##### *National Park Service*

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$32,366,000 for management and protection instead of \$32,228,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,596,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$50,000 for natural science studies; \$38,000 for land appraisal staff; and \$50,000 planning funds for a park below Greers Ferry Dam, Arkansas.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$26,177,000 for construction instead of \$26,077,000 as proposed by the House and \$26,368,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$100,000 for an addition to the present concession building at the Mt. Rushmore National Monument, South Dakota.

The conferees agree that within available funds, under construction (liquidation of

contract authorization) \$120,000 may be used for construction of an access road to the visitor center at the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$2,465,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,450,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for additional travel costs.

Amendment No. 13: Provides for purchase of not to exceed 103 passenger motor vehicles, of which 94 shall be for replacement only, instead of 94 as proposed by the House and 112 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

##### Land and Water Conservation Fund

Amendment No. 14: Allocates \$1,440,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Allocates \$84,377,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for assistance to States instead of \$90,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$79,576,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Allocates \$21,883,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the National Park Service instead of \$21,600,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,098,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$83,000 for Capitol Reef National Monument, Utah; and \$200,000 for the Edison National Historic Site, New Jersey.

Amendments Nos. 17, 19, and 20: Deletes amendments proposed by the Senate in connection with the purchase of additional lands for the protection of Whooping Cranes and other rare and endangered bird species.

Amendment No. 18: Allocates \$17,300,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the Forest Service instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,785,150 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$300,000 for Forest Service Wilderness areas in Idaho and \$5,000,000 for the Sylvania tract in Michigan.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes Senate language on the condemnation of land in Wyoming.

#### The Alaska Railroad

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$4,100,000 for payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Mineral Resources

##### Geological Survey

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$71,680,870 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of \$71,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$72,480,870 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$380,870 to expand the Federal program for obtaining and coordinating water resources data and for water resources research; \$200,000 for removal of sediment in the Gila River, Arizona.

##### Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$31,891,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$31,541,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$350,000 to continue the Bureau of Mines program in Alaska at its present level.

The conferees are in agreement that the laboratory at Boulder City, Nevada shall not be transferred to Reno during fiscal year 1966, pending a more thorough analysis of its effects and of the actual savings that would result from such transfer.

#### Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$7,220,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$6,945,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,595,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$275,000 for the development of a method to use coal ash and fly ash for the manufacture of brick.

#### Fish and Wildlife Service

##### Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$21,838,000 for management and investigation of resources instead of \$21,218,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,268,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$150,000 for initiating a study of increasing mortality of Pacific Coast Oysters; \$270,000 for the establishment of an ocean engineering program, of which \$180,000 is for refinement and development of techniques for exploiting midwater species and \$90,000 is for the development of efficient harvesting devices for Alaska shrimp resources; and \$200,000 to initiate research to revitalize the Great Lakes fishing industry.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$1,980,000 for construction instead of \$1,905,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,080,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$75,000 to complete construction and installation of fish screens in the Salmon River Drainage, Idaho.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The conferees will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment providing that any unobligated balance as of June 30, 1965 of the amount appropriated for the construction of fishing vessels in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965 shall be transferred to and merged with the 1966 appropriation under this head. The conferees are in agreement that this action shall not establish a precedent for future years.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$4,800,000 for Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Allocates \$300,000 for administration of Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Allocates \$400,000 under section 4(b) of Public Law 88-309 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that of this amount \$100,000 will be available to continue the special cooperative study to develop a virus resistant oyster in the four middle Atlantic States.

Amendment No. 32: Allocates \$4,100,000 under section 5(a) of Public Law 88-309 instead of \$3,750,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$36,134,300 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$35,324,300 as proposed by the House and \$36,814,300 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$20,000 additional funds for cooperative fish units consisting of \$10,000 at the University of Georgia and \$10,000 at North Carolina State College; \$160,000 for the establishment of four cooperative fish units at \$40,000 each for Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of Hawaii, Oregon State University and Iowa State University; \$45,000 for expansion of sport fishing research in the North Central Reservoir area; \$350,000 for expansion of the program concerned with rare and endangered American wildlife species; \$40,000 for the establish-

ment of a fishery management project in Vermont; \$195,000, consisting of \$150,000 for the increased operation of the research vessel and \$45,000 for the increased operation of the fish behavior tank, at the Atlantic Marine Game Fish Research Center, Sandy Hook, New Jersey.

The conferees are in agreement that, within the funds available for the predatory animal and injurious rodent control program, special emphasis shall be given to control of foxes and coyotes in areas where they are a significant hazard to sheep, and to the control of muskrats in Arkansas.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$7,077,200 for construction instead of \$5,115,500 as proposed by the House and \$7,943,700 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$150,000 for initiation of recreational development, Camp Cornelia, Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia; \$400,000 for initiation of development and rehabilitation, Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma; \$20,000 for purchase of land, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota; \$100,000 for planning of the marine game laboratory on the western Gulf of Mexico; \$50,000 for repair of existing docking facilities, Atlantic Marine Game Fish Research Center, New Jersey; and funds for construction at the following National Fish Hatcheries: Lahontan, Nevada, \$374,000; Bozeman, Montana, \$100,000; Mammoth Spring, Arkansas, \$122,000; Valley City, North Dakota, \$100,700; Kooskia, Idaho, \$255,000; Craig Brook, Maine, \$210,000; and Gavins Point, South Dakota, \$80,000.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment authorizing acquisition of land at the Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota.

#### Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,487,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,425,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$4,452,200 for salaries and expenses instead of \$4,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,454,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$2,200 provided over the House bill is for part-time messenger service for the departmental office of congressional liaison and the budget office.

Amendment No. 38: Increases the limitation on consultants funds from \$175,000 as proposed by the House to \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

##### Department of Agriculture

##### Forest Service

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$162,318,000 for forest land management instead of \$160,671,000 as proposed by the House and \$163,833,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$122,000 for Blanchard Springs Caverns, Arkansas; \$300,000 to accelerate the rate of reforestation; \$400,000 to meet increased costs of applying and monitoring non-persistent pesticides; \$50,000 for recreation planning, Trout Pond area, George Washington National Forest, West Virginia; \$200,000 for recreation and development work, Monroe Reservoir, Wayne Hoosier National Forest, Indiana; \$75,000 for recreation management, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Superior National Forest, Minnesota; and \$500,000 for fire protection and air tanker service.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$36,689,000 for forest research instead of \$32,939,000

as proposed by the House and \$38,777,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$425,000 for construction of a forestry services laboratory, Missoula, Montana; \$390,000 for construction of a forest engineering laboratory, Houghton, Michigan; \$1,280,000 for construction of headquarters, Rocky Mountain Forest Experimental Station, Fort Collins, Colorado; \$250,000 for construction of a naval stores and timber production laboratory, Olustee, Florida; \$190,000 for construction of a silviculture laboratory, Sewanee, Tennessee; \$20,000 for preparation of design and specifications of a tree seed laboratory, State College, Mississippi; \$35,000 for completion of greenhouse facilities, Great Plains Shelterbelt Laboratory, Bottineau, North Dakota; \$150,000 for the Beaver Creek Project, Arizona Watershed Program; \$450,000 for forest fire research to be divided evenly among the laboratories at Riverside, California, Missoula, Montana, and Macon, Georgia; \$150,000 for increased research at Alexandria, Louisiana; \$100,000 for forest fire and insect research, College, Alaska; \$60,000 for additional research on timber, Watershed Management and Wildlife Habitat, Forest Research Laboratory, Rapid City, South Dakota; \$90,000 for accelerated research on maple sap production in the Northeast United States; \$75,000 for recreation research, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Superior National Forest, Minnesota; \$45,000 for staffing at the Forest Hydrology Laboratory, Wenatchee, Washington; and \$40,000 for staffing at the watershed management laboratory, Parsons, West Virginia.

#### Forest Roads and Trails

##### (Liquidation of contract authorization)

The conferees are in agreement that during fiscal year 1966 the Forest Service shall design and plan from funds available for its national road program the section of the Lamolle Canyon, Nevada, road within the Humboldt National Forest.

#### Acquisition of Lands for National Forests— Special Acts

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Appropriate \$80,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$70,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill provides an additional \$10,000 for use in Cache National Forest, Utah, to minimize erosion and flood damage.

#### Administrative Provisions, Forest Service

Amendments Nos. 43 and 44: Provide for purchase of not to exceed 109 passenger motor vehicles, including 101 for replacement, instead of 101 as proposed by the House and 114 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Public Health Service

Amendment No. 45: Appropriate \$13,950,000 for construction of Indian health facilities instead of \$9 million as proposed by the House and \$14,450,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for the construction of a planned medical facility in Phoenix, Ariz. The conferees are in agreement that if an additional \$500,000 is needed to complete this structure, such funds may be included in subsequent appropriations.

#### National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$800,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$888,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$18,468,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$19,211,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: Approve technical clarification of language.

#### Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Veterans' Administration

#### Construction, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$1,400,000 for construction of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the amount appropriated herein is the absolute maximum that will be made available for this purpose. In the event that it is later found that this amount is not sufficient to finance the structure as presently planned, the plans and specifications shall be revised accordingly. The conferees further agree that final plans for this structure shall be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for approval by that agency to make certain that proposed construction can be accomplished within funds made available by this appropriation before any contract is let for such construction.

#### Lewis and Clark Trail Commission

Amendment No. 52: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to make this appropriation available January 1, 1965.

#### Transitional grants to Alaska

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$4,500,000 for transitional grants to Alaska instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Federal development planning committees for Alaska

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$174,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

WINIFIELD K. DENTON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN REIFEL,  
JOSEPH M. McDADE,

#### Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the information contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, I wish to make this additional statement regarding the conference report:

The conference total is \$1,212,739,070.

The conference report compared with:

Appropriations, 1965.....	+\$134,736,800
Budget estimates, 1966.....	-28,830,430
House bill.....	+28,648,770
Senate bill.....	-18,063,700

In addition, the bill carries a borrowing authorization for the helium program of \$16 million, a reduction of \$780,000 in the budget estimate.

I would like to point out that included in the amount approved by the conference over the House bill are several items totaling approximately \$6.7 million that undoubtedly would have been included in the House bill had they been in proper order at the time the House considered the budget estimate. This amount includes \$4½ million for transitional grants to Alaska; \$700,000 for construction of the Lower Two Medicine Dam; \$174,000 for Federal development planning committees for Alaska; and \$1,-

400,000 for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.

In addition, of the amount added in conference, approximately \$7.1 million represents funding for construction projects for which planning funds had been approved by both Houses of the Congress in 1964 and the plans for these projects are now completed with construction ready to begin.

I believe I can properly state that all of the items in conference received the earnest and extensive consideration of the conferees and the conference report we present to you today while it provides the minimum funds essential for carrying out the various laws and programs approved by the Congress, provides sufficient funding for all of the agencies involved to discharge their obligations in a satisfactory manner.

I would like to further state that the majority of increases approved in the conference truly represents an investment in America. For example, the conference reports an increase of \$3 million for soil and moisture conservation to be used for soil treatment, watershed management, and vegetation restoration in the Bureau of Land Management districts in the States. These are lands owned by the Federal Government and investment of these funds at this time cannot help but enhance their value in the future.

Likewise, \$7 million of the increase approved by the conferees, the greater part of which is for construction of schools and medical facilities, represents continued fulfillment of our obligations to the Indians. A sizable amount of the increase over the House bill as approved by the conferees, is related to an investment in the forest products and fishery industry which cannot help but improve the economy of these industries in the future, and will undoubtedly also contribute to the welfare of our national economy if properly administered.

Unfortunately, all items are not included in the conference report that various individuals desired. We regret that we cannot please everyone, but of necessity we must draw a line somewhere. One of these items involved expansion of facilities at the McKinney Lake National Fish Hatchery in North Carolina. Our good colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] presented a forceful plea in conference for approval of this item. However, the conferees followed a policy of approving only the so-called budget dropouts in this category. To have approved this item would have necessitated favorable consideration of many other items of equal priority.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated previously, I believe the funding program as proposed in this conference report, will provide a well-balanced financial plan for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1966, and merits the approval of the House.

At this point in the RECORD, with your permission, I would like to insert a summary tabulation of the action taken on the various items in this bill.

Summary tabulation, Interior Department and related agencies appropriation bill, 1966

	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
<b>Title I—Department of the Interior:</b>							
Public land management.....	\$451,259,000	\$410,802,000	\$424,549,000	\$417,483,000	-\$33,776,000	+\$6,681,000	-\$7,066,000
Mineral resources.....	123,136,000	121,326,000	123,706,870	122,531,870	-604,130	+1,205,870	-1,175,000
Fish and wildlife.....	77,926,000	82,938,800	90,082,000	87,205,500	+9,279,500	+4,266,700	-2,876,500
Office of Saline Water.....	29,000,000	22,485,000	22,485,000	22,485,000	-6,515,000		
Office of Water Resources Research.....	5,890,000	5,890,000	5,890,000	5,890,000			
Office of the Solicitor.....	4,479,000	4,425,000	4,487,000	4,487,000	+8,000	+62,000	
Office of the Secretary.....	4,479,000	4,450,000	4,454,400	4,452,200	-26,800	+2,200	-2,200
Total, definite appropriations.....	696,169,000	652,316,800	675,654,270	664,534,570	-31,634,430	+12,217,770	-11,119,700
Total appropriation of receipts.....	137,454,000	137,454,000	137,454,000	137,454,000			
Total borrowing authority.....	16,780,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-780,000		
Total annual contract authority.....	12,500,000				-12,500,000		
Total, title I—Interior.....	862,903,000	805,770,800	829,108,270	817,988,570	-44,914,430	+12,217,770	-11,119,700
<b>Title II—Related agencies:</b>							
<b>Department of Agriculture:</b>							
<b>Forest Service:</b>							
Definite appropriations.....	292,117,000	290,795,000	299,795,000	296,192,000	+4,075,000	+5,397,000	-3,603,000
Appropriation of receipts.....	770,000	770,000	780,000	780,000	+10,000	+10,000	
Total, Forest Service.....	292,887,000	291,565,000	300,575,000	296,972,000	+4,085,000	+5,407,000	-3,603,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	71,500	71,500	71,500	71,500			
Commission of Fine Arts.....	123,000	123,000	123,000	123,000			
<b>Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:</b>							
<b>Public Health Service, Indian health activities.....</b>							
Indian Claims Commission.....	75,181,000	75,193,000	80,643,000	80,143,000	+4,962,000	+4,950,000	-500,000
National Capitol Planning Commission.....	347,000	347,000	347,000	347,000			
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	1,000,000	800,000	888,000	800,000	-200,000		-88,000
National Council on the Arts.....	490,000				-490,000		
Public Land Law Review Commission.....	150,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	-100,000		
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,000,000				-1,000,000		
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	28,417,000	26,020,000	26,763,000	26,020,000	-2,397,000		-743,000
Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000			
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission.....	1,435,000	25,000	1,435,000	1,425,000	-10,000	+1,400,000	-10,000
Transitional grants to Alaska.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000			
Federal development planning committees for Alaska.....	6,500,000		6,500,000	4,500,000	-2,000,000	+4,500,000	-2,000,000
	200,000		174,000	174,000	-26,000	+174,000	
Total, definite appropriations.....	407,156,500	393,549,500	416,914,500	409,970,500	+2,814,000	+16,421,000	-6,944,000
Total appropriation of receipts.....	770,000	770,000	780,000	780,000	+10,000	+10,000	
Total, title II—Related agencies.....	407,926,500	394,319,500	417,694,500	410,750,500	+2,824,000	+16,431,000	-6,944,000
<b>Grand total:</b>							
Definite appropriations.....	1,103,325,500	1,045,866,300	1,092,568,770	1,074,505,070	-28,820,430	+28,638,770	-18,063,700
Appropriation of receipts.....	138,224,000	138,224,000	138,234,000	138,234,000	+10,000	+10,000	
Borrowing authority.....	16,780,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-780,000		
Annual contract authority.....	12,500,000				-12,500,000		
Total.....	1,270,829,500	1,200,090,300	1,246,802,770	1,228,739,070	-42,090,430	+28,648,770	-18,063,700

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 5, line 19, insert: "Provided, That not to exceed \$85,000 of this appropriation shall be made available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe for maintenance of law and order."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7. Page 6, line 25, insert: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$558,000 shall be for assistance to the Dunseith, North Dakota, Public School District No. 1, for construction of an addition to the Dunseith Public School."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 24, line 6, insert: "Provided, That in addition, any unobligated balance as of June 30, 1965, of the amount appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: "Provided, That lands or interests therein needed for the Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota, may be acquired by purchase, or by exchange of lands of approximately equal value."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the final action by the House and, we presume, by the other body on the first annual appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966. This final agreement on the first such bill comes 2 weeks earlier this year than was the case last year.

The public works and defense appropriation bills are scheduled for consideration by our full Committee on Appropriations later this week and to be considered in the House next week. This will leave only two additional regular bills—foreign assistance and military construction—and the necessary supplementals. We are ready with the military construction bill but the related authorization bill has

not yet cleared Congress so we cannot move the appropriation bill until that happens. We would also have been ready with the foreign assistance bill except for the fact that the foreign aid authorization bill has not cleared Congress.

The defense appropriation bill was ready for committee action in late April but has been delayed until next week on account of lack of authorization. Under the circumstances, we are moving along about as well as we can with these bills and we hope that all of them can be cleared through the House prior to the first day of the new fiscal year, July 1.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a status report of action by the House and the Senate thus far this session in connection with the appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. The table I am inserting reflects amounts approved in supplemental bills for the current fiscal year 1965 and the regular bills for fiscal 1966.

The House cut the budget requests on the eight regular bills for 1966 by \$1,154 million in addition to reductions of \$250 million from 1965 supplemental requests.

In the two regular bills for 1966 which the other body has cleared, and in which it considered substantial amendatory budget requests sent there after House action, \$1,140 million was added to the House bills but the total of the two was held to about \$61 million below the budget amounts.

As already indicated, the report on this first bill to clear conference carries total appropriations of \$1,212,739,070 plus a loan authorization of \$16 million. The appropriation total is \$28,810,430 below the applicable budget estimates; \$18,063,700 below the Senate total; and \$28,648,770 above the original House bill.

The summary table follows:

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess., as of June 15, 1965

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations<sup>1</sup> under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	House			
	Budget estimates to House	Date passed	Amount as passed	Compared with budget estimates
<b>1965 SUPPLEMENTALS</b>				
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	\$1,742,209,000	Jan. 26	\$1,600,000,000	-\$142,209,000
Second supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,226,456,933	Apr. 6	2,118,333,083	-108,123,850
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	May 5	700,000,000	
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,668,665,933		4,418,333,083	-250,332,850
<b>1966 APPROPRIATIONS</b>				
District of Columbia (H.R. 6453)	(387,467,800)	Mar. 23	(356,300,500)	(-31,167,300)
Federal payment	53,122,000		44,122,000	-9,000,000
Loan authorization	(26,311,900)		(26,311,900)	
Interior (H.R. 6767)	1,240,849,500	Mar. 30	1,184,090,300	-56,759,200
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)		(16,000,000)	(-780,000)
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 7060)	6,708,510,000	Apr. 5	6,604,404,000	-104,106,000
Labor-HEW (H.R. 7765)	8,293,814,000	May 4	7,964,034,000	-329,780,000
Independent offices (H.R. 7997)	14,531,023,000	May 11	14,109,908,000	-421,115,000
Agriculture (H.R. 8370)	5,815,134,000	May 26	5,717,832,000	-97,302,000
Loan authorizations	(787,000,000)		(787,000,000)	
State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary (H.R. 8639)	2,167,735,600	June 1	2,085,689,900	-82,045,700
Legislative (H.R. 8775)	204,872,222	June 8	150,589,107	-54,283,115
Total, 1966 bills to date	39,015,060,322		37,860,669,307	-1,154,391,015
Total, all appropriations to date	43,683,726,255		42,279,002,390	-1,404,723,865
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)		(829,311,900)	(-780,000)

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations<sup>1</sup> under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Senate			Compared with—		Final appropriation		Public law	
	Budget estimates to Senate	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved	Final action compared with budget estimates	No.	Date approved
<b>1965 SUPPLEMENTALS</b>									
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	\$1,742,209,000	Feb. 3	\$1,600,000,000	-\$142,209,000		\$1,600,000,000	-\$142,209,000	89-2	Feb. 11
Second supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,280,251,327	Apr. 27	2,257,869,415	-22,381,912	+\$139,536,332	2,227,563,977	-52,687,350	89-16	Apr. 30
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	May 6	700,000,000			700,000,000		89-18	May 7
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,722,460,327		4,557,869,415	-164,590,912	+139,536,332	4,527,563,977	-194,896,350		
<b>1966 APPROPRIATIONS</b>									
District of Columbia (H.R. 6453)									
Federal payment									
Loan authorization									
Interior (H.R. 6767)	1,241,549,500	May 26	1,230,802,770	-10,746,730	+46,712,470	1,212,739,070	-28,810,430		
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)		(16,000,000)	(-780,000)		(16,000,000)	(-780,000)		
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 7060)	7,749,770,000	June 8	7,698,669,000	-51,101,000	+1,094,265,000				
Labor-HEW (H.R. 7765)									
Independent offices (H.R. 7997)									
Agriculture (H.R. 8370)									
Loan authorizations									
State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary (H.R. 8639)									
Legislative (H.R. 8775)									
Total, 1966 bills to date	8,991,319,500		8,929,471,770	-61,847,730	+1,140,977,470	1,212,739,070	-28,810,430		
Total, all appropriations to date	13,713,779,827		13,487,341,185	-226,438,642	+1,280,513,802	5,740,303,047	-223,706,780		
Total, loan authorizations	(16,780,000)		(16,000,000)	(-780,000)		(16,000,000)	(-780,000)		

<sup>1</sup> Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$12,300,000,000 for fiscal year 1966.

NOTE.—Bills yet to be reported to the House: Public works; defense; military construction; foreign assistance; and necessary supplementals.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss another tragedy which occurred in the District of Columbia yesterday. This morning I was visited by a very fine lady who is a native of my home county. She is a registered nurse who has spent her life ministering to others. On yesterday she was the victim of a vicious rape and assault at a neighbor's home on Naylor Road SE., in the District of Columbia.

This lady responded to a call for help from the home of her neighbor, an elderly lady, 79 years of age. Her reward for this humanitarian effort was a vicious assault and rape.

The elderly lady, 79 years of age, to whose cry she responded, was pistol whipped and is today lying at the point of death in a hospital here in the District of Columbia. The husband of this 79-year-old victim was a longtime employee of the House of Representatives and is a bedridden invalid and was home at the time the criminal acts occurred.

I think that most of us have read with deep feeling of this assault and the tying up of a laundryman and gagging him and robbing him of \$275 while the misconduct was in progress. He had stopped by the home of the elderly couple in the course of his business.

Mr. Speaker, this fine lady, in talking to me, said, "Can't you folks do something about our laws?" Another statement she made was: "Are we women to be treated like animals here in Washington?"

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives has undertaken to do something about local deplorable crime conditions by the passing of the omnibus crime bill on two occasions. I would hope that others in Washington and in the Congress would have the same zeal which we have displayed for the protection of people who live in this splendid community but who are today the victims of crimes such as this one, in their homes at 10:45 in the morning.

Final action on the omnibus crime bill is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article reporting the incident.

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

MAN BEATS WOMAN, 79, RAPES HER NEIGHBOR  
(By Alfred E. Lewis, Washington Post staff writer)

A daylight intruder pistol whipped a 79-year-old Anacostia woman in her home yesterday, raped a neighbor drawn by the moans, and robbed a laundry driver who happened by, police reported.

Investigators said the assailant, wearing a white straw hat, left the rape victim and

driver tied in the home and the older woman bleeding and dazed.

Her 84-year-old invalid husband was in another room, unaware of what had happened, police said.

Officers were told the two women had seen the man walk by outside as they hung out clothing in the backyards in the Fairlawn section of Anacostia.

They returned to their homes and the older woman was standing in her dining room when she was struck on the head with a pistol about 10:45 a.m., police said. She turned around, seeing the same man she had noticed earlier, and was struck again.

The man took \$45 from a change purse in her pocket. Then, police said, Ralph H. Jennings, 59, of 1 Beauford Road, Morningside, Md., a driver for Bergmann's Laundry, knocked on the door to tell the 79-year-old woman her draperies were not ready yet.

He was told to come in, Jennings said, then was robbed of \$275 and trussed up in a bedroom with an extension cord and belt and gagged with a handkerchief.

Meanwhile, the next-door neighbor had heard the commotion and came to see what was wrong. When she saw a man leaning over the older woman, police said, the neighbor exclaimed, "My God, did she fall and hurt herself?"

Then the neighbor woman was ordered at gunpoint to undress and the man attempted to rape her on a living room couch, police continued. He then led her to a hallway and she asked her attacker, "Would you do this to your mother or sister?"

He answered, "Lady, I'm a narcotics addict, and I've got to have money for my contact," she said.

The older woman began to stagger toward them. The man pointed the pistol at her, but the neighbor begged him not to hurt her any more she said.

The man then raped the 54-year-old woman in the hallway, she added, and afterward tied her with a necktie and a belt and gagged her with her slip. Eventually Jennings worked himself free, untied the neighbor woman, and she called police.

The older woman was reported in serious condition at Casualty Hospital with head cuts and a concussion. The 54-year-old woman was treated by her physician.

Police described the intruder as a Negro, 30 to 40 years old, 5 feet 10 to 6 feet, 170 pounds.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3014, TO REGULATE THE LABELING AND ADVERTISING OF CIGARETTES

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 421, Rept. No. 515), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

#### H. RES. 421

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. 3014) to regulate the labeling and advertis-

ing of cigarettes, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

#### MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### CHARLES MAROWITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1445) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### ESTATE OF R. M. CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 856) for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

#### S. 856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and

directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of R. M. Clark, the sum of \$39,567.67, representing the amount reported by the United States Court of Claims to the Congress in response to S. Res. 344, Eighty-fifth Congress (congressional number 10-58, decided July 17, 1964). The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the estate of the late R. M. Clark (an individual formerly doing business as Lenoir City Alcoa Bus Lines) against the United States for losses sustained as a result of the operation by the said R. M. Clark of motor buses for the necessary transportation of nonresident employees of the Clinton Engineer Works, between points in or about Lenoir City, Tennessee, and the Clinton Engineer Works reservation (subsequently the Atomic Energy Commission installation) at Oak Ridge, Tennessee: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Passed the Senate March 11, 1965.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,  
Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EDWARD V. AMASON AND EMERITA CECILIA AMADOR AMASON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1473) for the relief of Edward V. Amason and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### ESTATE OF DONOVAN C. MOFFETT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1481) for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1481

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, for the purposes of laws and regulations relating to national service life insurance, the late Donovan C. Moffett, of Cortland, New York, shall be deemed to have made timely payment to the Veterans' Administration of the March 1963 premium on his national service life insurance five-year level premium term policy (V-2414184), the said Donovan C. Moffett having been physically and mentally incapable of attending to any business matters from February 26, 1963, until the date of his death, April 16, 1963.

With the following committee amendment:

Sec. 2. Any insurance benefits paid under the authority of this Act shall be made from the national service life insurance appropriation, and the amount so paid shall be

reduced by the amount of any unpaid premiums upon the policy referred to in this Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LT. THOMAS A. FARRELL, U.S. NAVY, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2913) for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2913

*Be it enacted by the State and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the hereinafter named persons are hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the amount listed opposite their names or such lesser amounts as may be outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act. Such amounts represent erroneous payments, through no fault of the payees, of temporary lodging allowances and overseas housing allowances incident to the change of permanent duty station of Patrol Squadron 4, United States Navy, from Naha, Okinawa, to Barbers Point, Hawaii, effective November 15, 1963:

Lieutenant Thomas A. Farrell, United States Navy, Medical Corps, \$1,350;

Lieutenant James D. Guyle, United States Navy, \$1,125;

Lieutenant Kenneth I. Bergstrom, United States Navy, \$378;

Lieutenant William R. Broadwell, United States Navy, \$292.50;

Lieutenant Commander Thomas R. Cate, United States Navy, \$1,080;

Lieutenant (junior grade) Robert J. Dana-her, United States Navy, \$90;

Lieutenant Richard E. Dupree, United States Navy, \$315;

Lieutenant Larry Hebert, United States Navy, \$378;

Lieutenant Commander William E. Heyl, United States Navy, \$711.10;

Lieutenant Donald C. Klein, United States Navy, \$1,620;

Lieutenant Commander Henry P. Krienke, United States Navy, \$945;

Lieutenant (junior grade) Vincent K. Olstad, United States Naval Reserve, \$126;

Lieutenant (junior grade) Daniel L. Rush, United States Navy, \$648;

Lieutenant William W. Turkington, United States Navy, \$351;

Lieutenant Gary L. Wachter, United States Navy, \$961.60;

Lieutenant Daniel D. Weber, United States Navy, \$202.50;

Lieutenant Commander Robert Wunderlich, United States Navy, \$1,485.

Sec. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of all certifying and disbursing officers of the United States, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to any person named in the first section of this Act, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to

the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOANNE MARIE EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3103) for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AT TINKER AIR FORCE BASE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3750) for the relief of certain individuals.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That each individual named in section 2 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his name, which amount represents an overpayment of compensation received by him from October 21, 1962, to July 5, 1964, both dates inclusive, while employed at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The individuals referred to in the first section of this Act and the amount of the liability of each of them, are as follows:

Name:	Amount
Hightower, Arthur O.....	\$258.80
Fleming, Bettye J.....	298.88
Akin, Edward L.....	408.29
Brown, Evelyn D.....	354.76
Moore, Mary L.....	319.89
Cavener, Dorothy T.....	357.12
Azeltine, Lena L.....	318.42
Buswell, Mary L.....	356.08
Buchanan, Ancel L.....	474.40
Patrick, Lucille.....	316.80
Gray, Donald J.....	208.55
Ozeretny, Jerry E.....	255.29
Pettit, Alva F.....	493.60
Benson, Lloyd A.....	494.72
Skinner, Norman L.....	199.55
Carothers, J. C.....	511.92

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual listed in section 2 of this Act an amount equal to the aggregate amount paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike "October 21, 1962, to July 5, 1964," and insert "October 14, 1962, through August 29, 1964."

Page 2, in the list of names following line 3, after "Hightower," strike "Arthur" and insert "Artur" and after "Patrick," strike "Lucille" and insert "A. Lucille".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JONG WAN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3900) for the relief of Jong Wan Lee.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

#### CAPT. TED M. RICHARDSON, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4027) for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force.

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

Mr. McEWEN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

#### CAPT. RICHARD A. INGRAM AND CAPT. ARTHUR R. SPROTT, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4028) for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

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

Mr. McEWEN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

#### LT. COL. JOHN E. McROBERTS AND T. SGT. HAROLD C. FISHER, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4029) for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

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

Mr. McEWEN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

#### DEDRICK A. MAANUM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4070) for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

#### LT. COL. JOHN W. CASSELL, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4324) for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4324

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel John W. Cassell, ~~XXXXXX~~ United States Army, of Fort Riley, Kansas, the sum of \$3,651.20 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed aboard the United States ship Alcoa Planter, a carrier under Government contract, which caught fire in the harbor at Bremerhaven, Germany, on February 1, 1963. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOSEPHINE C. RUMLEY, ADMINIS- TRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF GEORGE S. RUMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4719) for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4719

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the*

Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$11,667.06 to Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley, which amount was fixed by the United States Court of Claims in its decision in congressional case numbered 4-61, decided January 22, 1965, as the sum due the estate in full settlement of its claims against the United States for amounts due by reason of performance of work on contract numbered DA-30-280-QM-12130 by the decedent, George S. Rumley, doing business as the George S. Rumley Shoe Manufacturing Company, but which was withheld by the Government. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 30 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. RUTH GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5206) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gorfain.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### GORDON E. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5265) for the relief of Gordon E. Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5265

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gordon E. Martin, San Diego, California, is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$235.44, representing the amount paid by the United States for temporary storage of his household effects for the periods April 8, 1952, to October 7, 1952, and April 7, 1953, to October 7, 1953. The said Gordon E. Martin could have avoided such liability by having such household effects shipped, at a cost to the United States in excess of \$1,500, to his new duty stations at the time of his changes of permanent duty stations during his active service with the United States Navy in 1952 and 1953. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which the said Gordon E. Martin is relieved of liability by this Act.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WIDOW AND MINOR CHILDREN OF REV. DONALD AKSEL OLSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5471) for the relief of the widow and minor

children of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5471

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of determining the entitlement of the survivors of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen (social security account numbered xxx-xx-xxxx) to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of his wages and self-employment income (and for purposes of determining the amount of such benefits), the said Donald Aksel Olsen shall be held and considered to have filed a valid waiver certificate under section 1402(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on (and effective from and after) June 16, 1957.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN HENRY TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5819) for the relief of John Henry Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5819

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John Henry Taylor, of Columbus, Georgia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$923.51, representing the amount of salary overpayment received by him from the Post Office Department in the periods of January 1, 1953, through November 30, 1957, and January 11, 1958, through September 15, 1962, due to administrative error in the certification of service for longevity credit and without fault on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.*

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Henry Taylor, of Columbus, Georgia, the sum certified to him by the Postmaster General as the aggregate of amounts paid to the United States by John Henry Taylor and amounts withheld by the United States from sums otherwise due him from the United States on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the preceding sentence shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WILLIAM RADKOVICH CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5613) for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5613

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, arising out of contracts numbered W-04-353-eng-2036 and W-04-353-eng-2050, against the United States for the reasonable value, computed as of the time when made, of any reasonable and necessary changes and increases beyond the terms of said contracts made at the direction of the contracting officer and also including any additional or increased costs incident to delays and difficulties encountered due to unusual construction problems and unusual weather conditions, for which the said William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, was not compensated because of the provisions of section 12 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 565), which precluded payment of more than \$7,500 per unit for the construction of temporary family quarters: *Provided*, That the suit herein authorized shall be instituted within six months from the date of the approval of this Act: *And provided further*, That any judgment entered by the United States Court of Claims pursuant to the jurisdiction conferred by this Act shall not exceed \$350,000.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LT. COL. JAMES P. HUBBARD, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5815) for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army.

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa? There was no objection.

#### SGT. DONALD R. HURRLE, U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5839) for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurrle, U.S. Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5839

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sergeant Donald R. Hurrle, United States Marine Corps, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$129.49, representing the amount of compensation earned by him during the period July 30, 1963, through August 8, 1963, as an employee of the Bostonia station of the El Cajon, California, post office when, through a misunderstanding, he continued his employment at the post office while officially in the Marine Corps on advance leave.*

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sergeant Donald R. Hurrle, an

amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid by him or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CECIL GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5902) for the relief of Cecil Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5902

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cecil Graham of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the sum of \$3,673.21. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Cecil Graham against the United States for refund of Federal income taxes which were erroneously paid by him from 1947 to November 1, 1955, on the erroneous advice of an agent of the Internal Revenue Service but which cannot now be refunded because the period of filing claim therefor (as prescribed by section 6511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) has expired: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

That, notwithstanding the limitations of sections 322(b), 3774, and 3775 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, or of section 6511(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the refund of excess income taxes or of any other statute of limitations, the claim of Cecil Graham of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, filed with the Treasury Department within one year of the date of approval of this Act for the refund of Federal income taxes erroneously paid by him upon payments received from the United States Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, from April 1, 1947 through November 15, 1955, shall be considered to have been timely filed and shall be further considered and paid in accordance with the provisions of otherwise applicable provisions of law.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. WARREN G. WARD, CAPT. PAUL H. BECK, AND CAPT. RUSSELL K. HANSEN, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5911) for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and Capt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force.

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

Mr. McEWEN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

LEE R. SMITH AND LEE R. SMITH III, HIS SON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6318) for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son, are hereby relieved of all liability to pay the United States the sum of \$982.59, representing the cost of hospital and medical care rendered the said Lee R. Smith III as a cadet in the Civil Air Patrol, at the Brooke General Hospital, Fort Sam Houston, Texas, in the period April 22, 1959, through February 17, 1960, inclusive, for serious burns he received at the Chennault Air Force Base, Louisiana, on April 19, 1959, when as a member of the Lake Charles Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, while engaged in repairing a public address system on a metal building, he came in contact with a low hanging high-tension line carrying thirty-three thousand volts of electricity: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR C. BERRY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6441) for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6441

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the hereinafter named persons are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts listed opposite their names or such lesser amounts as may be outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act. Said amounts represent overpayments of retired or retainer pay resulting, through no fault of the payees, from erroneous computations of retired and retainer pay, due them from the Department of the Navy, or the amount of service on*

which such pay was based in the several amounts set opposite their respective names as listed herein:

Chief Yeoman Arthur C. Berry, United States Fleet Reserve, \$1,801.72;

Chief Boatswain's Mate William W. Brewer, United States Fleet Reserve, \$236.75;

Lieutenant Commander William R. Davis, United States Naval Reserve (retired), \$90;

Machinist's Mate First Class Rufino De Las Penas, United States Fleet Naval Reserve, \$190;

Chief Commissaryman Theodore E. Denno, United States Fleet Reserve, \$44;

Chief Boatswain's Mate Albert T. Diedrich, United States Fleet Reserve, \$462.77;

Chief Pay Clerk (W-3) Stephen Hruska, United States Navy (retired), \$320.58;

Lieutenant Junior Grade Thomas C. Ingle, United States Navy (retired), \$123.60;

Lieutenant Junior Grade Bruce C. Jeppson, Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve (retired), \$37.02;

Chief Machinist's Mate James L. Keppel, United States Fleet Reserve, \$1,439.28;

Commander Austin S. Kibbee, United States Naval Reserve (retired), \$5,847.85;

Chief Aviation Structural Mechanic Lee J. King, United States Fleet Reserve, \$85.68;

Lieutenant John J. Lowe, United States Navy (retired), \$1,161.76;

Chief Machinist Donald A. McFarland, United States Navy (retired), \$1,395.64;

Chief Boatswain Hugh F. MacNichol, United States Navy (retired), \$9,686;

Chief Machinist's Mate Everett Murphy, United States Fleet Reserve, \$340;

Chief Storekeeper Arthur V. Newell, United States Fleet Reserve, \$1,839.21;

Lieutenant Commander Benjamin D. Parish (Medical Corps), United States Naval Reserve (retired), \$48.42;

Chief Warrant Officer Opie G. Ray (W-2), United States Navy (retired), \$742;

Ensign Nathan R. Sewell, Junior, United States Naval Reserve (retired), \$549.18;

Rear Admiral Kirby Smith, Civil Engineering Corps, United States Naval Reserve (retired), \$4,400;

Boatswain's Mate First Class Anastacio Torres, United States Navy (retired), \$184.24;

Chief Pharmacist James W. Walker, United States Navy (retired), \$665.28;

Lieutenant George A. Whitlock, United States Navy (retired), \$1,783.92.

Sec. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. F. FORT, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6527) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7090) for the relief of certain individuals.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7090

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each*

individual named in section 2 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his name, which amount represents an overpayment of per diem received by him while stationed at Fleet Air Western Pacific repair activity, Tokyo and Osaka, Japan. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The individuals referred to in the first section of this Act and the amount of the liability of each of them are as follows:

Wilson, Ruddy (2686566), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$1,708.60.

Gilbert, William L. (2747774), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$7,154.70.

Hoover, Russel D. (3132792), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$6,783.20.

Floyd, Fretwell J. (8456082), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$8,273.20.

The estate of Dahlen, Wallace A., deceased, formerly a lieutenant commander, United States Navy, \$7,508.36.

Benson, Leonard R. (3933163), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$11,218.75.

Raines, James C. (2952599), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$6,953.80.

Ringstead, Richard G. (3286779), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$3,821.85.

McKee, Benjamin A. (3466670), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$6,471.45.

Coleman, Johnny R. (3603289), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$4,280.85.

Hudson, William J., Jr. (2744556), United States Navy Fleet Reserve, \$1,226.70.

Lindley, William R. (814054), United States Marine Corps Fleet Reserve, \$10,232.80.

Gorski, William S. (507173), United States Marine Corps Fleet Reserve, \$2,843.95.

Zidnak, Leonard G., 1772 Carlyle Street, Memphis, Tennessee, \$5,261.55.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual listed in section 2 of this Act an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percentum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 15, strike "one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof" and insert "claim."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7137) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

MAJ. DONALD B. POWERS,  
U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7138) for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. FRANK D. SCHWIKERT,  
U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7233) for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. CLAUDE E. TABOR, JR.,  
U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7355) for the relief of Lt. Col. Claude E. Tabor, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. THOMAS O. LAWTON, JR.,  
U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7435) for the relief of Col. Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection?

MR. AND MRS. CHRISTIAN VOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7682) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7682

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the national service life insurance (certificate numbered N. 881269) upon the life of the late Vernon A. C. Voss (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC3099771), who died on October 29, 1942, shall be held and considered to have been in effect in the amount of \$5,000 at the time of his death. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance (including a lump-sum pay-

ment equal to the difference between the total of the installments which would have been paid had such insurance in the amount of \$5,000 been in force at the time of death, and the total of the installments actually paid, between the date of death and the date of enactment of this Act) in accordance with the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, except that any payments made as a result of the enactment of this Act shall be made directly from the national service life insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARVIN D. NELLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7822) for the relief of Marvin D. Nells.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CPO JAMES J. GRIFFIN, U.S. NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5830) for the relief of CPO James J. Griffin, U.S. Navy.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

1ST LT. DAVID A. STAVER, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7439) for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAJ. VICTOR R. ROBINSON, JR.,  
U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7436) for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. NICHOLAS A. STATHIS, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7437) for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7437

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

*America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel Nicholas A. Stathis, XXXXXXXX United States Air Force, Norton Air Force Base, California, the sum of \$7,164.70 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed aboard the United States ship Alcoa Planter, a carrier under Government contract, which caught fire in the harbor at Bremerhaven, Germany, on February 1, 1963: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIEF M. SGT. SAMUEL W. SMITH,  
U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7438) for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COL. WILLIAM W. THOMAS AND LT. COL. NORMAN R. SNYDER, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7440) for the relief of Col. William W. Thomas and Lt. Col. Norman R. Snyder, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS DAMAGED BY RECENT FLOODS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2089) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 420 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 2089, a bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

S. 327 was passed by the Senate on April 23, 1965, and by the House on May 19, 1965, after being amended to contain the language of H.R. 7303 which had previously been enacted by the House. Thereafter the Senate agreed to the House amendment and the bill was vetoed by the President on June 5 because of what he termed "unwise and objectionable" language in section 5(a) of the bill.

The bill now before you, S. 2089, is identical to the bill formerly before you with the exception of that part of the bill which the President was against. That part of the bill has been deleted.

Because of the continuing emergency and the need to prevent further delay in bringing relief to the hard-pressed people and communities of the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House Resolution 420 be adopted in order that S. 2089 may be acted upon forthwith.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has correctly stated the purpose of this resolution; to make in order the consideration of virtually the same piece of legislation that passed this House on, I believe, the 19th of May of this year, only to be vetoed by the President on the ground that the language contained in section 5(a) represented an intrusion on the powers of the Executive; this language provided that no appropriation should be made for any of the work to be done in connection with the stabilizing of the banks of the Eel River, unless the work was first approved by a resolution adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the House and the other body, respectively.

As the gentleman from California has said, the executive branch has labeled

this provision and this language objectionable. Because of the emergency nature of this situation and the severe damage that was caused in the Pacific Northwest due to these floods, it was concluded by the Committee on Public Works of the House that to expedite passage of this legislation it would report out a bill deleting the language which has been called objectionable.

It is important to point out that in the report accompanying this bill the committee said that in utilizing this procedure of bringing out a new bill without language objected to by the President, the committee did not want this to imply any agreement with the position that the executive branch has taken with respect to the language in section 5(a). It is my understanding that the members of the Committee on Public Works will further discuss that very important and fundamental issue.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. 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 (S. 2089) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

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 S. 2089, with Mr. YOUNG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Public Works, the chairman of our committee [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this legislation which is pending before us.

Just a few short weeks ago, on May 19, this House unanimously passed almost identical legislation. That bill was S. 327. It provided the needed and necessary relief to take care of the flood-stricken areas of the Pacific Northwest, including the States of California, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Nevada.

Last January when the reports of the devastation of these floods had reached Washington, I authorized a special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], to visit the flood-stricken areas and to report back to the committee as rapidly as possible what action should be taken to provide relief to these areas. After 4 months of extensive work, the committee reported out a bill which, I believe, was good legislation. The bill before us today, S. 2089, is the same previously passed legislation, H.R. 7303, minus four lines which were found

to be objectionable to the executive branch of the Government.

Might I say at this point that I do not believe the language that was stricken from this bill is objectionable language.

I do not feel that now, at this time, when the need for this legislation is so paramount, an extraneous issue should be raised. I think the overriding point here is that the work the Committee on Public Works in both bodies did on this legislation and the need for this legislation justifies the fact that we should expedite its passage as soon as possible.

For the foregoing reasons, I trust that this body today will reapprove its action of May 19 by passing the present bill before us.

May I conclude by saying that I am a firm believer in the separation of powers in the three branches of our great Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. I am proud to be a Member of this body, and I will at all times stand forth to uphold the rights of this Congress.

I urge you strongly to pass this legislation before us without, at the same time, conceding for one moment any of the rights given to this body under our Constitution.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this legislation which is before us today is needed and necessary legislation. It brings relief to flood-devastated areas of our great Nation.

It was my privilege to chair a special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and visit the Pacific Northwest to see at firsthand the horror and the havoc that can be wrought by uncontrolled waters. I saw whole villages destroyed, roads and rail lines uprooted, and a basic industry—one of the most important in our Nation—crippled.

I returned from the Pacific Northwest and, through the cooperation of the other members of the Committee on Public Works, we moved as expeditiously as we could to bring relief to that area. The legislation passed this Congress once and, due to a difference in interpretation of the language, was vetoed.

The basic legislation is before us today. Regardless of what each and every one of us may think about the so-called objectionable language, the overriding point here is the need for this legislation.

I recommend its passage. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has consumed 4 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a very interesting exercise today, one which I have a great distaste for and one which, when acted upon, will in my opinion do great violence to the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branch of the Government and to the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress made a decision in its wisdom by unanimous vote in voting on this bill when it was before us in its original form. One of the most controversial sections was section 5(a) setting up a new type of program providing for

revetments and support for a railroad along the Eel River which was admittedly needed for the economy of the area. It was a new program providing for a study by the executive, by the Office of Emergency Planning, to determine what kind of project was needed and how much money it would cost.

In doing that, which was a new program, and which unless Congress retained some authority relative thereto would amount in itself to an authorization of a project of an unknown nature, in the wisdom of the committee and the Congress, and rightly so, there was a provision, and I for one insisted upon it and it was written into the bill without question by the committee, that this being a new type of authorization or a new type of emergency program, without being based upon an existing authorized project, that along the Eel River, if this revetment and support for this railroad was to be provided for the railroad bed, that the Congress and the committees of the Congress, should have the right to look at the proposed project to determine whether the cost was reasonable and whether the project itself was of a nature of projects that we in the future might want to act upon. There is not any question about the constitutional authority of the Congress to do so, and in doing so we wrote into that section 5(a) the following wording after the President made the study and the Office of Emergency Planning decided along with the engineers the nature of the project that when it came to the appropriation, before such appropriation could be made:

No appropriation shall be made for any such work which has not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.

There is no constitutional question about the congressional authority to do so. I say that there is a serious constitutional question of right as to whether Congress should give up its admitted constitutional authority to the executive branch.

This veto amounts to an item veto by the President of the United States. If the Congress wants to approve an item veto concept, let it do so, but it shall not do so without me raising my voice in opposition to it.

This is not an unusual provision. This provision was written into law by the Congress in the last session. It was written into law not only under President Johnson but also under President Eisenhower. It was signed by both Presidents. Exactly the same language was signed in the Public Buildings Act of 1959, which the distinguished and capable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] drafted. I compliment him for it. It has done a great job in this field. I was privileged to have a small part in it.

That provided precisely the same language. The objective was to try to implement, on a long-range-plan basis, public buildings all over America without requiring that the full Congress act on every single project to be authorized. Thus the committees were given authority by the Congress to act through com-

mittee action. It is a good law and it has worked well. It has accomplished its objective.

This would have worked equally well. It required that a report be made back—and I read again—no later than June 30, and the committees of the House and Senate would have to act.

There is no question of delay involved in this. There is a question of what is right or wrong as it relates to the constitutional authority of the Congress of the United States, and whether the President should be given the right by this gimmick or by this method to institute an item veto and to usurp the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States.

Last week, on Thursday, those were the sounds and those were the thoughts which rang out in this Chamber. Those were the thoughts which prevailed in this Chamber. Those were the thoughts which prevailed on the question of a far more questionable nature than the one we have before us at the present time.

We heard cries from the gentleman from South Carolina, and properly so, as I reflected on Thursday afternoon, that this was a great day for Congress, that the Constitution was being observed, that congressional power was being retained. We marched up the Hill proudly.

We are marching down the Hill today, and not very proudly, so far as I am concerned, because there is no question about the right of the Congress to authorize specific public works projects and in so doing to reserve the right, after those projects have been studied by the executive, to actually authorize them through committee action.

The Public Buildings Act, signed by President Eisenhower, had the same language.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act had similar language. That was signed by President Eisenhower.

The Water Resources Research Act of 1964, signed by President Johnson, had similar language. Oh, he said that he did not like the language, but the Act, in his opinion, apparently was of sufficient national importance that he did not dare to veto it because of this one phrase reserving the rights of the committee to approve the action of the Executive as set forth in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And that was not an emergency measure, the gentleman might emphasize.

Mr. CRAMER. No, it was not an emergency measure at all.

Here the President takes the position, on a bill involving \$111,875,000 for the disaster stricken Northwest, where immediate assistance is needed—which is why we acted on it on an emergency basis—that he is willing for those people to be denied the relief that they must have and must have now, in order to exert his Presidential prerogatives, which I say are wrongly exerted in this instance, in order to dictate to the Con-

gress of the United States that he, the President of the United States, does not believe even an authorization, for which we have power to make a study, should come back to the Congress for official authorization on a public works project. This is a position, I submit, wholly untenable, and which, in my opinion, fractures the constitutional concept of separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Not only that, but the President dictated to the Congress stating:

You do this. You take that bill back and within a few days bring me back that bill, and I will sign it, if this one clause to which I object in this \$111.8 million bill is deleted relating to committee approval.

He told them to delete that one little section, that one little phrase in that one little section. That whole section only amounts to \$3,875,000 out of the total figure of \$111.8 million for relief. Now if that does not amount to an item veto I have never seen one.

After hearing all this debate last week with regard to congressional prerogatives, then we have this come up. We had a very burdensome issue last week as it relates to that congressional prerogative, and we know that there will be a similar issue relating to the closing of hospitals with reference to Veterans' Administration hospitals in the future. That does not relate to the initial authorization of a project but instead to whether the President can deauthorize a project. That is an entirely different question from this because this relates to the authorization of a project. After hearing all of those speeches last week and watching the vote in favor of holding the congressional prerogative, which passed by a very large majority telling the President that the Congress will preserve its prerogatives, we then marched up the Hill gallantly, honorably, and bravely, and today we come back and march down the Hill. We are doing that by taking this action here, saying, "Mr. President, you want an item veto. Well, you have the votes so we will give it to you. If you do not want Congress to exercise its proper prerogatives, you have the votes so we will buckle under to your command." That is precisely what the committee did. Let me be honest about the committee's attitude as such, but let me be equally honest as to the committee's attitude in retaining the language. The committee says in the report that it agrees with the Senate report on the same bill. The Senate in a couple of days took the President's version and struck out the clause and reported it to the House. In a few days we were following the President's demand, and we reported it out. Here is what the committee said in the report. The committee "would particularly emphasize the fact that it agrees strongly with that language in the Senate committee report which states: 'such consent'—meaning by striking out the provisions—"however, does not necessarily imply committee agreement with the President's view that the objectionable language constitutes an improper encroachment by the Congress and its committees."

It says, "It does not necessarily imply." I happen to be personally convinced, and there is hardly a member on our committee who does not feel, that the President is wrong in this instance. Our distinguished chairman of the committee just said so. Where is the intestinal fortitude to stand up to the President? This is his first veto of a major measure, knowing that there is an emergency involved. Where is the intestinal fortitude necessary for the Congress to stand up and say to the President, "We will not permit a President to dictate to the Congress or to item veto this bill?" This should be so, particularly in view of the fact that he did not veto a similar bill because he said it was of such great national interest. I say there can be no bill of a greater interest to the people of the northwest part of the United States than this flood disaster relief bill. I, for one, have worked very hard in order to try to get this bill out and to make it an adequate bill which would not be controversial in nature. Then, lo and behold, the President vetoes it and brings controversy all over the Nation and here to the floor of this House unnecessarily because he wants an item veto in it. I say that is wrong.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Can this be the same President Johnson, who, in his first message to Congress after becoming President of the United States in November 1963 said, in effect: "I have served in the Congress and I will never be a party to interfering with Congress. I will never be a party to destroying the independence of the Congress?"

Is this the same President?

Mr. CRAMER. My recollection is that it is, I will say to the distinguished gentleman. But I do not recognize that it is the same one. I understand it, but I do not recognize this language as the language that the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. GROSS. I do not recognize it, either as coming from the same Lyndon Johnson. And so today, like the old cow, we are faced with swallowing our cud, then regurgitate and chew on it at some later time. We are told to tuck our collective tails between our legs and run on this issue. I am against running.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that he is certainly speaking my sentiments.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Florida that I happen to be one of those who agrees basically with the position that the gentleman is taking with reference to the President's position here. I disagree very vigorously with the Presidential advisers and with the action that he took. But I do want to say this, in fairness to the committee of which he and many other distinguished Members of this House are members, I want to express my deep appreciation of the ex-

peditious action here. I think my colleague from Florida would have to agree with me that we are faced with some practical political facts of life here, and in view of the emergency nature, and in view of the situation that exists with reference to the people out there, I commend the Public Works Committee on the action that they have taken.

I think that this is a basic issue on which we are going to have to choose our grounds on which to fight, and which I am sure the Congress will do, because, as the gentleman has indicated, there are many other pieces of legislation in which language such as was found to be objectionable here has been used and is today being applied. I think President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and now President Johnson may have signed bills in each case with some reservation and, as I recall, back in 1957 or 1958 on Public Law 130 there were some reservations expressed.

Congress asserted its jurisdiction and we have maintained it. I agree with the gentleman, and I fight with him together on this basic principle. But I think we have to justify our grounds and I do not think this is an opportune time to do it. I would hope that the bill pass and the emergency be met in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that everybody wants to provide relief and provide it now. But as one person in the United States that has prevented relief from going into the Northwest area a number of days ago—and that was not the Congress of the United States, that was the President of the United States—I would say to the gentleman that if we are going to have to try to fight our battle someplace else, the more battles we lose, the better the prospect that we are going to lose the war.

The war is to try to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States. Lose this little battle here and that little battle there and then do not worry about losing the war; do not worry about giving the President powers that belong to Congress, buckling under when he vetoes a bill, when he is trying to exercise powers that obviously belong to the Congress; lose a few battles, and you do not have to worry about losing the war. I say this is the battleground. Our committee should have so acted, should have so seen it so that we would not have to worry about losing the war later on.

And if, in fact, there are certain political realities to be recognized, I will ask the gentleman the question: Why did not the President recognize that there were certain political realities involved, certain needs involved of an emergency nature and yield on this, as he did on the other bill which he signed, the water resources research bill, knowing the emergency nature of this matter?

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

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. In answer to the gentleman's question, let me say that it has been my understanding that Presidents,

as I indicated, going back to 1955 have had reservations about this language. I think there is probably room for disagreement.

Mr. Chairman, as I said to the gentleman earlier I happen to agree with the gentleman as to the position taken by the gentleman from Florida on the basic constitutional issue. I simply do not feel, however, that now is the time nor is this the place to fight this particular battle. I believe ultimately, yes, in the Congress we will have to fight it. But I believe here is a case where the Executive was being political from the standpoint of bringing to the attention of Congress the reservations which this administration and others I feel have had on the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to justify him. As I said before, I vigorously disagree with the position, but I do think we are faced with the political facts of life and we know that sometimes we take advantage of the day and time to present our views. I believe this is what we have experienced in this case.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I will say to the gentleman from California that no one is more concerned about the emergency nature of this problem than I. I just wish the President had been equally as concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I will say this to the Members of the House as well, that I know the problems existing in the Northwest and the need for immediate relief.

Mr. Chairman, it is my personal opinion that the President would not veto the bill a second time if this provision were written back into it. Of course, there is no guarantee of that, but that is my personal opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I say it is unfortunate that our committee did not have the intestinal fortitude itself to stand up on its two feet and preserve the prerogatives, constitutionally, of the Congress. But it is quite obvious that the majority side has enough votes to do anything it wants to do at this session and it is going to do this at this session whether we like it or not. It has got the votes to defeat an amendment if it were offered. It defeated my amendment in the committee and it would undoubtedly defeat such an amendment on the floor.

So, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the emergency nature and knowing it would be futile to offer such an amendment, when the President has such dictatorial powers over the Congress, I am not even going to offer it. The result is quite obvious as to what would be done, but I say this issue must be discussed and we must not lose any more battles for fear of losing the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has consumed 21 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for S. 2089. I agree with the principle expressed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], that there has not been a violation of the Constitution by this Congress in passing the original bill. However, we do have a situation in the Pacific Northwest which

requires attention and requires attention immediately.

Mr. Chairman, there are many logging communities in northern California, Oregon, and Washington that depend for their livelihood upon the jobs in one timber plant in that community. That timber plant is dependent for its functioning upon the roads out of the National forests by which the logs are brought down to that plant.

Mr. Chairman, most of those roads were destroyed during this flood period. This bill contains the authorization for the funds required to reconstruct and restore those roads so that the lumber can again be brought down to those plants.

Until this reconstruction occurs those communities are being absolutely strangled economically. No matter how justified we may feel our position may be from a constitutional standpoint, I do not think it is fair to those communities to let them die while we continue this wrangle over who is right and who is wrong.

For the reasons I have stated, I therefore intend to vote for this bill, although I voted for the original bill with the original language. I feel, as the gentleman from Florida does, that the original language was fully justified. However, in fairness to the people of those small communities who are literally being starved economically because of this delay, I intend to vote for this bill to provide for relief and help to them just as soon as we possibly can do so.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before us. There has been a considerable amount of wrangling over words. I am not in disagreement with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and the chairman of our committee, Mr. FALLON. However, the fact before us is that we have a very serious and dire emergency in the Pacific Northwest. Most of this damage has occurred in my own congressional district. So the only thing we can ask of this committee is that it forget about the confrontation at this time, if it will. There is not anything I would enjoy more than to join with the gentleman from Florida in taking on the President and the executive branch on this issue, but right now we need to get on with our work. As the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], stated, many of these people who were affected will be dying on the vine, unless we take this important step and pass the bill so the job of rebuilding can go forward.

Today the Congress of the United States will make its second attempt to write into law a flood relief act of 1965 for the west coast.

The first attempt passed by both Houses of the Congress was vetoed last week by President Lyndon B. Johnson because he disagreed with one provision of the act.

I joined Congressman (BIZZ) JOHNSON, other Members, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and immediately reintroduced the flood

relief legislation last week after the President's veto.

Senator MORSE's identical bill—S. 2089—before us today—passed the Senate in short order, passed the House Public Works Committee last Wednesday and the Rules Committee Thursday.

Passage by the House today will again put the legislation before the President for signature.

Many members of the Public Works Committee and the members of the Rules Committee—Democrats and Republicans alike—do not agree with the reasons given by the President for vetoing the original bill.

The reason given by him was that it was unwise and objectionable—an infringement on the prerogatives of the executive branch.

Our first bill provided that a study of flood repair work suggested in the Eel River canyon be reported back to the Congress after determining that which is in the public interest. The specific language covering this provision, to which the President objected is as follows:

Sec. 5(a), line 1 of page 11 (H.R. 7303) as follows:

" , but no appropriation shall be made for any such work which has not been approved before June 30, 1966, by resolution adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively."

As a matter of fact, precedents for use of this language may be found in the Public Buildings Act of 1959 and in the Watershed Act, and I am disappointed that he vetoed the bill in view of these precedents.

Were it not for the emergency nature of the legislation, our strategy possibly would have been to move to override the veto. But with the press of other legislation and the number of people dependent upon the earliest possible passage of this legislation, we chose not to have the confrontation at this time.

Therefore, we have deleted the language which was objectionable to the White House in order to pass the legislation at the earliest possible date and assure the President's signature on the bill. We have had too much delay already, so I urge the immediate passage of this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the bill, S. 2089, the Pacific Northwest Disaster Act. You will recall that the Congress earlier passed S. 327 for the same purpose. We were unable to convince the administration and its advisers that the bill should be signed. When we learned about the veto and received the veto message, we immediately introduced new legislation both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

The Senate bill cleared the Senate immediately. It was sent to the House of Representatives and assigned to the Committee on Public Works. That committee worked very hard so that a bill could be brought to the floor immediately, because we feel this is the only way

in which we could get this emergency relief work underway.

Today we have the bill S. 2089 before us for consideration. The language objected to by the administration has been deleted.

We are legislating here for the relief of our people in the Pacific Northwest. This covers the damaged areas in five of the Western States. It is very important emergency legislation to finalize the authorizations and make available funds that will restore this area to normalcy.

Section 5(a) was a very controversial section, as the gentleman from Florida has explained. He worked very hard with us to iron out a suitable section in the way of language so that our committee could pass the original bill unanimously and bring it to the floor of the House. That section stated it is mandatory that the people making the studies, the President, the Office of Emergency Planning, and the Corps of Engineers, report their findings and recommendations to the Congress of the United States.

That is still in the section. I think that the form of the final language that is before you today is a very good compromise to give this relief. I, too, have some feelings that we do not want to give up our legislative prerogatives nor do we want to give up any of our jurisdiction to the other two branches of the Government. But I believe we have an emergency here. The transportation system of this whole area was damaged considerably. I am very happy to say to you people that this week the railroad will go back into operation. The railroad has been restored. In section 5(a) we ask for consideration for the revetment and the riprapping of certain areas along the Eel River adjacent to the railroad.

My good colleague, the gentleman from California on tomorrow will drive the golden spike that will put this railroad together again. I am sure that Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN is going out there for that occasion.

I do hope that today this House of Representatives and the Congress will consider this bill favorably and allow it to go back to the executive branch of the Government for the simple reason that our construction period is very short in this area of the United States and it relates solely to the public agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads has a great job to do there yet and the Forest Service has a big job. The railroad is already restored. The Corps of Engineers and the Office of Emergency Planning and the executive branch and the President himself will look into the need for riprapping in that area to give protection to the railroad that has been restored.

I might say this is a temporary measure and it runs through June 30, 1966. So I do ask for your favorable consideration today to allow us to restore this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT].

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the record has

been made, I believe, today on the question of separation of powers. To the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and those of like mind, I would like to express my thanks on behalf of the people of my district for permitting this matter to be handled so expeditiously. I would also like to pay tribute to the chairman and to all the Members of the House Committee on Public Works for the action they have taken under difficult circumstances originally and again here during the past few days.

My statement has already been made, prior to the previous vote, as to the great need that we have in the State of Oregon and particularly in my district because of the damage being suffered every day so far as our economy is concerned by reason of the access roads needing repair.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida and urge the Members of this body to support again this much and desperately needed legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult area in which to legislate. Not only are there questions of the relative prerogatives of the legislature—or more particularly the Public Works Committees thereof—vis-a-vis the executive, but there are also questions of the propriety of the Government assuming private losses and, if so, to what extent it should be done in time of loss, nature of loss, or extent of loss.

This bill does not solve any of these problems. It leaves them as it finds them. It neither adds to nor detracts from the weight of the philosophical arguments pro and con. It does give immediate assistance to restore private losses in the timber industry of the Northwest—stricken as it was so severely by last winter's unprecedented floods. It restores losses of such magnitude in an industry so important to everyone in the country, that the private losses have become a matter of public concern. The Congress acts wisely in approving this bill and in refusing to be deferred by arguments extraneous to the main issue.

We should, however, not use the passage of this bill as an excuse for forgetting the problem of recurring disasters and of the necessity of providing machinery which speedily and automatically can handle such tragic occurrences.

I suggest again that one logical answer is federally sponsored disaster insurance in this area where private coverage is largely unavailable and where the need is so great. The alternative is a case-by-case, bill-by-bill attack on the misery and pain of natural disaster which will be plagued by the same doubts we have today and which—by the delays and obstructions which, in spite of all our efforts, result from the very nature of the legislative procedure.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice in support of S. 2089, the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965, to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the recon-

struction of areas damaged by last winter's floods and high waters.

As you will recall, these severe natural disasters struck the Pacific Northwest States during December 1964 and January and February 1965. The total damage amounted to many more millions upon millions of dollars than we will ever be able to replace.

But the proud and brave men, women, and children of these areas have made a tremendous effort to pick themselves up and rebuild their homes, their businesses, their farms, and their way of life, in the aftermath of one of the most violent and destructive series of natural disasters in the history of the West.

In addition, the local governments in these areas—the cities, the towns, the counties, and the special governmental units have all strained to the limit of their financial capabilities to carry on the work of repair and rehabilitation.

And, certainly, the States themselves have done a magnificent job in organizing this staggering effort, and in substantially increasing their taxes statewide in order to mount the all-out campaign necessary to overcome the physical and financial handicaps imposed by the caprice of an unpredictable nature.

In the last few years we have seen similar disaster strike in many parts of the country, and I am proud to say, the Federal Government has been among the quickest to respond to the call for help.

There have been tornados in Indiana and other sections of the Midwest, extreme flooding along the Mississippi River basin from Minneapolis to St. Louis, severe drought in several areas of the country, hurricane damage along the east and gulf coasts, and disastrous earthquakes in Alaska.

In each of these cases, the Federal Government has been ready, willing, and able to extend the hand of needed assistance to the unfortunate victims of nature's whim.

In view of this tradition of compassion for and aid to our citizens in their time of need, I am confident the House will again vote to authorize this important self-help assistance to the victims of last winter's disastrous floods in the States of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge speedy passage of this legislation to provide assistance to the five States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent—December, January, and February—floods and high waters. The financial problems of those affected is desperate, and it behooves us to act quickly.

This bill would authorize from the general fund of the Treasury a sum not to exceed \$50 million for fiscal year 1965 and not to exceed \$20 million for fiscal year 1966 for the repair and reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails damaged.

The floods which occurred were a result of a most improbable combination of circumstances which left an incomprehensible path of death, damage, and destruction which no amount of money can ever replace. Forests, river banks, roadways, communications, fish, wildlife,

towns, and industries were dealt a tragic, destructive blow which makes these floods some of the worst experienced in the history of the United States.

Although this occurred almost 6 months ago, that area and its people desperately need the aid provided in this bill to enable them to restore this great Northwest area. I urge its passage.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary to tell my colleagues how important it is to the Pacific Northwest that this disaster relief bill be enacted and sent to the President for his signature. Nearly 6 months have passed since the first shock of record high water brought devastation to the valleys of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and northern California. Vitaly needed programs of recovery have languished because authority and funds are lacking.

The bill under consideration today provides the same needed authority to Federal agencies as was contained in the bill passed by this body on May 19, and I urge that it be enacted without delay.

The people of the flooded areas owe a great debt of gratitude to members of the Public Works Committee for the sympathetic consideration that has been given to these problems and particularly for the speed with which this new bill has been brought up for consideration in the House. My thanks to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, for his assistance in this matter, and to our colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from California, for his diligent and effective work as the principal sponsor in the House.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we in Oregon are gratified that legislation to speed recovery from the disastrous winter floods in the Northwest is nearing final passage—though substantially for the second time because of the President's veto.

I am grateful to the gentleman from Alabama and the full committee for its prompt action.

Passage of this measure will go a long way toward giving Oregon and her neighbors the impetus to rebuild their damaged economies, their homes, the lives of their people. For many the assistance will help provide a reason for being again, hope having been virtually demolished along with all else as the angry rivers bled our lands of much of their value.

In retrospect, had not the floods left the indescribable wreckage and horror behind them as they roared through our land, we would be hard put to conjure images of the realities of this enormous washout. None would believe us. We would be accused of having fantasies, of daydreaming the impossible.

But it happened. Though Oregon is not new to flooding during early spring, the heavy runoff during the snow melt usually hits one or two or three watersheds at a time. But not this time.

As has been recounted many times, the entire Pacific Northwest from the Columbia River south into northern California was hit by near-record rainfalls in the period preceding and during Christmas week. Warm temperatures

contributed additional waters to increase the flow of streams. Then it was as though nature had gone berserk. Every stream in the region went wild, turning into terrifying torrents that piled rushing water into the rivers and then onto the lands, crushing homes, burying roads, orchards, and fields.

In the morass of mud and wreckage that was left when the waters subsided, there were 18 persons dead and thousands of others left homeless and uncounted others without jobs or livelihood. Millions of dollars worth of roads and rail lines were destroyed. Perhaps \$60 million in farm resources was destroyed. Damaged or ruined were 120 major and minor bridges and access roads to our rich forest lands. Our recreation areas and water sheds suffered severe damage that will take years to repair.

The foundation of Oregon's economy is its natural resources. My people are dependent on these resources—the timber, the water, the land itself. And countless numbers earn their bread from the processing of timber, its transportation and manufacture and from agricultural pursuits.

The floods, by affecting these vital resources, left my State with nearly \$250 million in public and private losses, not to mention the present and future earnings and production involved. We sought this legislation—I previously introduced such a bill, not to seek preferential treatment from the Federal Government, but to help the Northwest United States back on its own economic feet.

Oregon has not sought special treatment and it is not doing so now. There have been other natural disaster areas such as the Alaska earthquake, the Ohio Valley flooding, the Pacific coast tidal wave, the Wichita Falls, Tex., and southeast Michigan tornadoes, the flooding in Montana and Idaho, and hurricanes that devastated portions of the east coast—Cleo, Dora, and Hilda. This is assistance parallel to that afforded in those terrible disasters. The legislation would also give hope to those in the Midwest who suffered this year from tornadoes and flooding.

What we have asked for is a helping hand. Now that this bill is finally being passed, there will be increased appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads to allow that agency to furnish part of the funds required to reconstruct the access roads to our vital forests from which over 80,000 Oregonians derive their income and upon which 60 percent of our State's economy is based.

There will be an extended home loan repayment period to enable the homeowner to rebuild his home. This is necessary because many families had their financial resources wiped out in the storms and floods.

In this connection, let me say I am gratified that the Small Business Administration had decided to extend for 90 days to September 30 the time for filing and processing applications from Oregon so that small business concerns and homeowners will be able to apply for

SBA disaster loans to repair flood damage.

The loans are for a maximum of 20 years at a reasonably low 3-percent interest rate. To make the loans more meaningful, a provision in the law will allow 30 years instead of 20 for maturity of these loans.

In addition the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to reduce from 30 days to 7 days the minimum time required to advertise the sale of national forest timber in the affected areas.

There will be increased highway appropriations to help restore the vital arteries of communication between the Northwest and the rest of the Nation.

Once again, I commend this legislation to my colleagues. We must get these programs underway. Our mills must be brought back to full production; our people brought back to full status as members of their communities and their State and Nation; our unemployed must be brought back to their jobs. It is now time to get to work. We have waited long enough this session. We of Oregon and the Northwest ask your hand to complete this mighty undertaking.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Congress hereby recognizes (1) that the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho have experienced extensive property loss and damage as the result of floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965, (2) that much of the affected area is federally owned and administered, and (3) that the livelihood of the people in the area is dependent on prompt restoration of transportation facilities, and therefore Congress declares the need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate those States in their efforts to provide for the reconstruction of devastated areas.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in addition to the amounts authorized in section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code, not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not to exceed \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Such sums shall be obligated and expended by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with such section 125, and related provisions of title 23 of the United States Code for the repair and reconstruction of highways, roads, and trails, damaged as the result of a disaster.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding provisions of existing contracts, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, separately, and as part of the regular road and trail construction program, shall reimburse timber sale contractors or otherwise arrange to bear road and trail construction and restoration costs either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers to the extent of costs determined by the respective Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for restoring roads in any stage of construction authorized by a contract for the purchase of timber from lands under his jurisdiction to substantially the same condition as existed prior to the damage resulting from the floods of De-

ember 1964, and January and February of 1965 in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, and to the extent costs determined by the respective Secretary as incurred or to be incurred for completing road construction not performed under any such contract prior to the floods but which, because of changed conditions resulting from the floods, exceed road construction costs as originally determined by the respective Secretary. The costs for such road restoration, reconstruction, and construction under any single timber purchase contract on roads not accepted prior to the floods, whether construction was complete, partial, or not yet begun, shall be borne as follows: 15 per centum of all amounts shall be borne by the timber purchaser, except that such purchaser shall not be required to bear costs of more than \$4,500, and the Secretary shall bear the remaining portion of such costs. This subsection shall not apply (1) in the case of any road restoration or reconstruction if the cost of such restoration or reconstruction is less than \$500, and (2) in the case of any road construction if the increase in the cost of such construction as the result of the floods is less than \$500 more than the construction costs as originally determined by the respective Secretary.

(b) Where the Secretary determines that damages are so great that restoration, reconstruction, or construction is not practical under the cost-sharing arrangement authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may allow cancellation of the contract notwithstanding provisions therein.

(c) Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) For forest development roads and trails, \$123,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, of which not to exceed \$38,000,000 shall be used solely for the construction, repair, and reconstruction of forest development roads and trails in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, necessary because of the floods and high waters in such States during December 1964, and January and February 1965, and \$85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967."

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reduce to seven days the minimum period of advance public notice required by the first section of the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 476), in connection with the sale of timber from national forests, whenever the Secretary determines that the sale of such timber will assist in the reconstruction of any area of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho damaged by floods or high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to give any public land entryman such additional time in which to comply with any requirement of law in connection with any public land entry for lands in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, as the Secretary finds appropriate because of interference with the entryman's ability to comply with such requirement resulting from floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965.

SEC. 5. (a) The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, shall make a survey to determine what protective works would be necessary to prevent the recurrence of damage by floods or high waters to those banks of the Eel River, California, which are adjacent to the trackage of any common carrier by railroad and shall report to Congress the results of such survey together with the cost of any recommended work within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act. The President, acting through the Office of Emergency Planning, is authorized to perform all or any

part of the recommended work determined to be in the public interest and to reimburse any common carrier for any of such recommended work performed by such carrier. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall be used to make the survey authorized by this section, shall recommend necessary work that has been determined by the President acting through the Office of Emergency Planning to be in the public interest, and shall be used to supervise any work authorized to be performed under this section.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$3,875,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho, damaged or destroyed by the floods and high waters of December 1964, and January and February 1965, may have a maturity of up to thirty years, except that section 7(c) of such Act shall not apply to such loans.

SEC. 7. This Act, other than section 5 and the amendment made by section 3(c), shall not be in effect after June 30, 1966, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under this Act on or before such date.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965".

Mr. JONES of Alabama (during the reading.) Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a little while ago I called attention to the words of President Johnson in his first message to a joint session of the Congress, this being on November 27, 1963. I want to read verbatim from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

The President speaking:

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones.

How deep in the marrow of Lyndon Johnson's bones is his regard for the independence and integrity of Congress as evidenced by his veto?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Young, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 2089) to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, pursuant to House Resolution 420, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be 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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on S. 2089, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### ESTABLISHING A DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 419, 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. 6927) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of the bill (H.R. 8822) as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill (H.R. 6927). At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and 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 gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 419 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6927, with 2 hours of general debate and waiving points of order.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6927 has to do with the establishment of a new department at the Cabinet level. In view of the importance of this particular subject I would hope that the House would see fit to grant the rule here suggested and to permit the members of the Committee on Government Operations to present the case for this new department. Therefore, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 419.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, proposals to create new Cabi-

net departments are not novel. Indeed, since 1952 there have been 46 bills to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and scores of other bills to establish everything from a Department of Peace to one for Science and Technology. Although on August 28, 1961, the House Committee on Government Operations reported a bill to establish a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs no action was taken in that session and in 1962 a reorganization plan to accomplish this objective was defeated 264 to 150.

It is being said, I note in some quarters, that the passage of this bill is needed to produce a renewed burst of enthusiasm for the Great Society program and to give a psychological uplift to the drive to enact the other programs. Mr. Speaker, I submit that before we pass a bill that may in years to come cost the taxpayers billions in administrative costs and expanded Federal programs—before we pass a bill that may have a further disruptive effect on the pattern of Federal-State relations we ought to seek far more substantial reasons than that.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the administration, through its Solicitor General, made the following statement in a brief filed before the U.S. Supreme Court urging that the Court direct reapportionment of State legislature in accordance with the Census:

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

In hearings this year in the other body, Mr. Gordon, former Director of the Budget was questioned about the potential strengthening of State-urban relationships through the pending reapportionment. Mr. Gordon did not reply to this specifically, but one answer can be suggested. If the Central Government has already set up a department of urban affairs, and has already established an administrative pattern for Federal-urban practice, has already in operation coordinating machinery for Federal-urban programs and planning—what practical aid can reapportioned State legislatures be in this respect? Whatever ultimate effect reapportionment might have on intrastate responsible political power will come too late if legislation has already cemented the framework of Federal-urban operations.

This year in his state of the Union message, President Johnson said that a great society will not flower spontaneously from swelling riches and surging power. It will not be the gift of governments or the creation of Presidents.

Mr. Speaker, the elevation of HHFA to Cabinet status is not going to solve the problems of our cities either, even though it is an attempt to lead the people of this country to believe that a solution to the problems of urban development is a gift of government.

To avoid the obvious criticism that merely by elevating HHFA to Cabinet status you account for only about one-third of the total urban aid-impact programs of the Federal Government an attempt is made in the majority report to say that this new department will concern itself only with urban development not other urban affairs. Well, where does one end and the other begin? Where is the magic dividing line? What possible logic is there behind an attempt to establish this impossible dichotomy. I submit there is no such separation and the reason why important agencies with a vital affect on urban development are left outside this new Cabinet department is because to include them all would result in a bureaucratic monstrosity that would make even the administrative woes of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pale into insignificance.

This new Cabinet department will not coordinate—it will proliferate.

It might be well at this point to refer to the recommendation of the Hoover Commission task force on lending agencies dated February 1955. The task force recommended that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be discontinued and that its components be divided into three separate establishments. The purpose was to separate the economically sound businesslike functions of the Agency from the subsidy-type programs. One establishment would be organized around welfare programs such as urban renewal and public housing. The second would evolve around the Federal Home Loan Bank System because it was concerned primarily with a specialized segment of the private banking and credit field, and the third independent establishment would be the Federal Housing Administration, a mortgage insurance activity. Thus, the proposed bill not only violates a basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission report, but also a recommendation of the Commission's task force on lending agencies, a report which was submitted to the Congress by Chairman Herbert Hoover on February 5, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a substitute offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], whose bill, H.R. 8822, would establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. If you really want coordination of existing programs and not simply aggrandizement of Federal power herein lies the answer.

Instead of ignoring some 60 existing Federal programs concerned with urban metropolitan problems by leaving them outside the proposed new department you provide the head of this Office the kind of authority to coordinate across departmental lines all of these various urban-impact programs as stated in section 3(a) of the proposed substitute bill. The Director of the Budget has been called one of the most powerful three or four men in the Government, yet he holds no Cabinet rank. He coordinates the spending requests of all executive agencies to the tune of \$100 billion a year. We submit that properly organized and staffed and given proper presidential in-

terest and support an Office of Community Development can go far toward solving the problems the majority would seek to solve by setting up a super-governmental agency.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I reported this rule from the Committee on Rules to authorize the House to consider H.R. 6927 introduced by my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. I am the author of a companion bill to H.R. 6927—H.R. 8771.

Mr. Speaker, in the strongest way I wish to identify myself with this rule and to urge its adoption and the enactment by the House of H.R. 6927.

Mr. Speaker, with 70-odd percent of the people of the United States living in urban areas H.R. 6927, is designed to meet the housing demands and the urban development requirements of the most populous areas of this country—areas most vital to the welfare and the progress of our country.

It is a bill which gives proper emphasis to the importance of housing and urban development, making the head of the Department a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

It thus brings the head of this Department into close contact with the President and enables him to advise and counsel the President with reference to the execution and recommendation of national policies which would provide better facilities through which the U.S. Government can assist in meeting the housing and urban development needs of the people of this country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rule be adopted and that H.R. 6927 be enacted by the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under the rule by which the Committee on Rules has brought H.R. 6927 to the floor today, the House for the first time will be able to choose between two alternative ways of doing what virtually everyone agrees must be done—that is, provide consistent policy direction and program coordination for the dozens of different Federal programs, administered by several independent departments and agencies, which have a major impact on the Nation's urban areas.

To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no one disagrees with this objective. On the contrary, everyone recognizes that Federal activities in urban areas are marked by confusion, contradiction and duplication.

Yet, for 4 straight years, Congress has refused to approve Presidential proposals for a new Cabinet-level department to deal with urban affairs and housing, whether by legislation or reorganization plan. In 1962, the House disapproved a reorganization plan by a vote of 264 to 150. And in 1961, 1963, and 1964, the House—despite Presidential requests—failed to bring similar legislation to the floor.

The principal reason, I suggest, is that proponents of a new department have

not made a convincing case either that a department is needed to provide adequate service to our urban areas or that a department could effectively coordinate the multitude of programs operated by other departments and agencies in this area.

Under the rule, Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer at the appropriate time an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee bill. The amendment, which is the text of H.R. 8822, would establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development. Such an Office, which would be equipped with the authority of the President and would function at his direction, would make possible the continuing policy and program coordination which is so notably absent today. For this reason, I believe my amendment warrants the support of all our colleagues, regardless of their convictions about the proper Federal role in meeting the needs of urban areas.

The central problem, Mr. Speaker, is to assure that the right hand of the Federal Government knows what the left hand is doing—and that both are working together. We need to make certain that the 50 or 60 or more urban area programs are administered as efficiently and as effectively as possible; that overall urban policies are consistent and that program goals are compatible; that one program or agency is not unduly hampering another; that waste and duplication can be eliminated; that the conflicting interests and views of the several departments and agencies in the field or urban affairs can be resolved in an orderly way; and that the goals determined by Congress can be achieved with a minimum of delay and redtape.

To illustrate this point more specifically, we need the kind of uniform policy and interagency coordination that will prevent a Federal highway from being built where an urban renewal project has already been located. We need to prevent the kind of situation where months grow into years while the Corps of Engineers and the Urban Renewal Administration try to decide how to share responsibility for a flood control project in an urban renewal area.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues can recite hundreds of such real-life examples of what can happen to programs with desirable purposes when there is no way of keeping two agencies with related responsibilities moving in the same direction.

As the number and size and cost and complexity of urban area programs have grown, the problem has become increasingly severe. Congress, of course, cannot legislate every detail of program administration. It must leave to the agency concerned a rather considerable degree of discretion and flexibility. In exercising this discretion, experience has shown that agencies tend to concentrate on their own programs often to the virtual exclusion of related programs.

The effect of this tendency has been seriously harmful in many ways—as Governors, mayors, county officials, students of urban affairs, organizations in this field, and Federal officials them-

selves have reported time after time. The lack of coordination at the Federal level undermines the objectives of Congress. It disrupts relations between Federal, State, and local governments. It imposes unnecessary burdens on State and local officials and handicaps the operation of their own programs. It is wasteful of time and money.

The pending bill, Mr. Speaker, cannot achieve the kind of Government-wide coordination which is needed to correct this situation.

For this reason, at least 24 of our colleagues have introduced identical bills in this session of Congress, and similar bills have been introduced in the past three Congresses, to provide the coordination we find is essential. Our alternative would provide an effective mechanism for coordinating all urban area policies and programs at the only level where coordination can really work, the Executive Office of the President.

There are several important reasons why the bill to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development cannot provide the needed coordination.

First. There is nothing in the committee bill which would give the proposed new Secretary any power to coordinate urban programs outside his new Department which the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not already possess or could not be assigned by the President.

Second. The new Department would have jurisdiction over less than 20 percent of the existing urban programs in the Federal Government.

Third. With the exception of the Federal National Mortgage Association, no programs, powers, or functions not now assigned to HHFA would go to the new Department or its Secretary.

Consequently, the new Department would simply be the old agency under a new name.

No less an authority than the late President Kennedy, however, stated the case for our proposed coordinating office in the most persuasive terms. In his message to Congress in 1962 proposing the establishment of an Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President, he said—and I quote:

Science policies transcending agency lines need to be coordinated and shaped at the level of the Executive Office of the President, drawing upon many resources both within and outside the Government.

While the President credited the National Science Foundation with doing a good job of administering sizable scientific programs, he concluded that this operating agency could not do the coordinating job it had previously been assigned.

The Foundation—

He said—and I quote him again—

being at the same organizational level as other agencies, cannot satisfactorily coordinate Federal science policies or evaluate programs of other agencies.

This, in a nutshell, is our contention with regard to HHFA and the proposed new Department. In neither form can it successfully coordinate its equals.

As our colleagues will recall, Congress agreed with the President and approved his proposal for an Office of Science and Technology without opposition either in committee or on the floor of the House. The good judgment of this body has since been confirmed in the admirable way in which that Office has functioned.

What we are proposing today, Mr. Speaker, is that the House follow this successful precedent in a field—urban affairs and community development—where the circumstances are similar but the need for coordination is even greater than it was in the area of science and technology.

Our proposal is based solidly on experience and on the repeated recommendations of scholars and officials at every level of government. The Council of State Governments, the National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities—formerly the American Municipal Association—have all, at one time or another, officially recognized the need and endorsed the approach followed by our bill. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, whose members include Cabinet officers, Senators, Representatives, Governors, mayors, county officials, State legislators and private citizens, has also strongly recommended the establishment of a unified policy for urban programs and the government-wide coordination of all such programs.

Mr. Speaker, to those of our colleagues who fear the ultimate growth of a new Cabinet-level Department into a mammoth organization embracing all urban area programs, I would urge support of our alternative as the best means of preventing such a development.

And to those who are truly concerned with the need for better service to our urban areas, for consistent policy and for efficient coordination, I also urge support of our alternative as the only effective means of achieving these tremendously important objectives.

I support the rule.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any desire on the part of any of the Members on this side to speak on the rule. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] says that he has no further requests for time. So, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6927) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes.

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 H.R. 6927, with Mr. BOGGS 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 rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLÉN-BORN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this bill and as a member of the Committee on Government Operations and of the subcommittee which held hearings on H.R. 6927—and as a Congressman from this Nation's largest city—I have a particular and pointed commitment to the passage of this legislation.

Life in American cities is not the good life. Over the past hundred years, we have built cities in which to live in health and happiness, only to discover that the resulting urban life is a major threat to those very goals. We are, in short, in danger of losing control over environment, in this case the environment where 135 million Americans live and work. I do not regard this as an exaggeration. It represents something close to a national crisis, and I am yet to be fully convinced that this country will have the imagination, skill, and commitment to overcome that crisis.

The measure before us today is long overdue. Yet it represents only a crucial first step in a project which has as its goal improvement in the lives of 70 percent of this country's population. It is my conviction that the debate and legislative history of this bill must record deep awareness of the enormous and intractable problems presented by the contemporary American city. It must be an occasion for us to weigh the gravity of our task, and the complexity of our goals.

The President's message on the problems of the city, sent to this Congress on March 2, was of historic significance. It documented, in simple and compelling terms, the extent of the American urban crisis. It reminded us, for example, that in less than 40 years the entire urban population of this country will double; urban land will double with it. We will need schools for an additional 10 million children; welfare services for 5 million more people over the age of 60; transportation facilities for the movement of 200 million people.

These projections would be of sobering impact even if our present cities were healthy and confident. But these new threats will be visited upon urban areas already subject to decay and dissolution.

In a society where technology and science accustom us to invention and innovation, it is hard for us to acknowledge the existence, let alone the threat, of social decay. And yet decay is the theme of the American urban crisis. There is the decay of buildings, of homes, of rooms, of plumbing—where there is plumbing. Nine million homes, most of them in our cities, are presently in urgent need of renovation. There is the decay of schoolrooms and other

community facilities. And there is always the more vivid decay of pollution, in the air and water.

Such material decay breeds social, psychological, and often moral decay. The elderly, the poor, those discriminated against because of their race, those who are concentrated in ghettos of deprivation, all are subject to the more invidious demoralization which accompanies a loss of faith in one's environment—one's ability to change it. How can we expect our people to maintain their energies and spirit when their buildings, schools, and streets are in disrepair, with little hope of renewal? In the absence of hope, there develops a mentality of cynicism and alienation—and the life of the city is thus subjected to crime and violence.

What makes these problems all the more frustrating is the subtle interrelation and interpenetration of individual social problems. In projecting new programs of urban renewal, one must account for the demands of transportation. On relocating the residents of slums, one must be sensitive to the needs and attitudes of their new neighbors. The city, in other words, is a mechanism of such sensitivity that to tamper with one structure or one component, is to effect and often upset an unpredictable number of seemingly independent components. And this is all the more difficult because the political and jurisdictional definitions of the city are becoming less and less relevant to the problems of urban decay. The city projects appendages to itself, which we call suburbs. In one sense such units lie outside the purview and authority of the modern city. And yet the jobs of suburban citizens, and hence the entire quality of their lives, usually depend upon the health and vitality of the central city. The threats of pollution, and inadequate transportation, of course, ignore the artificial jurisdictions of municipalities.

With their problems rising geometrically and their jurisdictions growing increasingly irrelevant, our city leaders face still another difficulty—the absence of satisfactory economic resources. In 10 years municipal tax revenues have increased by nearly 50 percent, but local indebtedness has doubled. The demand for trained personnel is going unmet. For the conviction that the modern city is unmanageable often infects the representatives of the people, as well as the people themselves. Reliance upon Federal resources is already well-established. It is now clear, however, that the existing structure of the Federal Government, as well as, in my opinion, the existing spectrum of Federal programs, is totally inadequate if the city is to meet its crisis successfully.

The first need in meeting the crisis of our cities is for enlightened planning, equipped with the full influence and resources of Cabinet-level authority. I do not believe this country and this Government are presently prepared to solve the problems facing our cities, because I am not yet convinced that the necessary programs have been or are being devised and developed. For the urban problem is still an intellectual problem, which

must be met with careful thought and creative reflection. The new Department will be a repository for metropolitan planning. It will present a forum for innovation and imagination. But, most important, it will be an agency of coordination where scattered and undisciplined efforts can create as many problems as solve them.

Let me stress that from the organizational point of view the need for coordination of urban efforts is paramount. This is not to say that all programs pertinent to the cities must suddenly be put under the jurisdiction of this new Department. The Department of Agriculture, for example, profits from the water conservation and development programs of the Department of Interior, and the Weather Bureau programs in the Department of Commerce, and the farm labor programs in the Department of Labor. The Treasury Department finds no need to incorporate the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Reserve Board, the Export-Import Bank, or the Federal intermediate credit banks. A Department of Housing and Urban Development will see to it that the needs of the American city are represented in the planning, consultation and administration of all Federal programs. This requires no radical alteration of existing programs and agencies.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to reaffirm my conviction that the measure before us today should represent the threshold of a New Deal for the American city. I believe the problems obstructing that goal are the most difficult, frustrating, and demoralizing problems facing this country. They will multiply geometrically in the absence of aggressive Federal response, a response which should be initiated, led, planned, and coordinated by a Department of Housing and Urban Development. But let me also say, in the interest of realism and sobriety, that these problems will persevere despite such a commitment. We must be prepared for that. For the issue, finally, is classic and fundamental: Will we be the masters or the victims of our social environment?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I quite agree with the gentleman that coordination is most important in the problems of urban areas. As he knows, I represent an urban area myself. However, of the items that the gentleman mentioned; namely, air pollution, water pollution, civil rights, crime, schools, streets, not one of these areas would be under the jurisdiction of this proposed new Cabinet rank Department of Housing and Urban Development. Housing, which was also mentioned, would be. For all practical purposes, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State would have as much authority in the areas that were listed as would the new Cabinet rank Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

As you know, I favor a different proposal which I am convinced would provide the coordination which you ob-

viously, from your remarks, are so anxious to see happen here.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me suggest two rebuttals to what the gentleman said. On page 3 of the bill, it indicates the various advisory capacities and responsibilities that the new Secretary would have and I might read it to the gentleman so he will realize the area of responsibility that the Secretary has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. In the first instance, the responsibility of the Secretary is to advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development. Second, it is to develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering an orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas.

And third, to exercise leadership in the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; to provide technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems.

It goes on for other areas. The point that I am trying to make is that you cannot categorize and departmentalize and put in cubbyholes all of the problems that involve our cities and surround our cities. I believe that at one Cabinet level we can meet and solve and deal with, think about and initiate, all of the various programs and responsibilities that our urban areas have today. You cannot simply put one in one area and one in another area. This sort of umbrella approach will be a very real way of meeting the challenge.

The gentleman's alternative proposal would be to take on the 13,000 employees of the HHFA and make them part of the executive branch. I really doubt that that is what the gentleman and his co-sponsors of the alternative really want. We do not want to build up the executive branch when their only responsibility is in the area of advising the President. This is a working department, not merely an advisory department. When both of them come under one roof, the administrative management functions and the advisory functions, I think then the first real step in meeting the urban needs will have been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] has expired.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the opening paragraph of the minority views contained in the report of the Government Operations Committee on this bill rather cogently states the position of the minority; and I shall quote:

H.R. 6927 is unnecessary, will not accomplish what its proponents represent, and is contrary to sound principles of Government organization. It should not become law.

Mr. Chairman, ideally the legislative process, the thing we are all involved

in, should involve three determinations as to any issue that is before us. First of all identify a problem; that there is a problem that is crying for a solution. Second, to determine if there is the necessity of Federal involvement in the solution to this problem and, if so, then, of course, it becomes a subject matter for us to be concerned with. And third, to construct the best possible solution to that problem.

In my opinion, the first two steps in this legislative process can be agreed upon by both sides in relation to this question. There is a problem, the problem of orderly development of our urban areas; and secondly. I think we have long ago determined that there is a necessity of Federal involvement. Witness the many programs we have at the Federal level directed to providing solutions or aiding in the providing of solutions to the urban problems that face our urban areas throughout the country.

It is at the third step of this legislative process that we disagree. The majority, at the request of the President, have introduced this bill to solve the problem of the coordination of the urban problems and the Federal involvement in the solution of urban problems by the creation of a Cabinet-rank department. So we agree on one and two, and on number three we disagree, because the minority, or at least many Members of the minority, have sought and found what we consider to be a better solution. Admitting that we have many programs at the Federal level and that they need coordination, many Members on this side of the aisle have introduced similar bills for the creation of an Office in the Executive Office of the President to provide the overall coordination that everyone agrees is needed.

As I see the levels of the Executive Department we have certainly at the top level the President, and included therein the Executive Office of the President directly responsive to him.

Second, you have the Cabinet-rank departments; and third, the various agencies of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the direction which the minority takes in the solution of this problem is to put this right at the highest level in the ranks of the Executive responsibility, in the Executive Office of the President, and not at the second level, the Cabinet-rank department.

Mr. Chairman, this is why we state in the preamble to the minority views that the bill under debate is contrary to sound principles of law or of Government organization, because we are not seeking the solution at the highest level where coordination can best be provided.

The bill under consideration, H.R. 6927, in fact provides little or no coordination. It puts the emphasis entirely in the field of housing. In substance, all but one paragraph or one section of this bill is directed to the elevation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet-rank status.

What we really will do in the passage of this bill is to certainly agree and provide that the Federal Government has a permanent and an expanding role in the

field of housing. This could be the only purpose in elevating HHFA to Cabinet status, and the only result.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, one of the constituent agencies of HHFA is the FHA. This particular agency which is one of the constituent agencies of HHFA, the Federal Housing Administration, is one of the most respected of all Federal agencies involved in the field of housing.

Mr. Chairman, the FHA has enjoyed excellent relations with the private mortgage bankers, the private mortgage market, and also with the individuals, the homeowners, who have sought help from FHA.

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out in the testimony before the subcommittee on this bill by the Mortgage Bankers Association that there is no clear-cut provision in the pending bill as to what the future of FHA will be and, in fact, during the full committee executive session considering this bill, I offered an amendment to the bill that I think would have vastly improved its appeal by specifically providing for the continuance of FHA, with the appointment of a Federal Housing Administrator by the President, instead of the new Cabinet head assigning these duties to some assistant secretary.

Mr. Chairman, as to the first two objections that are set forth in the minority report, we hold that this bill is unnecessary, not because of an unawareness of urban problems, but because there is no need to elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency to a Cabinet-rank status. All of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee agreed that HHFA and its constituent agencies had done a good job. They had no complaint about the quality of the work of HHFA.

Mr. Chairman, there is no magic solution to the problems that face our urban areas, merely by raising to a Cabinet status this agency and giving it little or no new powers, and really no opportunity to coordinate the many programs that are presently engaged in by the Federal Government.

Secondly, the accomplishments that are claimed for this bill by the majority cannot really be accomplished by the enactment of this legislation.

The much-advertised, one-stop service for the mayors of our communities has been the appeal of similar legislation for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. Mayor Daley, of Chicago, in testifying before the subcommittee, admitted that the passage of this bill will in no way provide a one-stop service for the mayors of our communities in their dealings with the Federal Government. As I pointed out in a question put to Mayor Daley, of Chicago:

I think it is interesting to note that although housing is one of the major concerns of our cities, there are many other problems that our cities face.

If you have a highway construction program you go to the Department of Commerce; a flood control problem, you go to the Department of Agriculture.

I am speaking about after enactment of this bill, not at the present time.

These same steps will be necessary for our urban areas. Improvement of rivers and

waterways you go to the Corps of Engineers, water pollution, you go to Health, Education, and Welfare, disaster relief, you go to the Emergency Planning Board, the Executive Office of the President, civil defense you go to the Defense Department, employment problems you go to the Department of Labor, school lunch programs—certainly very important in our area—you go to the Department of Agriculture. We could go on and on.

In other words, the enactment of this bill does not put all of these programs in one place where they can be coordinated. The alternative solution is the creation of a new office in the Executive Office of the President where these programs can be coordinated at the top level. Even as to the one area, the only area that is really covered by this bill, the area of housing, the bill does not do what its sponsors claim for it.

The sponsors of the bill claim this will put the problem of housing at Cabinet status. In the testimony it appears only about one-third of the Federal Government funds involved in housing will be in this new Cabinet-rank department.

It was pointed out in the committee hearings that a full two-thirds of the funds of the Federal Government added to this program of housing and urban development would not be touched by the passage of this bill. I refer to our programs under our Office of Education, and under the Home Loan Bank Board, that control two-thirds of the funds of the Federal Government in Federal housing. This bill will not accomplish anything more than to raise the one-third of housing in HHFA to Cabinet rank. Therefore I think the bill should be defeated and the substitute should be adopted.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 6927, which would establish a new executive Department on Housing and Urban Development. This is a historic step that will put our Government in better position to aid our urban communities, to administer housing programs, and to aid and to improve the possible development of problems that are growing more difficult, as we all know.

Living as I do in an urban community, the county of Los Angeles, which has 7 million people in it, more than many of the States in the Union and more than several of the States added together, I am particularly cognizant of the problems that we in the cities face. Seven out of ten people in our Nation today live in urban areas. There are 125 million people living in cities and suburbs of this country. These people are concerned with housing, land use and planning services, mass transportation, and other public facility requirements. Eighty percent of our population in the next 35 years will live in cities or suburban areas.

When the Department of Agriculture was set up to look after the problems of agriculture, 70 percent of our people lived in the farm areas.

Now that condition is reversed and we face an emphasis on living in urban

areas and, therefore, we believe this is a timely move on the part of the administration to focus attention on these basic problems of physical properties and physical property planning which are related to cities particularly.

Now I want to answer an argument which is frequently made and has been made here on the floor of the House today. That all of the matters pertaining to urban living should be in one department. Why God bless you, if we did this we would have 80 percent of all the Government functions in one department. That is why we cannot take the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and put it in. We cannot take the Veterans' Administration and housing and services and put them into this bill. If we were to do just what has been said in the nature of criticism of what we are doing, the very people who are criticising us today for not doing enough would be criticising us for doing too much—for building up a great urban department concerned with urban affairs—a great ogre, a great bureaucracy. We would hear all of those terms used.

I say in all kindness to my friends who say that we are not doing enough, let us go ahead and do the basic things that have to do with housing in the cities, with mass transportation and with other development programs and planings and services within the city. Let us set up this department. Then, if later on the Congress decides it wants to add some additional duties that are pertinent to the people of the city that are not receiving the emphasis they should receive, then there would be plenty of time to do that.

But let us legislate a basic foundation organization at the present time and get this new Cabinet-level position established so that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs can speak at the same level as every other Secretary of a Cabinet-level department. So he can speak with the same authority and the same prestige and sit in on the councils of the President with the same prestige and with the same authority. What we are attempting to do is just to give to the Secretary of a Cabinet department, charged with the basic physical properties that are involved in housing and home finance and the public housing administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association and the programs for the elderly and the program for college housing and all of these things that we have mentioned, to put them together in one department where we will have one responsible head in the place of a number of heads created by statute which results in confusion in the contacts between local governments and the Federal Government in regard to the problems that they have on the urban level.

During our committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN], one of our respected members on the minority, offered an amendment. I do not know whether it will be offered again today, but I am going to call it the Erlenborn amendment because of its author. He sought to set up within this Cabinet position what amounts to a completely autonomous department inside a depart-

ment. In other words, to transfer to the department the Federal Housing Administration and place within this Cabinet-level department all of the offices, employees, insurance funds, assets, liabilities, contracts, property records and obligations, together with all of the functions and powers of the Federal Housing Administration, which are now vested in the Housing and Home Finance Administration. The same transfer of properties and responsibilities now vested in PHA, URA, CFA, and FNMA is also made. Their statutory powers and responsibilities would be placed in the person of the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Are there any agencies or departments that you have mentioned combined into this new Cabinet post that are not now under the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All of these functions I mentioned that have been created by statute by the Congress are under the Housing and Home Finance Administrator at this time.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is right and they are all under one boss already?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. YOUNGER. And the only thing you are attempting to do is merely to give to that man who is now responsible, a Cabinet post?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, not exactly. We are planning to set up a Cabinet level position and we are going to invest in a Secretary of the Cabinet the responsibilities which are now vested by statute in a half dozen different people.

Mr. YOUNGER. They are all vested now in the Administrator are they not? That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sorry to say the statute gives the Administrator of Public Housing certain statutory authorities. They are under the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, but not under his authority. In other words, he cannot overrule the statutory powers given to the different administrators by the Congress.

We are trying to do what the Hoover Commission advocated. We are trying to coordinate related authorities, functions, and responsibilities which have been placed in several different administrators by statutes of Congress, taking away from them the authority and responsibility under the present statutes and placing that in the Secretary of the Department.

The Secretary of the Department is to be responsible for the functions of the different divisions of the Cabinet-level Department. Authority is to be vested in the Secretary, and not in the different administrators.

The Erlenborn amendment sought to put all these statutory responsibilities in what was to be called a Federal Housing Commissioner, though it did pay the concept of a Cabinet-level Department lip-service. It said, "under the supervision and direction of the Secretary." How

could it be under the supervision and direction of the Secretary when the authority and responsibility was placed in another man?

If that amendment is offered, I want the Members to know exactly what is the issue. The issue is whether we will have divided authority in the Cabinet Department or whether we will have the authority and responsibility to answer to the Congress in one man at the top, as is now the case with respect to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, and all other Cabinet-level positions.

We seek to do exactly what we have done in the other Cabinet-level departments of Government.

I wish to address myself briefly, in the time remaining, to the substitute bill which I understand will be offered on a motion to recommit.

We considered all of the facets of this problem, I believe, during the past 2 or 3 years, when we had this and similar legislation before us.

The substitute bill seeks to place in the Executive Office of the President a considerable bureaucracy answerable to the President for the coordination of these programs which Congress has set up. This, of course, is ridiculous when one starts to think about it.

If Members will read Mrs. DWYER's bill, they will see the scope of function and the number of personnel involved in the proposal of Mrs. DWYER to locate this function in the Office of the President. We must remember that if this is done, the head of that commission will be answerable to the President.

Under the present arrangement a Secretary in the Cabinet is not only responsible to the President for implementation of the programs but is also responsible to the Congress of the United States. I am not in favor of building up the Executive Office of the President and putting functions in it which by statute have been put in Cabinet level secretaries, who have been answerable not only to the President but also to the Congress.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I should like to bring to the gentleman's attention the testimony of Mr. Bernard Boutin, formerly the Administrator of the General Services Administration, who testified in support of the bill. This is to be found on page 12 of the report. Mr. Boutin said:

There is a vast difference between the standing in the councils of the executive branch of the head of an independent agency and the status of a member of the Cabinet. A very good example of this is the ability of a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to talk as an equal with the Secretary of the Treasury on monetary policy, which is vastly important to the whole homebuilding industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true. The National Association of Home Builders asked for special recognition to be given to the functions of the agency supporting the private mortgage market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we do have a committee amendment which I advanced in the committee and which is found on page 4. It will give proper recognition to that function by placing it under one of the Assistant Secretaries. We believe this is all that is necessary. We do have a letter which will be read later from the Bureau of the Budget and will be put into the record, in regard to this matter, showing their approval of the amendment.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Government  
Operations, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your inquiry as to whether the name "Federal Housing Administration" would be retained within the Department of Housing and Urban Development which would be established by H.R. 6927 and also as to whether the Bureau of the Budget has any comment with respect to the amendment adopted by your committee to section 4(a) of the bill, relating to the administration of mortgage insurance functions within the Department.

The Bureau is aware of the concern that has been expressed by segments of the homebuilding and mortgage banking industries that the Federal Housing Administration will be in some way downgraded as a result of the establishment of the proposed Department. This concern has led to a proposal, incorporated in your committee amendment, that one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Department shall be designated to administer, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, departmental programs relating to the private mortgage market. It has also given rise to inquiries as to whether the name of the Federal Housing Administration would be retained for the departmental organization that handles mortgage insurance.

As you know, the administration bill, as introduced, was silent on matters of detail affecting these issues. However, there are no grounds at all for concern that the FHA and its programs will be downgraded. On the contrary, the Agency and its programs would for the first time be represented directly in the President's Cabinet. This is so because final responsibility for the functions would be vested in the Secretary who would, of course, be a member of the Cabinet.

With respect to your first question, the Bureau is fully aware of the value inherent in preserving the familiar terminology of the Federal Housing Administration and is confident that the Secretary of the proposed new Department, whoever he may be, will so organize the Department as to preserve the advantages of this well-known name. This is not to say that each and every function or internal organizational arrangement of the FHA will be indefinitely frozen within the Department. However, I do mean to indicate that the basic mortgage insurance functions will undoubtedly continue under the Department to be identified officially with the name "Federal Housing Administration."

The Bureau of the Budget has carefully considered the language of the amendment proposed by the committee to section 4(a) of the bill. In view of the importance of the private mortgage market programs for which responsibility would be assigned to an Assistant Secretary, I am confident that such an assignment would be made by the

Secretary whether or not an amendment were adopted expressly requiring that this be done. Although the Bureau does not believe that such assignments should be made in the legislation itself, in this specific case, and in view of the considerations discussed above, the Bureau has no objection to the assignment of responsibility which your committee's amendment is designed to accomplish.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,  
Director.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 138]

Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Mink
Bonner	Hagan, Ga.	Morton
Bow	Hamilton	Passman
Bray	Hanna	Pike
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Ind.	Pirnie
Cederberg	Hébert	Powell
Chamberlain	Ichord	Resnick
Corman	Irwin	Rivers, Alaska
Curtis	Jacobs	Selden
Dingell	Keith	Stafford
Duncan, Ore.	McMillan	Steed
Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald	Toll
Farnum	Martin, Ala.	Vivian
Findley	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Fisher	Martin, Nebr.	Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS, 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. 6927, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 390 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure my colleagues that I did not instigate the quorum call. However, I believe this measure is important. If this bill passes, it will have long-range, far-reaching effects, and it ought to have the attention and careful consideration of the full membership of the House.

The bill, by its title, would establish a new department of housing and urban development, but I believe it borders on being a legislative hoax. I say that because the title holds out an unfulfilled promise; it misleads people into believing that by creating a new department, the Federal Government will somehow solve all of the problems of the urban community when, in fact, this measure, psychologically at least, will tend to weaken State and local governments, and it will create greater unjustified dependence upon a new Federal department.

Our very able and distinguished colleague from California, [Mr. HOLIFIELD], whom I always find to be very candid and very fair, helped to put this issue into proper focus. He pointed out, quite cor-

rectly, that the bill does little more than to merely elevate the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet level, that the bill does not provide for the transfer of functions of many agencies of the Federal Government which now have a direct impact upon urban affairs—for example, that it will not transfer functions relating to civil rights, education, public health, air pollution, manpower development training, and so on. The gentleman from California pointed out how impractical it would be to make many of these transfers, and he said that if Congress were to transfer all of the various functions which have an impact on urban problems, fully 80 percent of the Federal Government's functions would be vested in such a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Obviously, we do not wish to transfer many of those functions. It would not make sense to do so. What is really needed and desired is better coordination of the many existing activities and functions as they apply to urban problems.

Incidentally, the gentleman from California indicated that the minority members were critical because many of these functions were not being transferred under the committee bill.

I want to assure him that we are not critical because these many functions are not transferred. But it is essential to an understanding of the bill to realize that many of the functions important to urban problems are not being transferred to the proposed new department. We would not want many of these functions transferred. The fact that they are not being transferred helps to point up what the real function and purpose of such a bill as this should be: to establish better coordination.

But what Cabinet officer, or which of the other members of the Cabinet, is relegated to the role of being a mere coordinator? Is this an appropriate function for the establishment of a whole new department of the Federal Government, or is it a function which could more appropriately be handled by someone operating in the office of the Presidency?

How could an official who does not have jurisdiction over education, public health, welfare, manpower development and training, do anything more than merely coordinate? It seems to me it borders on the ridiculous to set up a whole new department of Government, to establish a new Cabinet post, to carry out the function of a liaison man—to gather material and information about existing programs and agencies and to help coordinate the various agencies already established in to assist in the solution of urban problems. The approach of the committee bill just does not make sense.

Although the argument has not been expressed here today, it is sometimes indicated that a Department of Urban Affairs ought to be established in order to balance the establishment of the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If there needs be, and ought to be, any kind of a counterpart to the Department of Agriculture, then it would seem to me that it is already established in the Department of Labor. Food, the production and distribution of which involves the Department of Agriculture is not of importance only to rural people; food is a concern of all people. People in the cities as well as the people on the farms and in the urban areas are interested in, and ought to be concerned about the problems with which the Department of Agriculture deals.

This proposal before us today to establish a Department of Urban Affairs, I suggest, is a divisive approach to the solution of problems. It suggests that departments ought to be established, not on the basis of functions or responsibilities, but rather as some kind of a representative of people who live in particular areas. It would be just as logical, I submit, to establish a Department of Western Affairs, or a Department of Great Lakes Affairs, or a Department of Southern Affairs. Should the Congress also establish a Department of Suburban Affairs, or is that to be a subdivision of the Department of Urban Affairs?

The substitute proposal which will be offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] to set up an agency within the office of the Presidency to coordinate existing programs which directly bear upon urban problems, offers a much better solution than the bill which the committee has reported. The Dwyer substitute would provide something that our mayors and our city officials really want. They do want a one-stop coordinating service. When they come to Washington, they would like to go someplace and be able to obtain information and to obtain answers to their questions about various existing programs related to urban problems.

The substitute bill would provide that one-stop coordinating service. The committee bill will not.

The committee bill would merely elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which handles only about one-third of the housing problems of our Federal Government to the rank of Cabinet level.

So those Members—and that includes me—who are truly concerned about urban problems, who want to do something to help our cities, something that will be constructive and will not mislead, I urge you seriously and on a nonpartisan basis to support the substitute bill that will be offered.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the case for a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development is very simple. The problems of our cities—housing, urban renewal, community facilities, mass transit, open space—are so important that they should not be relegated to a low level sub-Cabinet agency.

Let me say I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] when

he pointed out a few moments ago that problems like housing, urban renewal, mass transit, are not Democratic or Republican problems; they are national problems.

There will be an effort made to substitute for the pending bill a text introduced by the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], to set up in the White House an Office of Community Development. As far as I am concerned, one more White House office of expeditors and coordinators, this one devoted to urban affairs, might do no harm, and might well help. But it is simply no substitute for setting up a Cabinet-level department. You either believe that the affairs of our cities deserve Cabinet rank or you do not.

In view of the fact that the reaction from our minority friends to the suggestion of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs has been, to say the least, quite lukewarm, let me see if I can generate a little enthusiasm on the minority side for it. Let me take as my text a most moving article which appeared some years ago in *This Week* magazine. On the cover of *This Week* is a picture of our distinguished friend, then the ranking Republican member of the House Government Operations Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], who just got through a few minutes ago speaking against the bill today to make a Cabinet-level department out of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The caption, over a picture of Congressman YOUNGER is, "What can we do to make our American cities better, cleaner, happier places to live in?" Representative YOUNGER of California has an exciting solution. Read this article. "Let us have a Department of Urbaculture."

In the article our distinguished colleague from California went on to say:

I feel that a brandnew department of government with a Cabinet status should be created. Its job would be to deal with the problems of the new, forgotten man—the American who lives in the city or the suburbs. I am only suggesting that the Government give the city man the same consideration it now gives its country cousin. This is not a new revolutionary suggestion. Several countries have Cabinet-rank departments concerned with housing and urban affairs. I don't think we should waste 25 years debating its merits before establishing the Department of Urbaculture as we did with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Right now is the time to begin making city living livable again. And it's also as good a time as any to give that underprivileged citizen, the city slicker, an equal voice in government with his country cousin.

That article appeared on August 5, 1956. In my first term here I was so taken with the logic and directness of the Republican leader of the House Government Operations Committee that from that day to this I have been an enthusiastic propounder of the theory that we ought to have a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, similar legislation to this was vigorously supported by President Eisenhower's two Housing Administrators, Mr. Albert Cole and Mr. Norman Mason. The Eisenhower Bureau of the Budget agreed with

the position that the Housing and Home Finance Agency deserved Cabinet-level status.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans 9 years ago saw the need for a Cabinet-level department devoted to cities and ever since then every single problem of our cities has become more intense and the need for a Cabinet department is greater today.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our friends on the Republican side will reconsider the course upon which they are apparently embarking and will at least catch up to where they were 9 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself, I am quite willing to call this new department a Department of Urbaculture much as the name distresses me, if we can get a little Republican held and support in doing justice to our cities and in saying that we have a Department of Urbaculture.

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

Mr. REUSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I too am pleased that the gentleman from Wisconsin has brought this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives, because I have a high personal regard for my colleague from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. I find myself in complete accord with his sentiments as expressed in 1956.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, a very long time ago Plato observed that "they have filled the city full of harbors and docks and buildings and all of that and have left no room for reason or justice."

What was true of Athens more than 2,000 years ago is true of the cities of the United States today.

We now take up an opportunity to restore to them both reason and justice; reason in that the cities and their environs are the home of the great majority of the people of the United States which we in Congress represent, and justice in that Congress should rectify the fragmented representation allowed our cities at the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I first introduced a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs in 1960 and have introduced it in every Congress since then. One of the reasons that I authored and introduced the bill was my own personal view of the executive branch when I worked in it in 1955 and 1956. In those days I was in the Justice Department. One of my jobs was to work with the President's Cabinet.

I know perfectly well, Mr. Chairman, that some Presidents use the Cabinet to a greater extent or effect than do other Presidents. But it is always true that the Cabinet is the highest council in the executive branch of Government, and what is said or what is argued or fought for there may have a lasting impact upon the future course of national affairs.

I know also, Mr. Chairman, that no Cabinet officer is supposed to be just a lobbyist for the particular area that he represents. The Secretary of Agriculture is not necessarily just a spokesman for the farmer.

The Secretary of Labor is not supposed to be purely a lobbyist for members of the labor force.

The Secretary of Commerce is not supposed to be just a spokesman for business.

But the fact is that these various interests in the United States do get representation at the Cabinet level through Cabinet officers.

Meanwhile, what has happened to the consumers of the United States? What has happened to the long-forgotten person in our crowded cities, very often living alone, living by a wage check, trapped in the cost-of-living increases and all of the other pressures that surround him? He is at the mercy of every pressure.

Who is his representative at the highest council table of our Government? I think it is reasonable to assume that in some cases in modern history subjects such as housing in our cities have been shortchanged because of the absence of a voice at the Cabinet level. It is time that the interests of the consumers in our cities which have been unrepresented at the Cabinet level be now represented at the Cabinet level by a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Agriculture, labor, and commerce all have a Cabinet-level voice in the executive department. But not the cities, whose aggregate interests certainly deserve equal attention and direction.

The troubles of the cities are increasingly susceptible to national solutions. The awareness of these problems and the design of programs by which the Government can ease or correct them should be placed regularly and forcefully upon the Cabinet table.

The Federal role in the affairs of our cities is most apparent along the Atlantic coast, where we already are witnessing the creation of a huge supercity, spreading irregularly from Boston to Norfolk. New York City, a part of which I represent, will be at the center of this formidable complex of power and, we hope, prestige. The problems inherent in this urban expansion pattern will not respect the traditional delineations of authority and responsibility along city, county, and State lines. Air and water pollution, to name just two examples, have for some time been recognized by Congress as interstate problems requiring Federal participation. There are many, many more.

I think that perhaps our most urgent responsibility is to plan the growth of our city complexes so that expansion is properly channeled. An urban outburst of the kind already underway cannot be properly directed by isolated, parochial committees and studies. The need is for comprehensiveness, and it should logically develop from the highest level of our Government.

It is for the reasons I have outlined that I support the establishment of a Federal Department of City Affairs, by whatever name it finally is assigned.

The bill before us today closely parallels a bill I first introduced in 1960 to create a Cabinet office charged with furthering the interests of urban America. Its immediate value would be to pull together and raise the status of the proliferation of agencies concerned with cities. Congress accepted the principle several years ago in the social welfare field; the result was the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The preamble to the Lindsay bill states in part:

The rapidly increasing urbanization of the United States, with its accompanying social and economic changes, creates new and accentuates existing problems in fields such as housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, prevention and elimination of urban blight, air and water pollution, water supply, sewage facilities, transportation, and many others.

As the proportion of the population of the United States living in urban areas increases, the needs of the urban population, especially in the field of housing, will become increasingly serious. The burdens placed on facilities and services in urban areas by their rapidly increasing population are such that existing facilities and services daily become more inadequate. Ever-increasing efforts are continually required in order to maintain such facilities at current levels, and still greater efforts are required to provide even minimal improvements therein.

The needs of urban areas are so pressing, and have such an impact upon the Nation as a whole, that Federal action is required to assist in meeting the problems of urban areas through housing programs, and through education, research, technical services, and other programs designed to assist in meeting the needs of urban areas.

The passage of 5 years has not lessened, but intensified these needs.

My bill, like H.R. 6927 before us today, provides for the transfer of all functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—including the Public Housing Administration, the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association—to the new department of city affairs.

Enactment of this legislation will not add to the Federal budget; increased efficiency, in fact, may lead to some economies. The bill simply assembles under one roof the varied Federal functions dealing directly with cities, thus permitting a consistent and coordinated approach to the multitudinous problems of the cities and suburbs.

It has been argued by many including some of my closest colleagues—that the problems created by the exploding metropolis are not necessarily answered by placing Federal responsibility for urban matters in a single organizational unit—that it is a matter of emphasis, not method. The contention, however, also was directed against the inception of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Yet the Department has formulated a philosophy which marks off more clearly than ever in the past the separate responsibilities in these fields of the Federal, State, and local governments.

It has also been argued that what the bill aspires to do can be accomplished through research. Research, however, can be wasteful and ineffective unless it is organized from top to bottom, not

inversely. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has done this. It has been able to keep pace with the times, not by preempting local responsibility, but by determining the nationwide scope of social welfare problems.

Congress established the Department of Agriculture in 1862, when the United States was still a predominantly rural country. In 1953, the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare signified that the composition of the country was substantially urban. That was 12 years ago and now more than two-thirds of all Americans live in or near a city. Yet we spend more Federal money on potato research than we do on urban economics.

It is appropriate perhaps, to describe what Congress is attempting to do in creating a city affairs department from the viewpoint of a typical, but fictional, mayor.

The mayor is undertaking an urban renewal project in which some buildings will be torn down and others rehabilitated. Air pollution and sewage disposal demand attention—and money. An eight-lane expressway, part of the Interstate Highway System, is scheduled to cut through downtown business properties. The route alignment also strikes across a valuable park. The chamber of commerce is after the mayor to try to build a new airport. Rumor has it that an electronics firm holding remunerative Army Department contracts is looking for a site in town. Petitions are on his desk for more public housing. A veterans' hospital is scheduled to be closed down with a loss of hundreds of jobs. The high school constructed only 5 years ago is already overcrowded. The civilian defense organization needs help. The city's welfare expenses are increasing each year. The tax rates are a continuing source of complaints and the city's borrowing authority is almost exhausted.

The mayor decides to take his troubles to Washington, which at least gets him out of town for a while.

The mayor is uncertain about where to begin in the Capital. He does not know the Senators from his State, and his Congressman was elected to office by defeating the mayor's son-in-law. Consequently, he looks up some addresses in the telephone book and hails a cab.

A week later, the mayor has enduring memories of the ceilings of waiting rooms in the following Government offices: The Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Community Facilities Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Sanitary Engineering Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Veterans' Administration, the Interior Department, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Defense Department, the Labor Department, the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, and the Executive Offices of the White House.

The mayor returns home with referrals to a dozen other units and subunits of his Government, a briefcase crammed with regulations, forms and applications, and a notebook filled with telephone

numbers and the misspelled names of Washington supernumeraries. He is discouraged and saddened—until he next attends a mayor's conference. There he learns that most other mayors have had the identical experience.

The activities of the Federal Government in assisting cities are administered by at least five major departments and independent agencies, and at least as many lesser ones. Each department or agency has several bureaus, divisions, or branches concerned with urban living. Many of the offices have conflicting rules or regulations.

I believe the bill before us represents a large step toward the effective consolidation of Federal functions concerning the Nation's cities and suburbs. It will not end all the logistical and procedural difficulties encountered by the fictional mayor, but it is a start. It should be passed.

The bill does not contain what I believe to be a valuable provision of my bill—the establishment of a Federal Urban Affairs Council. The Council would have been appointed by the President to advise on the programs and policies to be pursued by the new department. But I shall not quibble about this omission. I think this bill will do the job; it is important and necessary to those Americans who live in our cities and suburbs and also in considering this bill to those who do not. I would urge my colleagues to be mindful of something said of the city of Washington many years ago:

What you want is to have a city which everyone who comes from Maine, Texas, Florida, Arkansas, or Oregon can admire as being something finer and more beautiful than he had ever dreamed of before; something which makes him even more proud to be an American.

The sentiment should not be restricted to the Nation's Capital. We have the opportunity today to contribute directly and substantially to the time when all Americans will take pride in all our cities. Reason and justice dictate that we do so.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Government Operations on which I have the honor to serve is charged under the Rules of the House of Representatives with the study of the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining economy and efficiency.

Partly because of historical reasons the structure of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not a model of efficient organization. When the Housing and Home Agency was first established 18 years ago its main purpose was to supervise and coordinate the various housing programs then in existence. Each subordinate agency kept its own identity and most of its autonomy. New programs established since then—such as community facilities, urban renewal, urban planning, mass transportation, college housing, and housing for the elderly, did not change the nature of the HHFA. It remained, as the Committee report notes, a kind of "holding company" in its organizational structure. For ex-

ample, the powers and functions of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration have remained with the Commissioners of those agencies.

Now, this type of supervision goes directly contrary to the philosophy of the Government Reorganization Commission headed by the late Herbert Hoover.

In its very first report the Hoover Commission said that:

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

By making HHFA a Cabinet-level Department we would be following directly the Hoover Commission precepts and philosophy. Existing "jumbled lines of authority" would be brought together in an organization with greater unity of purpose and objectives.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be more clearly responsible to the President and to the Congress.

It would provide in the executive branch also a center through which policies affecting housing and urban development are coordinated, correlated, and articulated at the highest level of Government. Just as other Cabinet officers speak for the President and exercise influence throughout the entire executive branch, so would the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development exercise leadership in his field.

By recommending the reorganization of HHFA into a new streamlined Department, your Committee on Government Operations is complying in full measure with its mandate to study the operations of Government activities with a view to determining economy and efficiency.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 6927.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I rise in opposition to the bill, H.R. 6927. Actually this is not a new idea, of course. It really is not a key piece of legislation of the Great Society like some of the bills we have considered here on the House floor this year. This idea has been kicking around in one form or another since, I understand, about 1950 and actually did not pick up much interest at all until the first year of the Kennedy administration. Then, of course, a bill came out of the Committee on Government Operations. It went to the Committee on Rules and was turned down. Then, the next year the President sent up an Executive order to see if he could do it this way, and this time this body rejected the idea by a vote of 264 to 150.

Now we have it back again. I think one of the interesting things about it is the change in the bill. The only change in the bill is in the title. It was known as the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and now it is known as the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. This is the only change in this

idea that has been kicking around for, lo, these many years.

Now what does the bill do? This has been brought out again and again by the speakers and yet as the gentleman from Michigan said, it is an important bill and I think we might bring out again exactly what it does. What it will accomplish will be to elevate the Housing and Home Finance Administration to Cabinet status and include in the new Department the HHFA, the FHA, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Public Housing Administration and it puts a new hat on the man who runs these agencies and will make him a Secretary.

That is one thing it does. The other thing it does, and here is where a whole lot of people are being badly fooled and this has to do with the urban affairs part of it—all this does is to say that this new Cabinet officer will be a coordinator and an adviser to the President on urban affairs. It does not give him a single shred of authority or power to do anything about urban affairs. This thing came out again and again in the testimony presented before the committee.

Now it is always interesting, I think, in analyzing a bill to inquire what the bill does not do. In the first place, it does not put into a new Department the housing affairs of this Nation. As has been brought out here, about one-third of housing will be put into the new Department and two-thirds of the housing will remain out of the Department. The other thing it does not do, is that there is no change in status as far as urban affairs are concerned. It was brought out in the testimony in the subcommittee hearings that about 70 agencies of the Government now function in the various departments under other Cabinet officers and not a single one of these agencies is going to be changed. The new Secretary will not have a shred of authority or power over a single one of these agencies.

The sum and substance of this legislation, really, is what Mr. Staats, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who was the principal witness on behalf of the Government, said, as we questioned him. He said, "It will give this new man, this new Secretary, new prestige to let him function on a level with the other Cabinet officers."

I say to you that this is all it will do.

The point might be made: All right, perhaps it is a good idea to do this. Why not put a new hat of Secretary and Cabinet status on the Federal official in charge of housing?

Again and again it was brought out in the testimony before the Committee on Government Operations, that the present housing agencies were doing a good job. Mayor Daley, of Chicago, was among the witnesses. He was asked, "How are your relations with the FHA? How are your relations, as mayor of the city of Chicago, with the HHFA?" He said, "They are fine. They are doing a good job for us. We have no complaints."

We asked Mr. Keith, the president of the National Housing Conference, the same thing. His reply was the same, that they have fine relations with the

present housing agencies of the Government, and they do not need to be changed.

We asked Mr. Boutin, the executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, this same question. I will quote this time:

Is it not true that your relations with the FHA, your business building relationships with the FHA, have been good? It has been a good agency, it has done a good job?

Mr. BOUTIN. It has done a good job. I pointed out in the statement, we think this has been one of the really great economic inventions of all time.

This is what was said by one of the men who represents one of the biggest organizations in the country dealing daily with housing in the Federal Government, all the time.

So the testimony went on.

I believe it was rather interesting that the point was made that these same witnesses who deal with the Federal Government in housing had severe reservations about what the status of housing would be in the new Department and under the new Secretary. For example, the same Mr. Boutin said:

Yes, we favor this new Department as an organization, provided—

And here I quote his statement—

provided primary recognition is given to the role of privately financed housing and proper safeguards are established to insure the continued high level of operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association.

In other words, to use his words, they want language which would prevent the FHA from being relegated to a second-, third-, or fourth-rate position.

As a matter of fact, the Mortgage Bankers Association expressed in a strong statement the same reservation.

I received this morning a letter which I had intended to bring over and include in the RECORD. I had intended to read at least a portion of it. It came from the firm of Stockton, Whatley, & Davin, one of the largest mortgage dealers in the State of Florida, which has always had one of the largest home building activities in the United States. To paraphrase what they said, "For heaven's sake, do not put FHA and do not put mortgage financing over into this new bureau." They fear too that it is going to be downgraded. They fear too that it is going to take a second-, third-, or fourth-rate position and get lost in this new agency.

Let us turn for a moment to the urban affairs part of the bill. We have talked about housing. What is this going to do for urban affairs?

I believe that most of the people in this country, and I rather expect that most of our colleagues here in the House of Representatives, really feel this thing is going to do something for urban affairs.

I have pointed out that 70 of the urban programs are in other departments of Government.

We asked the chief witness, Mr. Staats, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, what the legislation was going to do so far as urban affairs was con-

cerned. Again and again he came back with the reply, "I am not talking about transferring any authority or any responsibility." He said, "The bill does not seek to modify or repeal existing programs or propose any new ones."

This is testimony from the Government witness. Again and again we asked what it was going to do so far as problems of cities were concerned, as we were talking about them. We never could pin him down that this bill was going to do anything for the cities of the Nation. The reason why we could not, is because it is not going to do anything, because there is no power and authority in the bill, as the Deputy Director pointed out himself, for this Cabinet officer to do anything about urban affairs, except to advise the President and tell him what is going on.

There is language in the bill about coordinating planning with the cities, but nothing is in there that gives this new Cabinet officer any new power. That again was the testimony. Now I go back to the witness who represented the county organization. When asked if he supported the urban affairs ideas in the bill, he said, "We frankly do not want this new Department to go any further than that, that is, to take over the housing programs." He said, "We are opposing and would be strongly opposed to putting all 60"—speaking of other urban programs—"into one department." I asked him, as far as other urban area programs are concerned, if they should be kept exactly where they are and his answer was one word: "Right." Of course, he thinks that is what will be in the bill. So, in short, nothing will be done in this area. Now let us look at it practically.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GURNEY. If this new Cabinet officer has no power as far as urban affairs are concerned, as a practical matter, what will happen? There is some precatory language in this bill that asks him to advise the President and to coordinate. What will happen if he goes over to HEW, which now administers about 50 programs having to do with urban affairs, and says to Secretary Celebrezze, "As far as your educational programs are concerned"—and as a matter of fact next year in the budget we have about \$7 billion for educational programs—what will happen if the new Secretary says to him, "As far as your educational program X is concerned, I think you should do this about it." Now, as surely as Mr. Celebrezze has "brezze" in his name, believe me, there will be plenty of breezy words coming over the phone to this new Secretary, because he will tell him where to get off.

That is precisely what one of the advocates of this program, the man who represented the counties, pointed out in his testimony. I will use his words because it is a very practical political answer. I asked him what this new Department would do. Would it take over departmental functions of others in the Government? Of course he said it will not do this and he said we are opposed to it.

I asked him, "Do you not suppose over the long run, the new Department will reach in and take some of these programs?" His answer was, "Our officers and directors met last week with six Cabinet officers. We came away with the impression that they are pretty strong men and that there will not be a whole lot of transferring of functions away from these departments."

There you have it. That is exactly what is going to happen. The new Secretary is not going to cut any ice with any of these other departments from a practical operating point of view because he does not have any power and he does not have any authority. To come down to it, you have a bill here, and I do not see this bill as a Democratic or a Republican matter at all, or a matter of conflict in political philosophy, whether one is a liberal or a conservative, that is simply a very poor bill. When you come down to it, you have a bill here that will not do much of anything that it says it will do. It does not do anything for housing that is not being done very well today. It only encompasses about one-third of all the housing programs. It does not do a blessed thing for a Department of Urban Affairs and the whole area of our problems in urban affairs because under this bill the new Secretary has no power and no authority in this field.

I have used up my time. I wish I had time to talk about the Republican substitute. To me, it makes good sense because it will put under the Executive Office of the President a man who can truly coordinate these urban affairs which are so important to our Nation.

I would urge the House to reject H.R. 6927 and adopt the Republican substitute.

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who say that this is not a good bill. To the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a superb bill that is long overdue, most desirable, and most justified.

Mr. Chairman, the need for a Department of Housing and Urban Development has grown with each year, and I feel very strongly that this need must be met, and must be met now. I heartily welcome the opportunity we now have to act on this long overdue proposal and want to commend the committee for its forthright action in reporting it favorably to the House.

As I have done in the three previous Congresses, in January of this year I again introduced a bill to provide such a Department and urged the committee to give priority to this long discussed important issue. When the present bill, H.R. 6927, was before the Committee on Government Operations, I urged that committee to favorably report the bill so that the House could face the issue squarely. Today, I am overjoyed and privileged to be associated with the legislation before us and to recommend that it be given the overwhelming approval it so clearly deserves.

This legislation is predicated on the congressional finding that the vast technological and sociological changes wrought by the increasing urbanization of 20th century America have created new problems in areas such as housing and urban renewal. There now exist over a score of Federal programs designed to help our local communities meet these problems. The bill before us seeks to establish a single Department of Housing and Urban Development, which will be responsible for the consolidation and coordination of many of these disparate efforts.

The urban areas which string across this country are not islands unto themselves; nor are the many difficulties they face unique. All too often, however, their efforts to alleviate their problems are undertaken without the benefit of the experience of other areas. Urban renewal programs which have proven to be most successful in meeting the slum clearance problems of a large eastern metropolis may never come to the attention of, for example, southern cities faced with the same problem. This situation would be greatly ameliorated by the creation of such a Department which will serve as a clearinghouse for information of this sort. In addition, however, the Department would also carry out independent studies on other problems which currently plague our cities. These studies would be made available to urban areas to assist them in their planning.

Aside from serving as a clearinghouse and a research center, this Department would also coordinate the implementation of the many Federal programs in force which provide assistance primarily to urban areas. The Federal National Mortgage Administration has one program, the Public Housing Administration has another, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency has a copious variety of programs to meet the growing housing problems which beset our cities. It seems to me that it would make eminently good sense to bring these closely related programs under one roof, and thereby to encourage a meaningful dialog among the experts who administer these programs.

This bill would also create a new and sorely needed Cabinet post—the position of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The function of the Secretary would correspond to that of other Cabinet officers: He would serve as the administrative head of one of the major functional divisions of the executive branch of Government, and he would serve as the spokesman for this phase of executive responsibility when broad issues are before the President and Cabinet. Seventy percent of our citizens live in and around urban centers; their needs should be attended to by an officer of Cabinet level.

There are no precise measuring rods for determining when an agency or agencies should become a department. But as the Committee on Government Operations correctly pointed out, the criteria normally employed are permanence, size, scope, interrelatedness, and the national significance of the programs to be ad-

ministered by the proposed department. By any of these standards, I believe that the Housing and Home Finance Agency clearly warrants departmental status. This agency has been in existence since 1947, and the scope and importance of its work have grown tremendously, and promises to continue to grow to meet an ever-increasing need. I think we should accord to this collection of agencies, a legal status commensurate with its responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me emphasize the fact that I feel very strongly about this need for this legislation. Many of us have introduced similar bills in past years; the need we perceived then has grown. Clearly now, the time is ripe to translate the facts of American society into proper government purpose, and to do this by establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development to enable the Federal Government to play a fuller role in America's growth and development.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, America's frontier is no longer on the prairie, no longer on the farm, but in our cities. President Johnson made this very clear in his message to Congress on March 2 of this year when he said:

Our urban problems are of a scope and magnitude that demand representation at the highest level of government.

He pointed out "These problems are already in the front rank of national concern and interest. They deserve to be in the front rank of government as well."

Mr. Chairman, in order to bring urban problems to the "front rank of government," the message called for the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development. I have sponsored a bill (H.R. 7108) to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development in this Congress and in past Congresses since I have been here, one to create a Department of Urban Affairs—H.R. 6065, 87th Congress; H.R. 4067, 88th Congress. I believe it is not really necessary to stress the urgency of congressional action to have at the Cabinet level a voice for the cities of America to deal with the manifold problems of urbanization. Congress has had this proposal before it for some 10 years. Hearings have been held in the House and in the Senate. Legislation has been introduced, and the matter has been debated during the course of the last decade. Since I have served in Congress I have testified three times in both the House and Senate in favor of this idea. Time moves on whether or not Congress acts.

During this period of time a whole new generation of children in slums have reached school age. During this period of time many of our senior citizens have died in the slums.

In the city of New York we have seen the slums expand while the Congress has hesitated to act. We have seen the Federal Government fail to expand public housing programs to meet adequately the need of our cities. We have seen the

inability and unwillingness of both the city and Federal governments to launch a massive attack on the conditions which breed crime and the accompanying problem of drug addiction. We have seen the cities of our country become choked with automobile traffic and the Congress hesitate to encourage long-range planning for urban transportation. We have seen, while we have been debating this bill during the last 10 years, our cities move to the point where they face fiscal exhaustion.

Our cities are not coping adequately with the crucial issue of mid-twentieth America—urbanization.

All of these question are part of the growing urbanization of America. If we are going to deal realistically with these physical and social problems, Mr. Chairman, a Department of Housing and Urban Development is necessary.

I listened earlier this afternoon to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. He tried to dismiss the analogy to a Department of Agriculture by saying that the problem of food is everyone's concern. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that equally the problem of shelter is everyone's concern. Basic to our very existence is the question of shelter. This Department of Housing and Urban Development will be concerned primarily with shelter and the environmental factors which affect living conditions in our major cities.

This Department will focus attention on the problems of our cities—the crucial problems of our Nation—and provide coordination for the more than 100 Federal programs relating to our urban areas.

Governor Hoff of Vermont only a few weeks ago remarked to the National Housing Conference that: "Today we are very close to a full-blown emergency and the average person has no idea this is going on."

Present growth trends indicate that there will be some 350 million people in the United States by the year 2000. The interim increase will concentrate in urban areas if present trends are projected. The larger metropolitan areas in the United States will contain 70 percent of an anticipated population of 244 million by 1980 and 80 percent by the year 2000.

In the New York Metropolitan area, it is anticipated that there will be an increase from 16 million in 1960 to almost 21 million in 1975. By 1985, it is anticipated that 3 million more will be added to our metropolitan area population. Proper shelter and other environmental conditions are essential for these 24 million citizens.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development will consider the "outer ring" of our cities along with the "core" or "inner ring." In this way, problems of city and suburb may be viewed as problems of the entire region.

In New York's central city, for example, twice as many 16- and 17-year-olds are not in school, and twice as many people make less than \$4,000 a year, than is the case in our suburbs. It is also notable that 89 percent of the nonwhite

population of the area lives in the central city.

We may view the urbanization of America as a physical problem involving an increase in both the size and number of cities in America. It is a metropolitan problem and a regional problem. It is a problem of cities and suburbs, of towns and counties, and of urban cores.

But, as President Johnson so aptly remarked in his message on cities, "Numbers alone do not make this an urban nation."

John Friedman, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, an authority on regional development, wrote in the 1964 National Education Association Journal:

Urbanization describes, first, a geographic fact: concentration of large numbers of people within a relatively small space. Second, it describes a social fact: the adoption of urban ways of living.

Urban ways of living will be the subject of utmost concern in the new Department. We must try, through this new Department, to focus on the quality of the lives of the individuals residing in our urban areas.

This will enable the Federal Government to exercise the same degree of attention to the problem of urbanization that it has toward rural problems of agriculture.

In the past one of the major problems facing the nation was the improvement of farming and farm life. Today we are faced with the even more gigantic task of adjusting our population to modern industrial production and urbanization. We can do no less today than we did in 1862 when the Department of Agriculture was created to put the Federal Government behind that effort.

Today we need to place our national attention squarely on the problems of our cities: On housing, education, employment, poverty, beauty recreation, and the whole question of discrimination. These, President Johnson said, "are, in large measure, the problems of American society itself."

Mr. Chairman, we do not pretend that this Department will be able to answer all of the questions or solve all of the problems associated with urbanization. But it can offer a coordinated start. It can offer an administrative base for "the enormous growth of interest and knowledge and intellectual ferment," to which the President referred.

In addition to concentrating attention on both the spectacular physical growth of our cities and the multitude of problems associated with the process of urbanization, the Department of Housing and Urban Development is designed to bring continuity of purpose to the many Federal activities that are now operative in our urban areas.

In section 2 of the proposed bill, Congress declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

Moreover, section 2 declares among other things that to carry out their pur-

pose, Congress would find that establishment of an executive department is desirable to:

First. Achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; and

Second. Assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development.

The need for such coordination is evidenced by a recent MIT study on the effectiveness of metropolitan planning, which concluded on this point as follows:

Better interagency coordination is also needed at the Federal level, to bring Federal programs, affecting urban development, in line with one another . . . It will be incumbent upon the Federal administrators to give careful and sympathetic attention to metropolitan plans and review recommendations. If these are subject to inconsistent interpretations by Federal officials, or if they are used primarily to insulate Federal agencies from local conflicts and promote increased program expenditures, the Federal Government will derive little long-range benefit from metropolitan planning.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to deal with the problems which have been identified and which have been created through the rapid industrialization and urbanization of our country, then it is important that we have in the Cabinet at the front rank of our National Government, a spokesman for our cities, a spokesman who will be at the same level as other spokesmen who sit in that Cabinet. And by turning the national spotlight on the cities of America, on the cities which, after all, do house 135 million Americans, we will be able to move forward to deal with all of the manifold problems about which I spoke earlier.

Mr. Chairman, the President, in his message on the cities, asked us to act. He said:

The modern city can be the most ruthless enemy of the good life, or it can be its servant. The choice is up to this generation of Americans. For this is truly the time of decision for the American city.

The adoption of the bill before us will be a major step in the direction of remaking our cities to be the servant of the good life.

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

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6927 establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In registering my opposition to this proposed new Department I am certainly not unmindful of the problems and the future of the core cities and their suburbs that exist in every State in our Union. I must certainly agree that our national welfare is dependent upon the orderly growth and development of our urban areas. I recognize that well over two-thirds of our entire population today lives in our 220 metropolitan areas and that this trend will be magnified in the coming decades.

President Johnson has spoken directly to this point in his speech at Ann Arbor Mich., in the spring preceding the last election when he painted the picture of a mountain of work still left undone in solving the problems of modern living. In the face of our recordbreaking economic achievements the President added the perspective when he said:

The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use our wealth to enrich the quality of American civilization.

"Ugly America" was the term the President used to describe the likely future unless something is done. And ugly America is becoming, more and more, the place where most of us live—in the urban areas where open space is being devoured by chaotic development, where rivers are polluted by industry and sewage, the air is dangerously poisoned by the teeming automobile, and the vistas are blanked out by billboards, used-car lots, and junk business. "In the next 40 years," the President said, "we must rebuild the entire urban United States."

In the face of our magnificent abundance and the wherewithal and resources to move on to a more tolerable world, a failure to move on and create a decent environment must certainly be read as a failure of capitalist society.

This must not be allowed to happen.

The shortcomings and failures are all too conspicuous. They are to be found in badly administered Federal urban renewal programs, in the inertia of cities where local governments have failed to revise old laws and tax structures that actually encourage and sustain slums and ugliness. Proposed Federal solutions—such as appropriations of more money—are sometimes oversimplified, while jealous and jumbled municipal sovereignties inhibit sound urban growth by their sheer complexity. A critical question in all this is how to reconcile the creative strengths of American free enterprise with the need for the kind of widespread and farsighted regional planning that possibly only Government can supply. Is such a reconciliation impossible? If it is, then the battle is lost.

The important thing in order to make sure the battle is not lost is to broaden and intensify the sense of general involvement. The general involvement at all levels by business, labor, and citizens groups, can be seen encouragingly in some places—in Philadelphia, for example, in Pittsburgh, in Boston, and, I am sure, in other cities in this country of ours.

Gladstone once said:

Good ends can rarely be attained in politics without passion.

What we need is a righteous passion, an anger, an overwhelming concern about what is taking place in our urban areas—in our suburban growth.

A righteous concern about the environment we live in must seize a great number of Americans.

The basic question presented by this bill, as I view it, is whether or not our local urban areas are so structured and local leadership is effective enough to make itself felt as an equal partner with

the States and the Federal Government in determining solutions to the urban sprawl. That now besets us.

Historically, our country has been a three-layered structure of government: Federal, State, and local.

Since World War II, it is apparent that the Federal Government is more than able to view the national interest and respond to the needs of our people at all levels—internationally, nationally, and locally. In this same period of time, State governments have more and more come into their own as a viable part of our historical tripartite, equal system of governing ourselves.

But the real question is what has happened to local government during the last decade and a half. Has it kept up with the 20th century? In my view, though admittedly with certain glaring and happy exceptions, the answer must be a resounding "No."

Believing as I do that local government is the mainstay of our system of personal involvement and self assertion in governing our own affairs, this unhappy answer dramatizes the main problem in determining how best we may govern ourselves. Let us make no mistake. In attempting to fulfill its historical and proper duties, local government must provide those services which can best be administered and controlled locally, in an efficient manner and at an economical cost.

If local government is incapable of so providing these services efficiently and at fair cost then the people will demand that someone else do the job. More often than not they will look to the Federal Government for this purpose. It will be a sorry day for us if and when the Federal Government takes over a major part of what has been historically local responsibility.

But this trend continues unabated. Not, I suggest, because there are ogres or designing people here in the Congress or in the Executive branch of our Government who are plotting this course; but simply because most of us who have taken part in local government in the past and those doing it today are not doing the job properly. We are not structuring its operation nor are we providing a viable tax base, so that our local urban government can do its job economically and efficiently.

Even though the fault as I see it lies principally at the level of local government, in fact the Federal Government does take over more and more responsibilities that belong to local government. The effect of this, if unabated, will surely mean a different America and one that I prefer not to see.

I believe in local government.

I believe that with the right prodding and leadership it can find for itself a place in the sun. But I do not believe that presents the facts today. What do we see today? Let me cite my own area because I am familiar with the situation there. In the Denver suburban area we have over 250 autonomous local units of government, each with the right to tax—mostly using the property tax—and to spend.

We have local politicians, of which I am one, who too often do not see beyond their own boundaries, or their own sources of power, or their own personal jealousies and interests. The effort, consequently, to restructure local government to provide a workable system or organization of metropolitanwide government to administer and make policy for services that are metropolitan in scope: to find an equitable tax base, again that is metropolitan in scope and does not discriminate against one class or group of people. This effort simply has not produced results to match the needs.

I have been in this fight in my own area. I know how difficult it is; and in the context of the large unmet requirements, I am not very proud of my own small accomplishment in helping to restructure local government into a workable metropolitan unit.

Yet, surely, all is not lost, for, if I did believe so, then I would have to admit that the game is over and we might as well have everything administered from Washington.

We have not come to this point yet. In the short time that I have been in the Nation's Capital as a Member of Congress, my experience leads me to believe that a new Department of Urban Affairs would quickly find new duties and tasks in filling the vacuum that now exists at the local government level.

This could be accomplished only at the expense of well-meaning but inefficient and expensive units of local government. Until local government itself is strong enough and viable enough to fulfill its proper role, the classic relationship between local, State, and Federal government will go begging.

I do believe that sometimes we almost have to face chaos in order to spur governmental entities to reorganize and do their job effectively and efficiently.

With all the feeling at my command, I prefer to keep the pressure on our urban groups of government—on the 250-plus units of autonomous government in the Denver metropolitan area, for example—to give them fair warning. Restructure yourselves: Give the people of your metropolitan area the right tools to work out their local problems on an efficient and economical basis, and do it soon for the problems increase with a rapid, also a geometrical, magnitude. If you fail the people themselves will demand a solution at another level of government and more likely than not that will be the Federal Government.

This warning must be clear and urgent. Local government must regain its place, by its own efforts, as a viable unit in our tripartite system of government.

I desire to give every possible basis and pressure to realize this goal. It is not the easy path. But, I believe it is the right path.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the objectives of better management of Federal Government housing and urban affairs activities, but in opposition to the bill under discussion. I do not see any evi-

dence that establishment of a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development will significantly contribute to worthwhile objectives.

All of us here today, and the country in general, will certainly support action which will provide the means of giving direction, efficiency, coordination, and consistent administration to the jungle of Federal programs intended to provide assistance in solving problems arising simultaneously with concentrations of population in metropolitan areas.

What we have today is a real proliferation of Federal programs in this area. The problem is serious. In 1960 an authoritative study called "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Affairs," found:

There is reason to believe that Federal programs are piling up on each other faster than metropolitan areas can digest them.

The study goes on to conclude that each program is planned separately with little concern for what other programs are underway.

That study in 1960, Mr. Chairman, was undertaken before the vastly increased buildup of Federal involvement with local and State affairs beginning in 1961. Some experts estimate that today there are more than 60 Federal programs affecting urban development, all going at one time with little or no effort being made to coordinate them so as to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.

The committee bill, H.R. 6927, would fail to deal with the central problem, and, in fact, might work to compound that problem. The bill would elevate the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet-level status and change its name to Department of Housing and Urban Development. The bill would add to this new department the Federal National Mortgage Association. That is all it would do.

No other programs would be assigned to the new department. The new Cabinet Secretary would have no authority to coordinate urban area programs which the present administrator of the HHFA does not already have. The new department would have authority over less than 20 percent of existing urban programs.

Mr. Chairman, in his address of March 2, 1965 on this matter, the President first made eloquent reference to problems of metropolitan areas—housing shortages, air pollution, school needs, and water supply. But he made no reference whatever to what many feel is the greatest need of all—the coordination of existing programs.

In advocating the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development the President said:

It will be primarily responsible for Federal participation in metropolitan area thinking and planning.

This sounds like at least an effort toward coordination.

But in the same speech he advocates also the establishment of something he would call the Temporary National Commission on Codes, Zoning, Taxation, and Development Standards. I have not been able to determine if this new group, TNCCZTDS, would operate under au-

thority of HUD, or HEW, or would be independent, or for what period of time its temporary nature would be intended.

I cannot conclude that the committee bill would do anything but add to the vast lack of coordination. It would mean new alphabetical gymnastics and would complicate the task of community agencies in making their way through the Federal jungle of bureaucracy.

One of the arguments advanced in support of the White House plan is that city dwellers need an added voice in Washington. It is evidently felt that elevating the HHFA Administrator to Cabinet status would give needed prestige to the millions of persons living in metropolitan areas.

This, of course, is a specious argument. In talking about problems of the cities we are really talking about things like health, education, and welfare. So it would perhaps make more sense if the HHFA were to be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where programs in these fields are already underway, and where coordination might better be achieved.

And if I may undertake some levity for a moment, it would make just as much sense for us to establish a Department of Female Affairs with the justification that women need a Cabinet level voice in Government. And then, of course, we would need a Department of Male Affairs as a balance.

Perhaps the most serious of all problems with the proposal before us today is that it would further erode the integrity of State and local government. It would tend to lessen initiative for civic improvement programs by giving the impression that massive Federal Government assistance is on the way. If and when great new Federal aid programs would actually be channeled through the new department, local government would be subservient to Federal controls of various kinds. To a great extent the Federal Government would replace the city council. Federal money would inevitably be used for political purposes, and the voice of the citizen, so vital to matters of local government, would be stilled, with very little opportunity for repairing the damage. State lines would only be a formality.

I want to commend the work of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] on this issue. She has very adequately stated previously the inherent weaknesses and fallacies of the committee proposal. She and other Republicans have wisely advanced an alternative proposal which, I believe, will make sense to any concerned American citizen who takes the time to inform himself about it.

I support this plan, which would establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development.

This is an honest proposal, Mr. Chairman. It is not intended to bestow prestige or status or vague hopes or political patronage on anyone. It is a proposal designed to accomplish the one thing we need in this area—coordination of Federal Government activities.

This is not a new concept. Rather, as the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] has pointed out, it is a tested and effective method of obtaining results. Three years ago, when it was decided that we needed better coordination of Government programs in science, we created an executive office called the Office of Science and Technology. It has worked well as a coordinator.

The goal of coordination through a central office of Government programs in housing and urban affairs was vigorously supported by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The issue is clear. We can elevate an existing agency to Cabinet status and try to make that action appear to be a solution to problems which have been identified here this afternoon. Or, we can get to the heart of the matter, and produce what we really need, coordination of Federal Government housing and urban programs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the substitute, H.R. 8822, and in opposition to the bill, H.R. 6927, which would create a Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I must say in passing that the report which the members of the committee have before them on this bill is, in my opinion, disappointing.

If the members of the committee will look on page 3, they will see that the report is not much more than a collection of comments and quotes, beginning with some quotations by Mr. Staats, a Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He is quoted for 3, 4, or 5 pages. Then there are quotations by Mayor Daley of Chicago which go from pages 7, 8, and through 9, and it continues with quotations from others up to a discussion of the differences between this bill and previous bills which have been defeated, at which point there begins a brief chronology of the previous defeats of this type of legislation. At no point, I submit, does the committee make a valid case for H.R. 6927.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if this legislation had been as important as the proponents indicate today, someone who is a Cabinet-ranking official of the Government could have testified.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] if any Cabinet member testified in favor of this legislation this year?

Mr. FASCELL. This year?

Mr. RUMSFELD. The answer apparently is "No," that not one single member of the President's Cabinet appeared to testify in support of the bill.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, this bill, according to the proponents would create a Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs which would then coordinate the other Cabinet-rank departments in the executive branch of the Federal Government insofar as urban problems are involved. Yet none of the Cabinet members came to the committee to request that this new Department be created to then coordinate

Federal activities in the area of urban affairs, or to express their enthusiasm for this proposed new Department.

Mr. Chairman, I looked through the hearings and I could not find where one Cabinet-rank member of the executive branch of the Federal Government took the time to even submit a written statement, let alone testify on this piece of legislation.

I would also like to comment on some of the remarks appearing in the report. I want to quote Mayor Daley, of Chicago. He is, of course, the mayor of a great city who is well known for his eagerness to come to Washington and the Federal Government to receive assistance in solving urban problems. He says, according to the report:

I believe that whatever resistance there is to this legislation stems from the use of the words "urban" and "housing," and their identification with big cities. There are some who still fail to refuse to recognize the obvious—that we live in an urban society and that the problems of urbanization directly affect the lives of most of our citizens and indirectly influence the lives of all of our citizens.

This is not correct, of course. The opposition here today to this legislation is not because of a failure to recognize the needs of our urban areas as the debate so clearly shows. On the contrary, it represents a sincere concern about our urban areas and about the multiplicity of Federal programs which exist today and the failure of adequate coordination. This bill does not provide a mechanism for coordinating the 60-70 existing Federal programs relating to urban affairs, contrary to what he or others may believe.

Furthermore, if you look at the testimony of Mr. Staats you see the words "status" and "recognition" as the basis for his support. These are the only valid arguments that have been made. In the report, in the hearings, as well as during the debate today, this is the only single valid argument in favor of the bill, that has been put forward; namely, that theoretically it would provide some sort of recognition to the very important urban areas of our country. I for one am considerably more concerned about solving urban problems than merely giving status to urban areas, particularly when by giving this status you defeat possibility of reasonable solution to the coordination problem.

There are many problems with the administration bill. If you refer to the report—page 46, I believe it is—we have listed the Federal programs which would fall within the jurisdiction of this new Cabinet-rank Department under the bill we are considering today. They are listed, as you will note, on but a few lines. If you will look at pages 47, 48, and 49 of the report you will see all of the various existing Federal programs that will not fall in this particular Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It takes close to three pages to list the programs which are excluded.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] brought out very vividly the problem of competition between the executive departments in the executive branch of the Government. This is a

very real thing. We know it exists because we have seen conflicts in recent years between the various departments of the executive branch.

Further, what about highways and streets? Highways are one of the greatest users of the dollars allocated for urban problems. Look at any chart of the allocation of funds for urban problems by the various levels of government—Federal, State, local—and you will see that highway funds rank near the top. You will see this is one of the major areas competing for the use of money, along with housing, urban development, parks, recreational facilities, and other programs. Visit with professional planners across the country and you will find they are aware of this, and they are deeply concerned about it because they are the people on the firing line day in and day out attempting to help solve the problems of urban areas. To create an intelligent balance in the allocation of space—so precious within urban areas—the most important individuals who have to be dealt with are those in charge of the funds for highways and streets. Yet highways will be under the Department of Commerce, and not subject to the new Secretary. This would not be the case with an Office of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President. Is the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs going to call up the Secretary of Commerce and give him instructions as to how he should conduct his Department? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6927 is unfortunately not the most reasonable solution to this problem. In fact, it is a most misunderstood proposal.

Today I received a letter from the AFL-CIO which stated:

The establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would provide for economy, for more efficient administration and good government. It would facilitate representation of local community interests and would make possible fuller acceptance of local initiative through representations by local authorities before one coordinated agency of the Federal Government.

This is not the case. This is just not what is going to happen. It is not what the bill they are supporting even proposes to do. There will be no one agency coordinating urban problems. If this legislation cannot stand on its own feet, then it should not pass. I ask why the AFL-CIO, the report, the debate and the hearings continue to attempt to sell this legislation to the American people and the Members of this Committee on some basis other than the words contained in the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 139]

Adams	Bonner	Brown, Ohio
Ashley	Bow	Chamberlain
Ayres	Bray	Clark

Corman	Hicks	Pike
Dingell	Ichord	Pirnie
Evins, Tenn.	Keith	Powell
Findley	Macdonald	Resnick
Fisher	Martin, Ala.	Rivers, Alaska
Foley	Martin, Mass.	Stafford
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Nebr.	Steed
Hagan, Ga.	Meeds	Toil
Hanna	Mink	Vivian
Harvey, Ind.	Morton	Wilson,
Hébert	Passman	Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS, 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. 6927, and finding itself without a quorum, it directed the roll to be called, when 393 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the Committee to study the views given on page 45 of the committee report. I am convinced that the proposal outlined in our additional views to establish a true coordinating Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the Executive Office of the President is a reasonable one. Contrary to what has been suggested earlier, our proposal, H.R. 8822, would not transfer the Housing and Home Finance Agency anywhere. It would leave it exactly where it is, and so, too, with FHA and the other agencies within the HHFA. It would provide a coordinating office under the President to bring order out of the confusion which exists in the Federal bureaucratic structure, and not just within the HHFA but throughout all Cabinet-rank departments which have jurisdiction over the 60 to 70 existing Federal programs involving urban affairs. It will clearly provide one-stop Federal service for State and local officials and result in a more balanced and reasoned handling of existing Federal participation in metropolitan development.

Before passing this bill, I think we ought to ask these questions:

How effectively are the present Federal programs meeting the problems? What are the criticisms of FHA and HHFA? I have not heard any criticism of either the FHA or the HHFA. This forces one to ask, Why then must these on-going programs be submerged in a new Cabinet department?

Furthermore, what actually are the problems confronting the cities? Should not any coordinating office be equally concerned with highways, air pollution, water pollution, recreation areas, public facilities, airports, to mention but a few of dozens of Federal programs? Are they of less importance, or better, are they not important with respect to the problem of coordination?

Will urban problems be more susceptible of solution through department status for the Housing and Home Finance Agency? Is its status or coordination that is needed?

In my opinion, the committee report, the hearings and the debate today have not made a case for the passage of this bill. But what do the experts in this

country say about this? Do they agree or disagree?

I have before me the report on "The Federal System as Seen by State and Local Officials," prepared by the other body's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Governmentment Operations Committee during the 88th Congress.

The subcommittee sent out a questionnaire to 6,000 State and local officials, 50 Governors, attorneys general, budget officers, and State legislators, 800 school boards, 1,900 county officials, 1,600 city managers, and 900 mayors, and 400 professors, and other experts on intergovernmental relations.

They sent the questionnaires to the people of this country who are living with these problems. The responses coming back showed 183 favored a Department of Urban Affairs, whereas 189 specifically opposed the creation of such a department. When asked whether or not they favored an Office of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President for the purpose of improved coordination of Federal urban programs, instead of a Department of Urban Affairs, they responded with 164 favoring such an office, and 130 opposed.

These are not lopsided figures. Obviously these individuals across the country who have the principal responsibility for dealing with urban problems are in some disagreement as to what is the best approach. The point is this is not a partisan matter, this is not a philosophical question. Rather the question is how can we best solve the problem? It is obvious from the report I have cited that a majority of these experts in this area are in opposition to the administration bill and favor our approach.

Why should the Congress pass a bill when a case has not been made, when a representative poll of experts across the country disagrees with this approach, when there is a more efficient, less costly, and tested approach; namely, an Office for Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President to coordinate these programs?

Mr. Chairman, no one is suggesting that the administration bill does not go far enough, or that all 70 Federal programs relating to urban affairs should be stripped from their departments and put in one new giant department. Proponents of this bill know this, contrary to their comments made here this afternoon. Our criticism rather is that their bill does not solve the problem of coordination, while our proposal would meet this problem.

Mr. Chairman, our urban areas have problems. There is no question on this. We have a great and growing Nation and it is proper that the Congress and this committee from time to time consider ways to better meet the needs of our Nation. But I submit that this bill H.R. 6927, is most assuredly not the answer and I urge the adoption of the substitute to be offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey which I believe is a proper, responsible, and constructive approach to this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN].

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida, Congressman FASCELL, for yielding me a few minutes. I have observed the work of Congressman FASCELL and several other of my colleagues from urban areas since I became a Member, and through them I have developed a greater sensitivity to urban problems.

As a lifelong grain and livestock farmer, I was only academically familiar with the urgent problems of city people until I took my seat in the House of Representatives last January.

In the past 6 months, from actually living in the city, I have come to realize the necessity for action on traffic snarls, housing, water and air pollution, and a host of other problems.

In 1862, the Department of Agriculture was created, in recognition of the vital relationship of agriculture to the national well-being. In 1889, the Department was elevated to Cabinet rank.

Today—with more and more Americans living in cities—it seems to me only fair and right that we should have a comparable department of Cabinet rank, in recognition of the increasing economic and social impact of urbanization.

Mr. Chairman, while I represent the most rural district in the Nation, I feel that as a U.S. Congressman, it is my responsibility to take a broad view of legislation affecting the entire Nation. I am pleased to support H.R. 6927, to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development and am particularly happy to see emphasis as well on small towns and cities and their needs.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, today we are taking up a bill which would set up a new Cabinet Department for Housing and Urban Development. I think it is very significant that this proposed legislation comes before the omnibus housing bill of 1965.

Within a few short days the House will be asked to vote on a multibillion-dollar housing bill. This bill would give the Housing and Home Finance Administrator tremendous life and death powers over very basic individual rights, responsibilities, and duties. It will permit the Administrator to set up a formula by which, at his whim, he can grant rent subsidies to millions of American families. He can give or deny these subsidies to families whose income limits are not even clearly set in the law.

The Administrator would also be given political power over the major cities in the granting of untold subsidies, grants, loans, and public works programs.

It is no wonder that the administration seeks to create a new department before it brings to the floor of this House its housing legislation. I say that if the housing bill is passed there is absolutely no necessity to create a new department with Cabinet rank, because the Administrator will have untold power. Such power, if supplemented by Cabinet rank for the head of the Housing Agency,

would make the proposed new department the most politically powerful in the history of our Government.

I feel about this departmental bill as Ben Jonson felt when he said: "God gave women so much power that the law does not dare give them any more."

This bill to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development supposedly is to upgrade the importance of housing as well as to help our huge urban areas to solve some of their many problems. Yet, at the same time, it is highly ironical that the designers of this legislation, through some strange, bureaucratic reasoning, seek to downgrade the most single influential Government program in the housing field. I refer, of course, to the Federal Housing Administration.

The FHA currently accounts for approximately 64 percent of the employees and budget of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The FHA Commissioner at present is paid at the Assistant Secretary level. For 31 years, the FHA Commissioner has been appointed by the President. For 31 years, the Congress has sought to give FHA the necessary prestige to help better house our citizens. For many, many years, FHA has been a household term. The FHA is the finest example of Government and private industry working together in this vital field of housing.

Now, what would this bill do to FHA? It would lower the relative position of the Commissioner and the agency by reducing the salary level of the Commissioner. It would put the FHA under an Assistant Secretary who would have many other duties and responsibilities other than just FHA. Only last year, the President of the United States asked Congress to enact an executive pay schedule which sought to substantially upgrade the salary of top Government officials. Now, in this departmental bill, they want to take the head of a constituent agency of the HHFA and substantially lower his salary. The same agency which, at the present time under existing law, handles approximately two-thirds of the entire personnel in the agency. Certainly, no one can expect to get top executive talent to head up this important agency if Congress, by its action today, would reduce the relative importance of this agency by downgrading it within the executive salary level of existing law.

I am at a loss to understand what is so bad about at least continuing to have the head of this agency appointed by the President with a rank of assistant secretary. Yet, this bill would give the power to appoint the FHA Commissioner to the Secretary of the Department. Apparently, not even the President of the United States is protected from this power grab and concentration of supreme authority in the Secretary of this new Department.

As I look around at our Government organizational charts, it occurs to me that the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service are probably two of the best run departments in government. Certainly, I know of no one that could accuse the Internal Revenue

Service of being hamstrung or inefficient. I think herein we have a good analogy of how the FHA should be set up if a Department of Housing is going to be established.

If the FHA Commissioner were appointed by the President and the FHA administration was placed within the Department of Housing and Urban Development en toto similar to the way the Internal Revenue Commissioner and Service is set up within the Treasury Department, this would in no way hamper the Secretary of the Housing Department in the performance of his duties. The FHA Commissioner would be assigned all duties and responsibilities by the Secretary. The Secretary could organize, reorganize, or make any other changes that he saw fit in the way of improving the administration of this agency. This type of organization within the new Department would enhance the FHA and enable it to continue to do an even better job of aiding homeownership.

I submit that the creation of a new Department with Cabinet rank and the new housing bill is a political power grab which should shock the conscience of the Members of this body.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, once again the Congress is being called upon to expand the bureaucracy of the Federal Government. It was little more than 3 years ago that the House of Representatives rejected by a vote of 264 to 150 a similar plan to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Today, under a new name but with a similar purpose, we are asked to approve the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In my study of the bill, I find that it really will not include all housing programs nor will it encompass all those programs dealing with our urban areas. It will, however, create a new Cabinet member, a new Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel and an Administrative Assistant Secretary plus more redtape for the municipal governments in cities across the country.

Although the present programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be included in the proposed Department of Housing, these represent less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities.

The Veterans' Administration Loan Guaranty Service had guaranteed over 5.5 million home loans for a total of over \$49.2 billion as of December 31, 1960. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board as of January 1, 1964, had advanced members \$27.1 billion and had been repaid \$22.3 billion. These two Federal agencies, not included under this proposed legislation, account for more than two-thirds of the housing financing activities conducted under auspices of the Federal Government.

A multitude of Federal functions would remain where they are now even if the administration proposal is enacted into law. For example, welfare and poverty programs, water pollution, sewage disposal, vocational education funds, elementary and secondary schools assistance, public health activities, the Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways, the food stamp program, airport planning and development—all would remain under their present jurisdictions in other departments and agencies.

It is clear to see that local and State officials who more and more are required to look to Washington for funds would still be dealing with many bureaus despite the new Cabinet-level department.

Local and State governments today are seeking coordination and assistance in their relationships with the Federal government. They do not want Federal domination.

I have joined in introducing legislation which would establish an Office of Community Development within the executive Office of the President. This alternative to the administration proposal would provide the needed coordination to the multitude of Federal programs in a single executive office. It would not increase Federal control nor would it lead to any significant increase in the growing bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, prior to coming to Congress nearly 5 years ago, I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Committee on Municipalities in the Kansas Legislature for 12 years. I believe I am well aware of the complex problems faced by metropolitan areas. During my service in the U.S. House of Representatives, I have worked closely with local and State officials on many problems of Federal concern.

The real need, as I see it, is to make the know-how of the Federal government available to State and local governments without creating a new bureaucracy. There is need for better communication concerning the multitude of Federal programs and the results of Federal research.

The proposal which I have offered with many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle represents an economical and practical approach toward developing a coordinated national policy which will benefit urban and metropolitan areas across the United States.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the debate this afternoon has made abundantly clear that there is a growing number of Members of the Congress who recognize the challenges of our fast expanding metropolitan areas. We have heard that approximately 125 million Americans and nearly 80 percent of our American productive capacity is now located within 212 metropolitan areas. We already know within 25 years these urban areas will increase by another 100 million people. With this phenomenal growth the problems of urban life—education, employment, housing, transportation, crime, air and water pollution, and discrimination, the need for open

spaces, planning, and all the rest have become increasingly complex.

But despite all this, there is not a single American mayor or county official who would say that the State and localities do not have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems. The American system has made that responsibility theirs. Indeed, who can deal better with local problems than those who know them best? All levels of Government need to help provide community officials with the muscle that it takes to get the job done. And it is not merely bigness, or just money, or the juggling of Federal bureaus that are going to do it. All of us in this House know that. And not one of us, regardless of where he sits in this Chamber, would destroy or substantially alter our Federal system of government. Each of us, Republican and Democrat alike, believes that this country has benefited tremendously by our division of governmental responsibilities—National, State and local. Our aim is to revitalize that very system.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is not the aim of some of those who are the loudest proponents of the administration proposal. One of those proponents disclosed his true intent in supporting the administration bill when he testified at page 122 of the hearings as follows:

I respectfully submit that we need to centralize responsibility and authority—and to enhance the power of the Federal Government, which must in turn establish and enforce national standards of excellence in planning and building our modern cities.

That witness was Mr. Frank D. O'Connor, a district attorney within the city of New York.

I say, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this is not the aim of the author of this proposal or of the proponents from whom we have heard this afternoon, but it is the objective of many of those who will be around to see us next year and the year after with their expansion plans if the administration proposal is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a metropolitan area. My congressional district has added more than 100,000 people since 1960 and it will have increased by more than 100,000 additional persons by the time of the 1970 census. For 2 years I represented almost half the people who reside in the city of Minneapolis. My background is the city.

I believe sincerely, Mr. Chairman, that America needs the Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. Nearly 30 Republican Members of the House have introduced legislation to accomplish that purpose. For even if we were to get a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Development tomorrow, the need for an effective office in the White House to coordinate the proliferating activities of the Federal Government, as they affect urban and suburban areas, would be no less necessary.

Here is why. By ignoring some 70 other Federal programs concerned with metropolitan problems and by simply elevating the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet rank, a Department of Housing and Urban Development cannot hope to achieve coordination, ef-

iciency, or economy. Urban problems cut across departmental lines, and as urban life grows increasingly complex, more and more of the problems can be expected to cut across these lines. Badly-needed coordination can be achieved without any increase in Federal control, and without any significant increase in the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy through the adoption of the proposal to be offered tomorrow by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

The proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development would simply elevate the position of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. To understand why a mere change in the status of HHFA will not do what is needed, let us look at the relationships of some Federal programs today. Take the Federal Bureau of Roads, under the Commerce Department, and the HHFA, for example. Under the proposed Department, activities of the Bureau of Public Roads would not be included. Highway planners, as we all know, find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs. On the other hand, local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. Clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the HHFA—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

But these objectives can and do clash. And, in some urban places in America, that clash can and does raise havoc with the dream of beautifying our country. Rather than elevating HHFA to Cabinet level, what we need is a referee. A White House office, such as we propose, would be an appropriate umpire. We have seen this particular approach work very well in connection with the Office of Emergency Planning and the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President.

The proposed Johnson administration bill creates neither a Cabinet level department to coordinate the Federal programs geared to the needs of the urban communities nor a Cabinet level department to administer the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing. As speaker after speaker has pointed out, less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities would be encompassed in the new department.

I have already mentioned that the Bureau of Public Roads is not included. It will stay in the Department of Commerce. Water pollution and sewage disposal programs will stay in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now. And, the more than 40 separate programs of financial aid for urban development involve some 13 departments and agencies.

Mr. Chairman, we simply cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions for the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars in meeting overall community needs. This is precisely why many of us favor the establishment of an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. This Republican proposal, if adopted, would not discourage local and State initiative or direct the development of appropriate community solutions, but would provide local and State officials with a coordinating point of reference for all Federal programs. This coordination can be achieved with efficiency and economy through the adoption of the alternative proposal offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to carefully consider the issues at stake here and cast their affirmative vote when Mrs. DWYER presents her substitute bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, if the general debate has indicated anything at all today, and I believe it has, it has indicated very clearly that most of us have the definite opinion that something needs to be done with respect to the problem of housing and urban development, and we might have a difference of opinion as to how to do it best. I would take sharp issue at a different time with respect to the substitute, which I think does less than what we now have, and presents no real or genuine improvement with respect to the situation. But as for now I shall limit myself to the affirmative presentation of the substantive legislation which is now before us. I think you could start out by simply saying, "Do you feel in your own mind, based on the knowledge you have of the urban growth of this country today and what is reasonably projected for the future, with 70 percent of our people living in urban areas, and with the problems that cross city lines, county lines, and State lines, and where on the eastern seaboard of the United States alone you have a metropolitan area that stretches from Maine to Key West, and it is also true in other areas of the country, do you feel in your own mind that the situation, the problems, the interests, with respect to housing and urban development are sufficiently of a national interest so as to warrant the establishment of a Cabinet position?" I submit, based on the evidence, and based on the knowledge and experience I have had, not only here in the Congress but outside of the Congress, that the time has come in the year 1965 to answer that question in the affirmative.

And I submit it is the only reasonable way to answer it and the general debate today has proven that practically unanimously.

I would submit that taking the existing agencies of HHFA and putting them into a department, giving the department head Cabinet status is the logical way to start. I have been amused at the inconsistent presentation made that all of the urban problems and departments and agencies and programs are not included in this legislation.

Well, of course, they are not. The committee considered that very carefully, and we decided that the substantive legislation is a reasonable, moderate, proper way to get this establishment organized and started. The remainder is up to the judgment of the Congress at any time subject to the study and the action of the legislative committees and the action of this House and the other body.

Those who use the argument to defeat this bill that it does not do enough, that they want to take care of all the problems today in one, big, integrated, bureaucratic organization will have the opportunity tomorrow under the 5-minute rule to submit to the judgment of this body whether or not those 60 or 70, or whatever the number of programs there are, ought to be included at this time. I would submit for myself that I would have to oppose those amendments. I would submit also that it is a very inconsistent position. Because in the substitute which is offered they even make the point that a long study of this matter should be made so that recommendations could be offered, so that something could be done in the future with respect to this problem. And they also make it clear by the nature of the substitute that the present start under their proposal will simply be a coordinating function.

The substantive legislation makes a definite affirmative start on what we all know in our heart is absolutely necessary to deal with the problem. It carries out a fundamental recommendation of the Hoover Commission with respect to lodging in the head of an agency all of the functions, the duties, the powers, and the responsibilities. It does not now exist. It does not now exist under the present organization.

You have an able administrator. He is doing a good job. But by reorganization plan adopted by this body and by legislative act you have functions, powers, and duties directed and specifically reposed in lesser officials.

One of the major functions of the substantive legislation before you will be to repose those functions, powers, and duties in a Secretary who will sit at the Cabinet level. Once that point is understood, I do not see how anyone can reasonably argue that in any way any of the functions which have been transferred over from any of the lesser offices now provided by either the reorganization plan or statutory law would in any way be downgraded. For goodness sake, the whole purpose of the legislation is to upgrade them, and the legislation makes that very clear.

For example, and to be specific, we have a Commissioner of FHA under the present situation. Under the substantive legislation that position would be an Assistant Secretary, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, just as in the case of the Commissioner, except for the raise in rank and position. And if that does not improve an already very fine organization and a very fine operation then I will be sadly mistaken, based on my knowledge of the history of government.

But certainly it is logical and reasonable to realize that when you take a position that is now Commissioner, appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, and raise that position to the level of an Assistant Secretary you have upgraded the function, power, and responsibility of that office.

Mr. Chairman, when you take the function now being carried out by an Administrator and repose them in a Secretary, you know full well from your own practical experience and knowledge that this is bound to upgrade the entire operation.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about what? We are talking about housing and urban development.

Mr. Chairman, housing and its associated industries and related industries are fundamental to the entire economy of the United States: as basic as agriculture, as basic as steel, as basic as labor. Name any economic factor, and when you tie it into housing and urban development you cover the entire range of human activity and economic necessity in this country.

Mr. Chairman, when you add to that the fact that 70 or 80 percent of it is reposed in the urban areas of this country, and when organization after organization and individual after individual has recognized the fact today in 1965 that the only sensible way to solve these problems is in a partnership between the municipality, the county, the State, and the Federal Government, and without this we would not be able to even make a dent in these problems, then I think you must submit reasonably and logically that this legislation does the right thing.

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in this legislation can anyone find any language or any intent or any inference or any testimony that in any way states that the relationship between the city, the county, the State and the Federal Government is to be changed in one iota. The programs that now serve your cities and your counties and your States will be the same program. This legislation does not alter that or modify that or change it in any way. The responsibility to do that remains with you in your individual legislative committees or by action of this body. This is where that responsibility lies. This is admitted because in the argument by the opposition this very point was raised in an effort to detract from the nature of this bill. In other words, one of the speakers says, "Well, it does not really do anything."

Well, Mr. Chairman, it does do something. But we have to be explicit as to what it does, which we submit we have made on the RECORD and we are telling you why in our opinion it needs to be done.

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

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

Mr. MacGREGOR. I was interested in the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Florida with respect to the fact that to no single witness indicated that there would be any change in

the existing relationship between National, State and local governments. I would call to the attention of the gentleman the testimony that I carefully read from the hearings, given by Mr. Frank D. O'Connor, in which Mr. O'Connor said:

I respectfully submit we need to centralize responsibility and authority to enhance the power of the Federal Government which must in turn establish and enforce national standards of excellence in planning and building our modern cities.

Does the gentleman from Florida agree that that would effect a change in the relationship between our various levels of government with respect to their functions and community development and community affairs?

Mr. FASCELL. I will say this in response to the gentleman—and I listened to him very carefully when he made that point. I also listened very carefully to the testimony and reread very carefully what Mr. O'Connor said in his opinion of what he wants. But it does not mean anything having to do with this legislation, because it is completely irrelevant.

The principal point is that if you are going to make any change with respect to existing programs you have to legislate on them. This bill does not legislate on existing programs. This bill does specifically what we said it does. That is, to create a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs and provide for a Secretary at the Cabinet level; provide for four Assistant Secretaries, one of whom is specifically designated to deal with the private mortgage sector; provide for a general counsel; provide for an administrative secretary, and then for the necessary language to transfer to the new department the constituent agencies specifically named in the bill: To wit, FHA, HHFA, Fannie Mae, under the terms and conditions set forth in this legislation. To add anything to this is pure speculation. To infer or to impugn or otherwise detract is certainly within your prerogative, but not reasonable or logical, if you read the legislation. We can raise all kinds of specters and doubts as to the future, but as for me, I am willing to rest with the great judgment that has been exercised by this body and by the other body, and by the individual Members and by the Legislative Committees in responding to the needs of their people. This legislation responds to the needs of the great majority of all the people of this country. That is the reason the bill has come back here time after time.

I am hopeful that this body, this Congress, will respond finally to the needs of the urban areas of this country by adopting this legislation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6927, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

There is no doubt that the present problems of urban renewal, expansion, housing, air and water pollution, and public transportation, to name but a few, will become even more varied and complex in the future. As we all know, there have been in existence for many years various agencies working in one or more

of the above-mentioned areas. This proposal in no way contemplates establishment of an additional agency, but rather the reorganization of already established agencies into one unified department. Coordination of activities, now so widely scattered, will permit far more effective and efficient operation.

In addition, I wish to remind you that citizens directly interested in agriculture, for example, are represented in the Cabinet by a department which serves to correlate their interests; the same is true of labor. By the same token, why should not the great majority of people who live in urban areas—now 70 percent of our population—have the prestige of representation through a department whose voice will be heard when overall national policy is being considered at the highest level.

Despite arguments to the contrary offered by opponents of this important measure, there is nothing therein which commits the Congress or the President to provide increased authority or power for the proposed new Department over that extent in agencies now functioning in this same field.

Nor will the rights of States or cities be violated by this legislation. The hollowness of such arguments is clearly demonstrated by the wide endorsement of the proposal at the community level. In fact, as long ago as 1962, when President Kennedy proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, my own county of Los Angeles, the largest urban county in the United States, endorsed the proposal by vote of its board of supervisors.

As pointed out in yesterday's letter to all Members from the House leadership, the bill now under consideration would do the following:

First, meet a need emphasized by the President for a member of his own Cabinet who can both assist him and speak for him in connection with housing and urban development problems and programs.

Second, give the people and problems in our urban areas a badly needed voice at the Cabinet table.

Third, provide a focal point in the executive branch for officials of local, metropolitan area and State government to get more effective attention to problems of housing, community facilities, urban renewal, mass transit, and so forth.

Fourth, make available to Congress a more authoritative and responsible spokesman for the executive branch in these areas.

Fifth, save money, through stronger supervision over programs involving billions in public funds.

Sixth, improve the organization of the executive branch by providing a center of responsibility for a whole complex of problems which have been growing more rapidly than any other group in our domestic economy, and will continue to grow for the balance of the century, at least.

Seventh, fulfill a specific pledge of the Democratic platforms both in 1960 and 1964.

Many of you have received letters, as have I, which profess alarm at the so-called downgrading of FHA, but we have been assured there will be no such effect, and I am confident such assurances are meaningful.

This entire subject has been thoroughly studied for a long time by both the executive and legislative branches. All have reached the same conclusion—the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development is desirable, and the time for the establishment thereof is now.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6927.

As chairman of the House Republican policy committee I am in complete accord with the stand taken by that committee in opposition to this unnecessary legislation.

There is no need for a Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under this bill the proposed Department would not even make any new contributions to the solution of the Nation's problems in the field of housing or urban affairs.

The bill makes no provisions for continuation of the Federal Housing Administration despite the fact that this agency is one of the best in the Government.

A careful study of the bill has convinced me that the real needs of these areas are ignored by H.R. 6927.

The bill should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point my statement on this bill as released on May 25, 1965, following the action of the policy committee in opposing the bill:

#### STATEMENT BY JOHN J. RHODES

The large number of Federal programs designed to assist in the solution of the problems of urban communities would be more effective if properly coordinated.

We believe that consideration should be given to the separate views expressed in the report of the Committee on Government Operations on H.R. 6927, in which the establishment of an Office of Community Development to do this job is suggested. The multiplicity of Federal programs in this area should be coordinated and the medium of an office within the executive department is the best means for achieving this end. This is a constructive approach to a specific problem rather than a pork barrel approach, such as H.R. 6927, which uses that problem as an excuse to enlarge the Federal bureaucracy and Federal patronage.

"H.R. 6927 [Department of Housing and Urban Development] is unnecessary, will not accomplish what its proponents represent, and is contrary to sound principles of Government organization. It should not become law."

These are the opening words of the minority report on H.R. 6927. We concur with the attitude they express.

The bill would establish a new Cabinet-level executive department which would swallow up the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration,

and the Public Housing Administration. It would also transfer, as an entity, the Federal National Mortgage Administration to the new Department.

The bill provides for now new governmental functions. Moreover, it makes no provisions for the continuation of the FHA, a vital and effective agency that has functioned adequately for many years.

It does not establish either a Cabinet-level department to administer the principal Federal programs which provide assistance for housing or a Cabinet-level department to coordinate Federal programs geared to the needs of urban communities. Thus it is neither a Department of Urban Affairs, as those interested in urban problems have been led to believe, nor a Department of Housing as those interested in this field have been told.

Less than one-third of the Federal programs in housing would be encompassed by the proposed Department.

The great majority of urban affairs programs would remain outside the purview of the new Department.

The argument advanced by the bill's proponents that the new Department's Cabinet-level status will result in increased efficiency in the operation of the HHFA is rendered preposterous by the fact that this Agency has done and is doing its job well without any increase in prestige.

Another argument advanced in favor of this bill is of an equally ludicrous nature. It holds that urban dwellers are entitled to representation at the Cabinet level. Yet this would represent the first time a Cabinet-level department would be created merely to serve the people on the basis of their abode.

The President and his Cabinet serve all people—urban and rural. The Secretary of Agriculture serves urban dwellers in his concern with marketing and consumer interests. Commerce, Labor, Interior, all are concerned with matters which effect urban dwellers.

If this concept were to be pursued to its logical conclusion we would find ourselves with a need for Cabinet-level departments for nonagricultural rural dwellers and suburbanites.

Finally, the lack of any pressing reason for the establishment of this new Department necessitates that consideration be given to the ever-present dangers inherent in extending the Federal bureaucracy.

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

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

The Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives is opposed to enactment of H.R. 6927.

We endorse, H.R. 5173, introduced by Representative FLORENCE DWYER, Republican, of New Jersey, as a better and more effective means of helping to solve urban problems.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open at any point for amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The bill follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Act".*

#### DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of our people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

To carry out such purpose, and in recognition of the increasing importance of housing and urban development in our national life, the Congress finds that establishment of an executive department is desirable to achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; to assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development; to encourage the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action, including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation; and to provide for full and appropriate consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments.

(b) The Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban developments; develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; provide technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities, and conduct continuing comprehensive studies, and make

available findings, with respect to the problems of housing and urban development.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to deny or limit the benefits of any program, function, or activity assigned to the Department by this or any other Act to any community on the basis of its population or corporate status, except as may be expressly provided by law.

#### UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of executive departments, and who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time. One of the Assistant Secretaries shall be designated to administer, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, departmental programs relating to the private mortgage market.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Administration, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary under the classified civil service, who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time, and whose annual rate of compensation shall be the same as that now or hereafter provided by or pursuant to law for Assistant Secretaries for administration of executive departments.

#### TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 5 (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration in that Agency, and of the heads and other officers and offices of said agencies.

(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, together with its functions, powers, and duties, is hereby transferred to the Department. The next to the last sentence of section 308 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and the item numbered (94) of section 303(e) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 are hereby repealed, and the position of the President of said Association is hereby allocated among the positions referred to in section 7(c) hereof.

#### CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 19(d)(1) of title 3 of the United States Code is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 1) is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Eleventh. The Department of Housing and Urban Development."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to make applicable to the Department any provision of law inconsistent with this Act.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The personnel employed in connection with, and the assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds held, used, arising from, or available or to be made available in connection with, the functions, powers, and duties transferred by section 5 of this Act are hereby transferred with such functions, powers, and duties, respectively.

(b) No transfer of functions, powers, and duties shall at any time be made within the Department in connection with the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association unless the Secretary finds that the rights and interests of owners of outstanding common stock issued under the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act will not be adversely affected thereby.

(c) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the civil service and classification laws, to select, appoint, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to prescribe their authority and duties: *Provided*, That any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary may fix the compensation for not more than six positions in the Department at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule provided by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964.

(d) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, powers, and duties to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate, may authorize such successive re-delegations of such functions, powers, and duties as he may deem desirable, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The second proviso of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby repealed.

(e) The Secretary may obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1964, at rates not to exceed \$100 per diem for individuals.

(f) The Secretary is authorized to establish a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of such common administrative services as he shall find to be desirable in the interest of economy and efficiency in the Department, including such services as a central supply service for stationery and other supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department and its agencies; central messenger, mail, telephone, and other communications services; office space; central services for document reproduction and for graphics and visual aids; and a central library service. In addition to amounts appropriated to provide capital for said funds, which appropriations are hereby authorized, the fund shall be capitalized by transfer to it of such stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order as the Secretary shall direct. Such fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and for depreciation of equipment.

(g) The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of such seal.

#### ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, make a report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

#### SAVINGS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) No cause of action by or against any agency whose functions are transferred by this Act, or by or against any officer of any such agency in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of this enactment. Such causes of action may be asserted by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any agency whose

functions are transferred by this Act, or by or against any officer of any such agency in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act. A court may at any time during the dependency of the litigation, on its own motion or that of any party, order that the same may be maintained by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate.

(c) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions, powers, and duties transferred by this Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer or office of the Department as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate. With respect to any function, power, or duty transferred by or under this Act and exercised hereafter, reference in another Federal law to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or to any officer, office, or agency therein, except the Federal National Mortgage Association and its officers, shall be deemed to mean the Secretary. The positions and agencies heretofore established by law in connection with the functions, powers, and duties transferred under section 5(a) of this Act shall lapse.

#### SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days following the date on which this Act is approved by the President, or on such earlier date as the President shall specify by Executive order published in the Federal Register, except that any of the officers provided for in sections 3(a), 4(a), and 4(b) of this Act may be nominated and appointed, as provided in such sections, at any time after the date this Act is approved by the President.

(b) In the event that one or more officers required by this Act to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall not have entered upon office on the effective date of this Act, the President may designate any person who was an officer of the Housing and Home Finance Agency immediately prior to said effective date to act in such office until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following said effective date, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such persons shall receive compensation at the rates provided by this Act for the respective offices in which they act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Boggs, 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. 6927) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Monday, June 21, to file a report on the bill H.R. 9042.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House of additions to the legislative program. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, will call up tomorrow the conference report on the NASA authorization bill.

Also on tomorrow, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] will call up House Resolution 416.

May I further advise Members of the House that on Thursday there will be a recess of the House to receive Lieutenant Colonels McDivitt and White, the Gemini team.

#### THE ECONOMIC HEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that our great country has problems, particularly problems abroad, is something that all thoughtful Americans recognize, but those who spread fear and doubt about the economic health of our country, in my judgment, are certainly not reading nor reporting the facts. I take this time to report to the House the phenomenal record made by the American economy in the month just completed, May 1965. Let me recount some of the figures which show the health of the economy of our country.

To begin with, employment in industry and business reached the figure of 60 million for the first time in the entire history of the United States. Jobs increased in the month of May alone by almost half a million which, incidentally, was 150,000 more than anyone had antic-

ipated and represented 2½ million more workers employed than in May 1964. Stated another way in May 1965 we had the lowest unemployment rate since October 1957.

At the same time the average factory worker's pay rose to \$107.50 a week, a new alltime high, or \$4.50 a week more than a year ago. Three out of every four workers were employed in a plant or factory or business which paid them more than \$100 a week.

So, Mr. Speaker, to compare the events of today to 1929 is to ignore the facts. I hope that all of us will look at these figures and recognize that the American economy is healthy and moving ahead at a rapid and sound pace.

Here are some additional facts which show the growth and expansion of our economy:

First. The gross national product is now almost \$650 billion; that is, at a seasonally adjusted rate. This represents a climb of almost \$15 billion over the last quarter in 1964. Since early 1961, the gross national product has grown by about \$150 billion per year, which is a climb of about 30 percent.

Second. The United States is now in its 52d consecutive month of a continuous peacetime economic expansion—the longest such peacetime growth in our Nation's history. This expansion began in February 1961.

Third. Since this expansion started, total employment has risen by 5.3 million people; and the number unemployed has dropped by 1.2 million. The unemployment rate has fallen to below 5 percent. The average unemployment rate in the first quarter of 1965 was 4.8 percent. This compares with 6.8 percent in the first quarter of 1961.

Fourth. The gross national product rise in the past 4½ years has resulted in many benefits: First, private consumption has grown by 27 percent; second, fixed business investment has expanded by 38 percent, thus showing the improved productive capacity of business; third, residential construction is up by 30 percent; fourth, manufacturing production has risen by 38 percent; fifth, output of utilities is up by 32 percent; sixth, agricultural output is up by 5 percent; seventh, total wages and salaries paid to workers and executives has grown by 28 percent, or a total of about \$76 billion—after taxes, and adjusted for changes in prices, the average weekly earnings of manufacturing workers are up by 16 percent; and eighth, corporate profits, after taxes, have risen by 87 percent; dividends are up by 38 percent; value of outstanding shares climbed almost \$200 million.

Fifth. As a result of the Tax Revision Act of 1962, and the Tax Reduction Act of 1964, corporate, after-tax profits have reached about \$37 billion—at a seasonally adjusted annual rate. This is close to \$5 billion above the rate achieved in the last quarter of 1964; and more than \$5 billion over that rate achieved in the first quarter of 1964.

Business and industry also are continuing to receive the benefits of the liberalization of depreciation allowances on plant and equipment, first initiated

by the Treasury Department in 1962. The furthering of this liberalization will provide business and industry with another \$700 million tax benefit in the current year 1965.

The personal income of citizens, since early 1961, has climbed by almost 20 percent—to an average—after taxes—of \$2,315 in the first quarter of 1965.

From the Tax Reduction Act of 1964 alone, the Council of Economic Advisers notes:

First. Consumer spending increased an extra \$9 billion.

Second. The gross national product in constant prices grew 4.5 percent in 1964, whereas in the absence of the tax cut it would have grown only 3 percent.

Third. Business investment in plant and equipment rose \$6.5 billion.

Fourth. Almost 2 million new jobs were created.

Fifth. At present, the expenditures on new plant and equipment by business and industry are running at an annual rate of about \$50.4 billion—an increase of more than \$5 billion for the year 1964. The estimate for the year 1965 is that there will be a 12 percent or more rise in plant and equipment spending over 1964.

Sixth. At the present rate, the gross national product will rise to or will exceed \$660 billion per annum in the year 1965.

The U.S. News & World Report, in its issue for June 14, 1965, said the following:

Actually, today there are few real similarities to precrash 1929.

Money now is managed, not rigidly tied to gold. Federal cash spending now accounts for 1 out of 4 dollars of national income, not 1 in 29.

Government spending is geared to fast action, vast outlays in setbacks.

Deposits of banks, savings and loans are insured, not subject to a sudden disappearance. Wage rates are supported by strong unions. Farm prices are bolstered by Government. Old people get pensions where there were few before.

Mortgages are amortized, not callable each 3 or 5 years, precipitating a wave of foreclosures in hard times. Government, by law, is committed to use its powers to strive to bring about and sustain jobs for all.

So, it is difficult to conceive a repeat of 1929 and its aftermath.

Business itself never was better. People's incomes are at a record level. End of excise taxes on many products at retail on July 1 will have the effect of a price cut. Pension checks will go up in the autumn.

Trade is sure to boom, with a record Christmas season.

Steel strike, most probably, will be avoided. Wage rise is sure to be around 4 percent, with some price rises to follow. Carefully handled price increases are very unlikely to bring a repetition of the 1962 crackdown.

The concern, as mentioned, is that the boom is starting to heat up a bit too much, that moves will be called for to tighten the supply of money. In the past, that has meant at least a pause, and usually some recession.

Tax cut of about \$4.8 billion is being speeded through Congress. Cuts and eliminations, when made, will come in stages over 3½ years.

On July 1, excises will end on jewelry, furs, toilet articles, luggage. Also, on business machines, phonographs and records, musical instruments, TV sets, radios, freezers, refrigerators, most appliances, most sporting goods.

Retroactive to May 15: Tax on air conditioners will be repealed, and auto tax will drop from 10 to 7 percent, be cut more later.

Then on January 1, 1966, tax ends on club dues, admissions, private wires, and auto parts except for trucks. Tax on local and long-distance calls will go down from 10 to 3 percent. There should be quite an effect from it all.

Tax cuts on incomes and affecting excises will add up to nearly \$16 billion, centered mostly in 1964 and 1965. These cuts are credited with being a real factor in stimulating business.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE CHAIRMAN MARTIN FAILS TO READ HIS- TORY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, William McChesney Martin, who has been Chairman of the Federal Reserve System for 14 long years, is one of those men who simply cannot read history, and is therefore destined to repeat it. Indeed, Mr. Martin is the perfect example of the type of man that the philosopher Santayana wrote about in his oft-quoted aphorism about those who fail to read history. The pity is, however, that when a man acquires the crucial position held by Mr. Martin and fails to study history, the whole Nation suffers—the whole Nation is threatened with a new depression.

Not only does Mr. Martin fail to read history, he fails to heed those who have read history.

Now the Representative from Patman Switch and Texarkana, Tex., the First District of Texas, does not hold a degree in economics—neither does the gentleman from St. Louis, Mo., who occupies the awesome post of Chairman of the Federal Reserve System. But the Representative of the First District of Texas, who happens to be chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, does heed the advice of our most learned economists. He has attempted to benefit by the mistakes of the past, to avoid our past mistakes. It was for this reason that the Representative of the First District of Texas sponsored the Full Employment Act. It is for this reason that he has brought to the attention of this body and the Nation the facts about how the Federal Reserve System could and should be brought into line so that a forward looking monetary policy could be followed in this country.

But all the king's men and all of the economists of the Nation cannot teach Mr. Martin anything about the mistakes of the past. He would lead us down the same road we went in 1929. By tightening up on the money supply and boosting interest rates, he will push us into another depression.

FORMER MEMBER OF PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL OF  
ECONOMIC ADVISERS HAS GOOD ADVICE FOR  
MARTIN

Surely one of the reasons we are enjoying the greatest uninterrupted expansion in our history is traceable to the fine

work done by the Council of Economic Advisers, established under the Full Employment Act which I sponsored. Many great economists have served on the Council, and the country has benefited immeasurably.

But as I have said time and time again, the Federal Reserve has always held aloof from the Council of Economic Advisers, cooperating only when it pleased the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Mr. Martin goes it alone. He makes his own policy. He pays no heed to the well trained and well schooled who make up the Council of Economic Advisers. He pays no attention whatever to the Members of Congress who have devoted a lifetime of work to economic trends, working in the interest of all the people, and not just for the American Bankers Association.

If Mr. Martin would follow the advice of economists, he would have never made the speech which sent the stock market into a sharp decline. He displayed his ignorance to the lessons of the past. But it was not merely what Mr. Martin said that sent the stock market into a fit of selling. It is the power Mr. Martin wields as the Nation's central banker to tighten up monetary policy that the alert speculators on the stock exchange watch. It is not Mr. Martin's words, it is his deeds that threaten a new Martin depression.

I commend to all Members of Congress the reading of an article just published by Prof. James Tobin. Dr. Tobin is sterling professor of economics at Yale University and served as a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from 1961 to 1962. Dr. Tobin was the Council's specialist on monetary policy.

What does Dr. Tobin say about Mr. Martin's assessment of the great depression of the 1930's? Let me quote from Professor Tobin:

A boon is a trying period for a central banker who believes, like Chairman Martin, that recessions and depressions are inescapable retribution for the maladjustments of prosperity. Should he let such excesses develop? Or should he administer a dose of tight money? This medicine itself may turn prosperity into recession. But the doctor will always assure his perplexed and involuntary patients that they needed it to forestall much worse suffering later.

Again Professor Tobin makes this telling comment:

Chairman Martin views economic expansion as a potentially explosive chain reaction, which only the tightest control prevents from running away. Some booms may merit this metaphor. But the current one seems in more danger of ending with a whimper than with a bang. To keep it going has required a succession of carefully timed and gaged stimuli—increases in Federal spending, income tax cuts, and now excise reduction. "Leaning against the wind," the favorite posture of the Federal Reserve, is not an appropriate stance when the problem is to keep the wind blowing.

Finally, in painstaking detail Dr. Tobin shows how Mr. Martin has misread the causes of the 1929-33 depression. As Professor Tobin expresses it:

What is the lesson of 1929? Chairman Martin says, "to a large extent the disaster of 1929-33 was a consequence of maladjust-

ments born of the boom of the twenties." More likely, the expansion of the twenties—noninflationary like the present expansion—simply ran out of steam. Instead of taking action to prolong it, Chairman Martin's predecessors tightened credit and raised interest rates. Like many contemporary observers and historians, they paid too much attention to a sideshow, stock market speculation, and too little to the main ring, the real economy.

Certainly no maladjustments or overindulgences occurred in the twenties which preordained that a routine recession in 1929-30 should become a worldwide economic and political catastrophe. That took incredible sins of omission and commission, all justified in the name of fiscal and financial orthodoxy. In the monetary area, the worst overt sins were raising the discount rate in September-October 1931 (Chairman Martin agrees this was a mistake) and in February 1933. On both occasions, the Federal Reserve's purpose was to protect the international gold value of the dollar. Chairman Martin was telling history upside down at Columbia when he blamed the severity of the depression on insufficient concern for the external status of the dollar. Recovery did not begin in the United States until Roosevelt gave recovery higher priority than the gold standard.

#### MR. MARTIN CANNOT STAND PROSPERITY

As I have said, Mr. Martin simply cannot stand prosperity. He is wedded not only to the past, but to the mistakes of the past.

But to reiterate, it is not simply what Mr. Martin says that causes the stock market to experience such a terrific decline. It is what Mr. Martin does as the man who controls our monetary system.

If an engineer at the controls of a locomotive were always putting on the brakes every time the train got moving, we would see to it that we got a new engineer. The pity is, that even the President of the United States has his hands tied. Sure, he could probably fire Mr. Martin. But could he pick the best man available for the job? No indeed, he could only ask Mr. Martin to step down from the chairmanship and ask one of the existing members of the Federal Reserve Board to be Chairman. This is all wrong.

I recommend that every Member of this body read carefully the article by Professor Tobin pointing out the errors of Mr. Martin's ways, which I append to my statement:

[From the New Republic, June 19, 1965]

#### WHAT IS THE LESSON OF 1929?

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve System since 1951, has suffered professional attacks longer and more patiently than most officials. On June 1, he counterattacked at Columbia.

His main message—somewhat veiled but well enough understood in Wall Street—was that the country may need, soon if not now, tighter money and higher interest rates to protect its domestic economic health and its balance of payments. Here Chairman Martin takes issue with a host of critics, mainly academic, some of whom may even have infiltrated Washington. Many think that the current expansion needs further stimulus rather than sterner discipline and that the dollar's prestige abroad already receives too high priority in U.S. policy.

Chairman Martin reads the critics lessons from the history of the 1920's and the great depression. The irony is that before 1933

Chairman Martin's intellectual and official precursors were firmly in the saddle here and in Europe. Unlike him, they did not have to accommodate or even answer heretical financial views. The mistakes they made were all their own.

A boom is a trying period for a central banker who believes, like Chairman Martin, that recessions and depressions are inescapable retribution for the "maladjustments" of prosperity. Should he let such "excesses" develop? Or should he administer a dose of tight money? This medicine itself may turn prosperity into recession. But the doctor will always assure his perplexed and involuntary patients that they needed it to forestall much worse suffering later.

The current expansion is especially trying. It has been proceeding for 52 months without the degree of monetary discipline the Federal Reserve became accustomed to administer in the 1950's. Yet it is hard even for the hypersensitive antennae of the central bank to detect any maladjustments or excesses. Since February 1961, a \$150 billion expansion in total annual public and private spending has reduced unemployment from 7 to 4.5 percent, without noticeably raising prices. In the spring of 1961, Chairman Martin told Congress that unemployment was structural, that it could not be reduced by more spending except at serious risk of bottlenecks and inflation. Similar warnings, similarly unfounded, have been repeated in orthodox financial circles at every step of the recovery. Had they been heeded, the country would have lost millions of jobs and billions of dollars in production and income.

Chairman Martin views economic expansion as a potentially explosive chain reaction, which only the tightest control prevents from running away. Some booms may merit this metaphor. But the current one seems in more danger of ending with a whimper than with a bang. To keep it going has required a succession of carefully timed and gaged stimuli—increases in Federal spending, income tax cuts and now excise reductions. "Leaning against the wind," the favorite posture of the Federal Reserve, is not an appropriate stance when the problem is to keep the wind blowing.

What is the lesson of 1929? Chairman Martin says, "to a large extent the disaster of 1929-33 was a consequence of maladjustments born of the boom of the twenties." More likely, the expansion of the twenties—noninflationary like the present expansion—simply ran out of steam. Instead of taking action to prolong it, Chairman Martin's predecessors tightened credit and raised interest rates. Like many contemporary observers and historians, they paid too much attention to a sideshow, stock market speculation, and too little to the main ring, the real economy.

Certainly no maladjustments or overindulgences occurred in the twenties which preordained that a routine recession in 1929-30 should become a worldwide economic and political catastrophe. That took incredible sins of omission and commission, all justified in the name of fiscal and financial orthodoxy. In the monetary area, the worst overt sins were raising the discount rate in September and October 1931 (Chairman Martin agrees this was a mistake) and in February 1933. On both occasions, the Federal Reserve's purpose was to protect the international gold value of the dollar. Chairman Martin was telling history upside down at Columbia when he blamed the severity of the depression on insufficient concern for the external status of the dollar. Recovery did not begin in the United States until Roosevelt gave recovery higher priority than the gold standard.

It is true that the position of the dollar as an international reserve currency today is analogous to the role of the pound

sterling from 1925 to 1931. But the lesson of the analogy is the opposite of the one Chairman Martin draws. In 1925, through an excess of orthodox zeal and a Colonel Blimp conception of imperial prestige, Britain returned to the gold standard at the 1914 parity of sterling with gold and the dollar. This made British exports to expensive. The result, foreseen by J. M. Keynes, was unemployment, civil strife, and depression. Nor did the sacrifices imposed on the British people and their trading partners overseas save for long the gold value of the pound or London's financial prestige. Britain was forced to devalue in 1931, and then British recovery began.

Chairman Martin deprecates the ensuing destruction of the international gold standard. But this was the result of the depression, not its cause. And the depression itself owed much to its severity to the British Government's previous determination to give the prestige of the pound sterling absolute priority over domestic prosperity.

It is worth noting in passing that then as now France had a strong currency because of previous devaluations, that then as now French threats to take gold forced deflationary policies on the United States and Britain, and that then as now France took gold anyway.

This is the history to which Chairman Martin appeals in asking us to place the international "value and status of the dollar" above all other considerations of economic policy. He excoriates "some Keynesian and neoclassical economists" for wishing the United States to follow the British 1931 example. But the issue is not really devaluation. The exchange value of the dollar in the sixties is by no means as unrealistically high as that of the pound in the late twenties. The issue is whether the maintenance of gold-dollar convertibility at the present rate has an absolute priority over all other objectives of U.S. domestic and foreign policy. Is "going off gold" such an ultimate catastrophe, like nuclear war, that we must avoid at all costs the slightest risk of its occurrence? And if, as Chairman Martin dubiously argues, the result would be worldwide depression, should we not expect more cooperation and forbearance from our allies than we are likely to receive so long as we define the problem, as he does, as a strictly American responsibility?

Both America and the world have more to gain from steady economic progress and sustained full employment in the United States than from timid obsession with foreign confidence in the dollar. Gratifying as it is, our long economic expansion has not yet restored full employment. The social costs of a persistent shortage of jobs can be observed daily in the streets of our cities and in the demoralization of those groups, notably Negroes and teenagers, who get jobs only when labor markets are tight. In a real sense these people—and the mayors, social workers, police and antipoverty warriors who must struggle with their problems—are the victims of the shortcomings of fiscal and monetary policy.

The identification of prosperity with imprudent self-indulgence may have an appealing Puritan ring. But it is wholly a vicarious Puritanism, like the austerity of the international financiers who in 1931 forced the Labor government to cut the dole of the unemployed and the salaries of teachers in a vain attempt to "save" the pound. It would be criminal folly to endanger our current economic growth either by an attack on conjectural maladjustments and imagined excesses or by subservience to gold-hungry foreign central banks. As Chairman Martin says, "If monetary history were to repeat itself, it would be nobody's fault but our own."

JAMES TOBIN.

### THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM AND SMALL BUSINESSMEN IN THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration is currently in the process of deciding in what form it will perpetuate mandatory oil import limitations. Because nothing less than the security of this Nation is involved—not to mention the survival of a healthy small business segment in the producing end of this Nation's petroleum industry—I believe the time has come to express the concern long held by many of us over the structure of the imports program inherited from the Eisenhower administration.

On May 20 last I addressed the House on the subject of "International Oil, Small Business, and the Balance of Payments." At that time I charged that "favored treatment to American international oil companies is a principal factor in the present balance-of-payments deficit" as well as "a primary cause of the distress in which the small domestic independent oilman now finds himself."

There is excellent reason to question whether the imports program, in the form devised by the Eisenhower administration, is properly responsive to the purpose of import controls. Accordingly, I have announced that hearings are contemplated in the early future—to be held by either the House Banking and Currency Committee or the Joint Economic Committee—at which the appropriateness of the present imports control machinery will be examined in some detail. I have concluded that so serious is this matter as to make hearings imperative at an early date.

In my May 20 remarks, it was noted that serious questions have arisen concerning the present oil imports program, and the quota-allocation procedure under it, including:

First. Is the present oil imports control arrangement fully effective in terms of the national security purpose?

Second. Is the present program the most suitable in terms of our balance-of-payments objective?

Third. Is the present import arrangement conducive to a concentration trend within the oil industry?

It should be recalled that the Kennedy administration was in the process of re-examining the appropriateness of the imports control mechanism at the time of the assassination. A Special Petroleum Study Committee appointed by President Kennedy had earlier pointed out that the present system "places the Federal Government in the role of distributing a considerable economic advantage. A distribution of an economic advantage of this magnitude is bound to bear upon the financial return of individual companies, the structure of the

industry, the functioning of the economy, and other national objectives."

President Johnson, early in his administration undertook to entrust oil policy decisions primarily to the Secretary of the Interior. However, I am absolutely certain that the President, in delegating this responsibility, had no intention whatever of short-circuiting the movement toward developing an imports program which will function in terms of purpose. As a matter of fact, it was upon insistence of some of the President's closest advisers that Interior decided to hold comprehensive hearings into all aspects of the oil imports program, ostensibly looking toward major revisions in the control arrangement.

The hearings were held last March, 3 days of hearings at which all interested parties were accorded an opportunity to recommend improvements. But these hearings were characterized by an unusually high degree of self-serving pronouncements by individual importing interests, each recommending revisions in the quota allocations formula calculated to further its own quota position. The fundamental purpose of import controls seems to have been largely overlooked.

Although top Interior Department officials had billed the hearings as comprehensive reexamination of the program in terms of purpose, early in the hearings they made known their intention to make no basic changes in the program.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that there have been a constant barrage of declarations by Interior officials to the effect that the import program is working fine—and that the only weak spot in the picture is that we are not drilling enough exploratory wells to keep reserves in proper ratio to withdrawals.

Moreover, the recent Interior Department industry appraisal report cites a clear need for more than just reversal of downward trends in exploration. Tomorrow's demand calls for exploration rates greater than in past years. The report states:

Even the most optimistic assumption regarding the exploitation of known deposits, however, falls short of the requirement for new domestic supply mentioned in chapter I, and there remains the certainty that sooner or later, new deposits must be found.

For the most of the past 30 years, the ratio of proved reserves to annual production of crude oil has kept in a narrow range of between 12 and 14 to 1, although it has declined in recent years to slightly over 11 to 1 because additions to reserves have not kept pace with production.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this a highly significant revelation. Here we have officials at Interior declaring that the imports program is functioning satisfactorily—but that domestic producers are just not drilling enough wells. The reason I say this is significant and quite revealing, Mr. Speaker, is that the primary purpose of oil import controls in the first place was to assure conditions on the domestic scene which would enable independent producers to keep drilling for reserves essential to this Nation's security and economic well-being. The Executive order proclaiming mandatory oil import controls on March 10,

1959, incorporated the following statement:

The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which makes it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the present program can be described as successful only if it is being evaluated by meaningless criteria. I am saying that the people at Interior seem to be doing exactly that.

#### IMPORTS VERSUS DOMESTIC GROWTH

What has been the record of imports under mandatory control since they were imposed in March of 1959?

Members of the Congress who took a lead in writing the 1958 Security Clause fully intended that this authority be used to prevent disproportionate growth of imports thereafter. The later Senator Kerr declared publicly that he had assurances from the Eisenhower administration that oil imports thereafter would be permitted to increase only in the ratio they then bore to domestic oil production in the United States. Let us see what has happened.

Since the imposition of mandatory controls in early 1959, the total U.S. market for oil has increased by about 1,090,000 barrels a day. How much of this did oil imports get and how much was left for domestic producers?

Imports got about 44 percent of this U.S. market growth, or some 480,000 barrels a day.

Domestic producers got the remaining 56 percent, or about 610,000 barrels per day.

But this does not tell the whole story—not by any means.

The fact is that domestic nonintegrated independent producers as a group got absolutely no part of the U.S. oil market growth since the imposition of import controls. As a matter of fact, they, along with the States in which independents are most predominant, have lost ground continuously under the control program—while the leading international oil companies have increased their share of production both at home and abroad.

domestic production growth—gaining some 49.3 percent of the U.S. market growth during the period of mandatory control, an increase in barrels of some 537,000 barrels daily.

Now remember that most of the increased Louisiana production of which I speak is from Federal offshore lands, subject to Interior Department jurisdiction. And it should be noted, also, that the Federal offshore production of which I speak is held almost entirely by the same international oil companies which produce abroad. The typical domestic independent producer—the individual operator who historically has discovered more than two-thirds of all our oil to date—is not financially equipped to compete in this big league for wells that regularly cost a million dollars or more each.

So what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that production under Interior Department jurisdiction—imported oil and Federal offshore production—got the lion's share of U.S. oil market growth, while production in the onshore areas of this Nation has been practically stagnant. As a matter of fact, production in the United States exclusive of Louisiana during the entire 6 years of mandatory controls has been allowed only about a 1-percent annual production increase—while imports have increased many times that rate.

So exclusive of Louisiana, total production has grown by only some 7 percent—or 73,000 barrels daily, throughout the entire period of mandatory import controls. And, since the leading major companies have increased their domestic onshore production far more than that, this can only mean that the rank and file thousands of independent oil producers in the Nation have enjoyed no production growth at all.

Now I submit that this is a far cry from what was intended by the Congress in authorizing mandatory oil import controls. I fail to understand why Interior officials, in the face of irrefutable evidence that the program is a failure, insist that it is successful and that no significant changes are in order.

#### OUTLOOK FOR NEW PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I have been given to believe that only minor revisions in this unsuccessful oil imports program are being recommended by the Interior Department for the period of controls beginning July 1.

If this is so, then I submit it is time that the President cancel the delegation of oil-policy matters to the Interior Department. His personal intervention may well be necessary to prevent further irreparable injury to a vital home industry.

The Interior Department held in March the comprehensive hearings called for by many of us in Congress and leading oil-State Governors, including the Honorable John B. Connally, Governor of Texas. But it appears from all published reports that the present Interior officials have no intention of using this opportunity to come up with a program which is suitable to the purpose and which will work.

There have been published reports that the Secretary of Interior, as well as his subordinates, have declared that they plan to make no reduction in oil imports at any point, and that they do not even concur in the need for freezing the present level until the domestic industry has a chance to get its breath.

As incredible as it seems to me, reports indicate Interior is recommending that the new import order reject proposals to link district V—west coast—imports with imports into districts I-IV, in such a way as to prevent runaway imports into any part of the Nation.

It is now known that the Secretary has reversed his earlier judgment in the matter of residual fuel oil imports, and has now publicly declared that his intention to decontrol some residual imports—thereby saving, he said, New England consumers some \$400 million a year—was blocked by interference at the White House. Incidentally his \$400 million figure, I am reliably informed, is as fictitious as a figure could be, apparently intended to garner favor with some at whatever expense to the security and well-being of the Nation.

We hear constantly of the concern being expressed for the equities between import sources. I am told that some Interior officials actually recommend a plan whereby imports of Venezuelan source will be graded upward in value, through the refinery input allocation system, theoretically to equalize their status with exempt Canadian imports.

I am informed also that the Secretary wants to give import quotas to petrochemical plants, so that they can import their feedstocks, on the theory that this helps them increase their export business.

There are reports that Interior officials are considering granting imports quotas to domestic wildcaters on the basis of footage drilled. This is clear evidence they recognize that the present import quota arrangement is not getting the job done.

One of the more significant developments to which I would bring attention at this time is the negotiation between Interior officials and officials of a certain international oil company having to do with the establishment of a \$600 million petrochemical complex in Puerto Rico. To make this economic, they are going to be allowed to import some 50,000 barrels a day of gasoline via Puerto Rico. Now this obviously will either increase imports by that much, or will necessitate rolling back the product imports of other companies. My understanding is that Interior has promised to follow the latter course. I am sure this will be greeted with loud cheers from the competing companies having to give up their rights so that the company Interior has favored can enjoy its special imports privilege.

#### BASIC OBJECTIVES

Mr. Speaker, foremost among the witnesses at the March hearings on the oil imports program held by the Department of the Interior was the Governor of my State, the Honorable John B. Connally. He presented charts which clearly demonstrated that the imports pro-

	Increase or decrease over base period 1957-59	
	Peak reached during 1952-57	Latest year, 1963 or 1964
	Percent	Percent
Geophysical activity.....	+43.4	-32.9
Active rotary rigs.....	+25.5	-29.9
Exploratory wells.....	+24.5	-11.6
Total wells.....	+11.3	-13.5
Crude oil found.....	+13.7	-25.0
Total oil found.....	+16.6	-11.9
Employment.....	+3.1	-11.4
Crude oil price.....	+3.0	-3.7

Production in offshore Louisiana, mostly under Federal leases, has skyrocketed under the program. The result is that Louisiana crude condensate accounted for almost all the so-called do-

gram is falling seriously short of assuring adequate exploratory operations at home. Both the crude oil and natural gas reserves-to-production ratios are on the decline. Said Governor Connally to the Interior officials before whom he testified:

The great time lag between exploratory planning and the actual flow of oil from new reservoirs—5, 10, 15 or even 20 years—is so great that the oil for the 1970's must be planned in the 1960's. To meet projected requirements in the face of the downward trend in reserve additions, development drilling, and exploratory effort of the petroleum industry, it is necessary that the Interior Department now critically review the effects of its past administration of the import-quota system, and set import levels that will comply fully with the objectives of the Presidential directive establishing the mandatory oil import program—to the end that the petroleum industry in the United States will regain its just level of economic health and that its exploratory vigor will be stimulated.

Governor Connally told Interior officials that "at the very minimum, freezing the present volume level of imports for a sufficient period of time until the downward trend in domestic exploration and reserve replacements are corrected" is necessitated by the present situation.

In response to the many published reports that certain Interior officials attribute industry problems to domestic inefficiencies, rather than an inadequate imports program, Governor Connally had this to say:

Some say that the domestic producers' plight is due in large measure to the great number of unnecessary wells that have been drilled. By today's technological and economic standards, and to meet today's domestic demand for oil, there have been more wells drilled in the past in some reservoirs than are needed to produce today's restricted requirement from domestic reserves of oil. In times of emergency it is possible that many of these so-called unnecessary wells will prove to be extremely valuable to increase the availability of our oil reserves and consequently to help maintain the self-sufficiency of petroleum in the United States.

Large numbers of wells in a specific reservoir contribute to the availability, or deliverability, of oil from the reservoir, but do not add materially to the oil ultimately recoverable from the reservoir. Since an oil reservoir shrinks a little bit every day from the time it is discovered until it is abandoned, the productive capacity of the reservoir declines in some relationship to its age, depending upon the recovery mechanisms at work.

If the present downward trend in domestic exploratory activity is not halted now, it is possible that the excessive criticism of unnecessary wells will be changed to praise for the farsightedness of the industry in providing needed deliverability of oil from our domestic deposits at some time in the future.

Finally, with reference to the balance-of-payments situation Governor Connally said:

The balance of payments of this Nation and our relations with many countries will be affected by what you do. But at this point let me remind you that since 1959 while production of oil has gone up 7 percent in the United States, oil production in Venezuela has increased 17 percent; oil production in Europe, including Russia, has increased 56 percent; oil production in the Middle East has increased 47 percent and oil

production from Africa has increased 1,041 percent.

*Free foreign oil production*  
[Thousand barrels daily]

	Eastern Hemisphere	Venezuela	Canada
1959.....	5,540	2,797	518
1960.....	6,451	2,873	541
1961.....	7,047	2,947	643
1962.....	7,958	3,230	737
1963.....	8,996	3,280	787
1964.....	10,574	3,415	845
Percent increase, 1964 versus 1959.....	+91	+22	+63

We hear now reports that Interior wants to change the program from one setting quotas on a semiannual basis to an annual basis. I very much fear the effect of this would be to delay consideration of whether the program is doing an adequate job. On this point I agree with Governor Connally that the effects of the mandatory oil import program should be assessed more often, not less often, and I fear that changing to an annual basis might be a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of failure to evaluate the program in meaningful terms, I might note that some very strange reasons are being given for granting import quotas these days. Just last week a couple of shutdown refineries were given so-called hardship quotas under a provision allowing them to persons who do not meet normal standards. As absurd as it must surely seem to all us outsiders, the quotas were given on the basis in part "an allocation would be helpful to each petitioner in adjusting its creditor problems." Now I am not questioning the need of these companies for quota subsidies, and I am not saying they should not get them. But is it not rather strange when quotas can be arbitrarily handed out to people because they have creditor problems? If that is a proper basis, I am sure we all have a lot of friends who are equally qualified.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this is admittedly a complex problem. I am under no illusions that answers come easy. What I am saying here today is that the present import allocation arrangement is politically unsuitable and eminently unsuccessful in terms of purpose.

In future weeks I intend to supplement these remarks with facts and figures showing exactly what is happening within the domestic petroleum industry, and particularly to the small businessman in this enterprise.

There is a serious monopoly trend in this industry, a matter which I plan to discuss at length in the days ahead.

At the appropriate time, committee hearings will be held, inquiring into the many facets of this and related problems having to do with the international oil companies and their balance-of-payments responsibilities.

My purpose here today is primarily to draw attention to what seems to be the dangerous course being pursued by the Interior Department in this oil imports matter. It is time for the execu-

tive branch of our Government to face up to a bad situation which requires correction. Present officials at the Interior Department do not seem disposed to do this.

If they fail to do so, then I predict corrective action will come from other sources. We are dealing with a national security matter. The interests of this Nation cannot safely be subordinated much longer to the interests of a few international oil companies.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAM McC. MARTIN  
IS NOT PRESIDENT LYNDON  
BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, there have been men who think of themselves as God. Under no circumstances do I want you to think that I am referring to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin. I know that he does not think he is God.

Then there are other men like Genghis Khan and Adolph Hitler who thought they were Caesar and set out to conquer the world. I would not put the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in this category either.

But there is a man abroad in the land in high position who thinks he is Lyndon Baines Johnson, the President of the United States. He takes the authority that belongs under our Constitution to the President of the United States and delegates it to himself. The Constitution states explicitly that, "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America," and that, "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." The Constitution is again explicit on money power, for it states that "The Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof."

Mr. Martin and his Open Market Committee are determining the interest rates of the country, whether we have adequate credit to meet our needs, and whether our money supply should grow with the economy or fail to do so, as it has in the last 6 months.

Mr. Martin is not responsible to the people—he is responsible to the bankers who control the Federal Reserve System.

On the other hand, Lyndon Baines Johnson is responsible to the people of the country, who elected him. By our Constitution, he is duty bound to execute the laws of the land, and the Congress when it set up the Federal Reserve Board had no intention to delegate all of its authority to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Martin ignores this fact. He takes unto himself illegal authority and, as I said the other day, since his policies run counter to that of the President of the United States, who is responsible for the economic and fiscal policies of the

country—the very well-being of the country—I say to you again, Mr. Martin should do the decent thing and resign. He has no business playing President.

Mr. Martin and his policies run counter to the Employment Act of 1946. The President is responsible for implementing that act:

To coordinate and utilize all of the Government's plans, functions and resources \* \* \* to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

If you do what the President is attempting to do, you will have prosperity in the country. If you do what Mr. Martin, who thinks he is President, wants done, you will have economic and financial trouble throughout the land.

Again I say, we have no room in this country for a man who holds high office, other than the Presidency, to act as though he were President.

Mr. Martin is obviously not a team man. Again and again and again, I shall ask that he remove himself from high office.

#### A NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMISSION

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, nowhere on our earth are the challenges available to man more formidable than at the depths of the ocean. Yet nowhere on our earth is there less direction and more confusion than that which exists in our programs to meet those challenges. It is with the hope of securing an evaluation of our present position and recommendation of our future posture that I am submitting legislation to set up a National Commission on Oceanography.

This legislation does not set up any new agencies. Nor does it seek to create any super agency to coordinate the great proliferation of programs which are currently being carried out in this field. Rather it authorizes the President to appoint a Commission which will investigate the current status of U.S. efforts in the field of oceanography and recommend a future course of action with respect to our national needs and development programs. The need for coordination of efforts and interchange of information and discoveries has long been recognized by both the people involved in our programs and the people responsible for the administration of them. What this bill does is to provide a suitable means of securing a review without creating another new agency to add to the proliferation.

The Commission would be composed of five people from the field of industry; five from government and five from the universities and laboratories participating in oceanographic work. This will insure that a complete study of the problem is obtained and also insure that no one segment of the oceanographic com-

munity will dominate the Commission. The need for this Commission can be illustrated when we see that over \$44.7 million is being expended by the Federal Government in support of oceanographic research—yet this program is a splintered effort handled by the 18 departments and agencies.

It is problems such as the foregoing that must be answered if this country is going to keep ahead of the increased Russian efforts in the field of oceanography. They have even recently expanded their efforts in the Caribbean, using Cuba as a base for their operations.

The Commission which I have proposed has a job to do. When it finishes that job it will cease to exist. Its termination takes place 2 years after the enactment of the proposed legislation and 1 year from the date of passage it must submit an interim report to the President and Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the great plethora of proposals and suggested solutions which have been tendered to solve the problems of our oceanographic program are the best testimony for the need of this legislation. At this time the most important thing we need to know is where we currently stand—and where we should be going.

#### THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1940 the Russians overran Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and conducted a mass deportation to Siberia which caused the death of hundreds and thousands of people. Today, the Lithuanian communities the world over are commemorating the 25th anniversary of this sad event.

The tragic plight of the Baltic nations has long been a matter of deep concern to me. One of my first actions upon becoming a Member of Congress was to introduce a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 363, referring to the continuing enslavement of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. The case for passage of such a resolution is clear.

It was over 25 years ago that the Soviet Union began to build its empire in Eastern Europe by the forceful annexation of the Baltic States. In all of that time, the hopes of the peoples of these captive nations for freedom and independence have remained alive. The struggle to break the chains of Russian tyranny, thought often to be a silent struggle, goes on. Free people everywhere have looked on with admiration as they witnessed the unmistakable evidence that the will of these brave men and women remains unbroken.

We in the free world have a profound moral obligation to our brothers trapped behind the Iron Curtain. No free man

can fully enjoy the exercise of his liberties while his fellow men are still brutally deprived of the most fundamental human rights. We must keep the light of liberty shining so that they look to the West for inspiration will always know that they are not forgotten.

This responsibility lies particularly heavily on the United States. As the leader of the free world, we must point the way for our friends and allies. One obvious way in which we can meet our responsibilities in this field is to continue to stress the case for Baltic freedom in every available forum.

My resolution recommends to the President that the United States take this matter once more to the United Nations. We would seek a declaration of world opinion demanding that the Soviets withdraw all troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. In addition, the hundreds of thousands of Baltic exiles who still survive in Russian prisons and slave labor camps must be allowed to return to their homeland.

The final resolution of this question must include free elections through which the Baltic peoples may choose their own form of government.

Although we cannot expect the Communists to accede to these demands immediately, the repeated demonstration of our determination to defend this righteous cause will in the long run help to make Baltic liberty a reality.

#### STROUDSBURG, PA., HOLDS ITS SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION THIS WEEK

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to call attention to the sesquicentennial celebration in Stroudsburg, Pa., one of the many charming and historic boroughs and cities in my congressional district.

In actuality, the community of Stroudsburg is much older than its 150 official years; this is simply the anniversary of the borough's formal incorporation in 1815. Its history goes back to the last months of 1799 when its founder, Jacob Stroud, began encouraging workers with skills to settle on land he had purchased in the area which lies at the confluence of three of the most beautiful small streams in Pennsylvania—the Brodheads, the Pocono, and the Mc-Michaels Creeks.

Jacob Stroud's community grew and flourished on the slopes of the hills which rise gradually from the Delaware River. These are the world-famed Pocono Mountains and they have become one of America's most popular vacation lands.

Jacob Stroud was a gentleman of great determination. Although he began his life in the area which was to bear his name later as an apprentice to Nicolas

Depuy, the region's first white settler, and was forced to borrow the money he needed to make his initial purchase of land. Colonel Stroud left a substantial inheritance to his eleven surviving children when he died on July 14, 1806. In addition to 4,000 acres of land, he left a grist mill, a blacksmith shop, a number of large homes and, by way of diversification for the area's early economy, a distillery.

The Stroud family continued to play an important role in the evolution of the community. When Jacob's health failed, it was his lawyer son, Daniel, who returned home from nearby Easton, Pa., to take over guidance of the family and the town. It was Daniel's foresight that gave to the community the broad, tree-lined streets which now serve as its business center.

Although it is now a thriving, growing 20th century community, the Borough of Stroudsburg has retained much of the charm and character of its earliest times. Its people are friendly and hospitable. It is always an occasion of great joy for me to be able to visit Monroe County and Stroudsburg, for I know of no area outside my own native city of Bethlehem which tries more completely to make a visitor feel comfortable and "at home."

To celebrate this auspicious anniversary, the people of Stroudsburg have planned a magnificent calendar of events beginning with this past Sunday's "Religious Heritage" observation in its many wonderful churches. Last night, a series of sesquicentennial balls were held throughout the area and these were very well attended.

The ladies of the borough have become accomplished seamstresses overnight—those who were not before have demonstrated how brilliantly they can adapt themselves to the vicissitudes of sewing their own costumes. And I should add that they have given us all a far greater sense of the grace and charm of 19th century living with their attractive long dresses and sunbonnets.

There is a far greater assortment of beards, goatees, Van Dykes, mustaches, galways, and sideburns than is generally in evidence at celebrations of this sort—and that is due to the remarkable fact that most of the men in the entire county region have joined in the spirit of the festivities.

All in all, I think the sesquicentennial parade this coming Saturday evening, in which I will be privileged to participate, is going to be one of the largest and finest of its kind Pennsylvania has ever seen.

As the Representative of the 15th District of Pennsylvania, I point with excusable pride, today, to the extraordinary events which are now transpiring in Stroudsburg. I take this opportunity to invite those of my distinguished colleagues who would like to take a good, authoritative look back into the history of our Nation to visit the borough this coming weekend.

I know the people of Stroudsburg, as always, will welcome you and I am fully confident that you will have the time of your lives.

#### THE WORK AND RECORD OF JUDGE DEVANE

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, questions which have been asked in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House could be interpreted as a reflection on the character of a distinguished jurist, now deceased, of the State of Florida. During hearings on H.R. 7371, questions directed to Mr. Edward Ball of Jacksonville, a trustee for the Du Pont Estate, apparently were intended to infer a connection between a directed verdict favoring the Du Pont interests in a Federal case and the subsequent sale of property by Judge Dozier A. DeVane to the Du Ponts.

Judge DeVane, who served as U.S. district judge from 1943 until his retirement in 1958, was an outstanding and respected jurist. A longtime law partner of U.S. Senator Charles O. Andrews, he was highly regarded for his legal talent, and he served with distinction on the bench. He had a record of unquestioned integrity. He died on December 15, 1963.

I consider it most unfortunate and inappropriate to bring the name of Judge DeVane into the hearings. He could have sold his property to a hundred different persons. The price was in no sense unreasonable, but simply reflected the rapid increase in values for real property in the State of Florida. The fact that he continued to live on the property for a nominal sum as one of the considerations of the transaction is also inconsequential. It is normal procedure for major landholding companies when purchasing property to allow the property owner to continue to live in the home for a stated period or for the remainder of his life. This opens the door to purchases which could not otherwise be completed.

Throughout his lifetime, Judge DeVane's ability, his work, and his contributions to his community and State were very highly regarded. He was universally respected.

#### ARREST OF FREEDOM DEMOCRAT DEMONSTRATORS, IN JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. BURTON of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on June 14, yesterday, we again saw that American citizens were abused in their efforts to assert their constitutional

rights of freedom of assembly and expression.

Mr. Speaker, in Jackson, Miss., some 472 members and supporters of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, while engaged in an effort to peacefully protest the convening of the State legislature, were arrested, harassed, and beaten.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this action underscores the urgency for the passage at the earliest possible date of the strongest possible voting rights legislation. We must enact a comprehensive voting law which includes a ban on the poll tax and provides for the protection of the rights of those engaged in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

What happened yesterday was shameful. I urge the Attorney General to use to the fullest the powers at his disposal to apprehend and to prosecute those responsible for the criminal acts which occurred in Jackson, Miss., and to invoke the full authority of the Federal Government to make reoccurrence of these acts impossible.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS IN JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. HAWKINS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I received the following telegram from Mr. John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—which reads as follows:

ATLANTA, GA.,  
June 15, 1965.

Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Yesterday, June 14, in Jackson, Miss., 472 members and supporters of Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, attempting to peacefully protest convening of undemocratically elected State legislature, were arrested, taken to Jackson State Fairgrounds. There men made to run gantlet, beaten by city policemen and State highway patrolmen with badge numbers covered. At least five were hospitalized as result of police brutality. Request you express indignation at this violation of constitutional rights and urge that action be taken to prevent reoccurrence.

JOHN LEWIS,  
Chairman, SNCC Mississippi Freedom  
Democratic Office.

This type of brutality and violation of constitutional rights is repugnant to our American principles of justice and human dignity. This Congress must take all necessary steps to strengthen the Civil Rights Act, expand the antipoverty programs, full employment, and all other Federal laws to insure equal rights and protection of constitutional safeguards to all citizens.

I am also requesting the Attorney General to take new and more adequate steps in this situation which has obviously gone beyond the control of local law enforcement officials to the point where it appears they are actually involved in violating their oath of office.

#### MODEL WELFARE PROGRAM NEEDED FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KREBS. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers on June 10 reported that the Senate District Subcommittee has requested that a model welfare program for the District of Columbia be prepared.

Three distinguished Members of the Senate, Senators MORSE, ROBERT KENNEDY, and RIBICOFF, it seems to me, have earned the quiet gratitude of every American citizen with a conscience by their efforts on behalf of the children who are the blameless victims in the District of Columbia of both economic deprivation and political discrimination.

I am led to comment on this development, which reflects as much shame on the Nation, as it does credit on the Senators who are speaking for the voiceless children of the city, by my own reflection on an accidental discovery I have made.

In a conversation with a District official I learned this week that children in the District of Columbia, if they are over 1 year of age, are not entitled to relief, even though their parents are residents of the District unless they are themselves residents of the city. This means that a child who has not lived in the District for a year is not entitled to relief.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's distinguished brother, President John F. Kennedy, will be honored for many reasons, but many people especially cherish his memory because he introduced by his speeches and his example the word compassion into the national everyday vocabulary.

Neither the word nor the conception however seems to have penetrated to the District of Columbia Public Welfare authorities. Rules, whatever their justification, which encourage fathers to desert their families out of love for their children, which put a premium on deceit and misrepresentation, which pit professional investigators against families in need of food and shelter and clothing, which foster midnight raids on the poor, and which single out children who are not old enough to walk or to talk, to declare them officially ineligible for relief, these rules are bureaucratic madness, they are a form of legalistic brutality that has no place in the world, certainly not in the United States, and please God, most assuredly not in the Capital of the country.

I wish to express my personal appreciation to Senators MORSE, KENNEDY, and RIBICOFF for the truly noble work they are performing in a compassionate cause.

I would hope that in whatever welfare code they finally devise they will find a way to make compassion a tempering principle in the administration of welfare in the District of Columbia.

#### BRUCE JOLLY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL PRESS CORPS LEAVES HIS DUTIES AFTER 15 YEARS "ON THE HILL"

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, today a respected member of the congressional press corps is leaving his duties here after 15 years on the Hill.

I wish to pay tribute to Bruce Jolly, who for the past decade and a half has served as Washington correspondent for the Greensboro Daily News, my hometown morning newspaper. He is resigning this post, as of today. After a vacation, which he so richly deserves, he will join one of our major Southern firms in a public relations capacity.

This veteran newsman has been a familiar and welcome sight here in the Capitol and a genuine friend, especially to the members of the North Carolina delegation. He has covered every national political convention since 1952, with the exception of one. His duties have taken him on the campaign trail with most presidential candidates since then. His stories have taken him from the South Pole to the Arctic, to London, and to several points on the continent of Europe. He has chased hurricanes in Bermuda and has reported from the scene on Communist Cuba.

During his Washington tenure, Mr. Jolly reported accurately and fairly, two of the essential qualities of a good newspaperman. Those of us in Congress who know him will miss him. But, all of us will value a friendship which we hope will continue.

#### JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. CONYERS. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram this morning from Jackson, Miss., pointing out, I think, information that is generally well known to all of us by now. It has come in over the ticker tape, radio, and newspapers. It is about the unwarranted abuse by police action in Jackson, Miss., in arresting 472 citizens who were peacefully picketing in pursuance of their constitutional rights.

Not only were they arrested, but they were taken to the Jackson State Fair Grounds and made to run gantlets, were beaten by city policemen and State highway patrolmen with badges covered. Five of these people were hospitalized.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these are actions that no longer can we ignore, or read about and regret ruefully as the information comes to us. It seems we

are called upon individually and collectively as legislators to require the Attorney General to investigate these allegations. We must make certain that in Jackson, Miss., and anywhere else in the South, and in the North as well, will the situation be permitted to take place where law officers and law enforcement agencies will be leading in the violation of the law, but will be protecting all citizens in their constitutional rights.

#### JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the events of yesterday in Jackson should remove any lingering doubt any of us may have about the need, not only for a voting rights bill, but immediate Federal protection of citizens in the South who are exercising their constitutional rights to peaceably demonstrate.

I read the scanty news report this morning about people being taken to the hospital with head wounds. I have just been informed that the police made the participants in that peaceful demonstration run the gantlet, and that many blows were struck by officers who had covered their badge numbers. It makes no difference what the purpose of the demonstration was. We cannot tolerate deliberate police brutality in this country, and we cannot tolerate interference with the right to peacefully demonstrate.

#### NEW YORK VOTES FOR A STATE LOTTERY TO HELP PAY FOR EDUCATION

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, I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the members of the New York State Senate for having the courage and the wisdom to vote last night for a State lottery to help pay for the education of our children. By a vote of 34 to 19 the New York State Senate took a big step toward adopting a lucrative source of income which is and has been the monopoly of the underworld crime syndicates.

I hope this Congress will show similar courage and wisdom by supporting and voting for a national lottery which could easily and painlessly pump \$10 billion a year into our depleted U.S. Treasury.

#### THE UNITED STATES—SOURCE OF NASSER'S MILITARY POWER

Mr. PELLY. 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. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, our 3-year foreign-aid agreement with Egypt expires June 30, 1965. It should not be renewed. It has been a device under which Nasser has been able to sell rice and other food products produced by Egypt and to replace this food supply needed by the people of Egypt from the United States. Under this plan he disposed of most of this food to certain Communist countries and in return has been able to obtain military equipment to carry on his imperialistic activities in Africa and to build up his potential threat against Israel. He has been selling, among others, to Red China, Cuba, Indonesia, and the Soviet Union. We have been making this possible.

Why we should have entered into an agreement with Nasser on this basis is beyond me. In general, this points up the issue that has been debated and discussed over and over again in the House; namely, that Congress should spell out its wishes regarding foreign aid and not abrogate its authority, under the Constitution, to legislate as we believe in the public interest. Of course, often we hear Members in this House caution against trespassing on the prerogatives of the President; yet I have heard no one stand up and point to any place in the Constitution where foreign aid is solely under the jurisdiction of the executive branch. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution calls for administration of foreign policy by the President. But, as to the policy itself, I think it is clearly the responsibility of the legislative branch to establish programs and set forth laws as to how and where our money will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, to return to the point at issue, it may have shocked some people to learn from recent Cairo dispatches that Egypt has violated its agreement with the United States, but it shocked me more to think our Government was insipid enough to enter into the original agreement in the hope Egypt would live up to its part of the bargain. Meanwhile, our Government must have known Nasser has been cheating. Even worse is the naivete of our State Department. For example, we have been in the position of replacing rice sold to Cuba. Isn't this just like selling it to her directly? Under the agreement we have simply provided that Egypt was restricted in the amount of rice it could sell abroad, based on Egypt's total rice crop. In effect, we have been feeding Cuba and other Communist countries.

It seems to me that from now on Congress should investigate and stipulate the terms under which any shipments of grain could be made. Congress should spell this out. The Constitution says Congress has sole authority to regulate foreign commerce. Why should we delegate that power? In this connection, I am hopeful that when the foreign aid appropriation bill is considered by the

House, a limitation can be added stipulating that funds cannot be used to administer any aid to Nasser. That would stop this foolishness. I am in favor of cutting out all aid to Nasser. As it is we have been indirectly the source of Egypt's military buildup and in no way, shape, or form have we contributed to the overall food supply of her people.

#### A SAD ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HORTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 25th anniversary of the illegal seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In so doing, we voice our fervent dedication to the ultimate freedom of these three countries and all captive nations.

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with the Nazi Germany of Adolf Hitler, the Red army poured into the Baltic nations and unmercifully attacked the peace-loving Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Thus ended nearly two decades of democratic governments which had brought them to full partnership in the family of nations.

Under Communist occupation and aggression these peoples have lost all freedom. All three countries were annexed to the Soviet Union. Soviet agents deliberately enslaved the Baltic people. Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these have been the marks of Soviet treachery and tyranny in the Baltic States.

This past weekend I spoke at a meeting of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian groups in my congressional district. At that meeting, I stated:

The enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which began with the most vicious and atrocious crimes against humanity, must never be forgotten in our dealings with the Communist camp. It is my firm belief that no meaningful accommodation with the Reds ever will be possible—or desirable—unless and until the Kremlin yields to the free world's petition that self-determination be restored to the Baltic States and other nations in Communist captivity.

Mr. Speaker, at this meeting, which it was my honor to address, the sponsoring organization, Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, Rochester, N.Y., chapter, adopted a resolution pledging their continuing commitment to freedom for the Baltic States. I am so impressed by the vibrance and vitality of this declaration that I take pleasure in making it a part of the RECORD of this great legislative body:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICANS OF BALTIC ORIGIN LIVING IN ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Unanimously adopted by Americans of Baltic origin living in Rochester, N.Y., at a

mass meeting to commemorate the 25th sad anniversary of Soviet occupation of Baltic States, held on June 13, 1965, at St. George's Hall, 555 Hudson Avenue, sponsored by Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States:

Whereas the liberty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in June 1940, notwithstanding solemn treaties and agreements of nonaggression; and

Whereas the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had enjoyed for many centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over 20 percent of the Baltic population since June 1940; and

Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we Americans of Baltic origin or descent reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the U.S. Congress to pass 1 of some 74 Senate or House Concurrent Resolutions, pending now before the Senate and House committees, requesting the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and to ask that the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw from the Baltic States, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberian prisons and slave-labor camps and to conduct free elections in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania under the United Nations supervision.

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC STATES, ROCHESTER, N.Y., CHAPTER,  
JOSEPH YURKUS, Chairman.  
ALFRED NIEDOLS, Cochairman.  
ABEL PINTSON, Cochairman.

I have sponsored and supported a resolution in Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 290, calling for official condemnation, through the United Nations, of the Soviet enslavement of the Baltic. I request that the United States go on record now in firm support of the principles of human rights which are now being denied to the peoples of the Baltic Nations. The search for world peace will never be ended until the American principle of self-determination is recognized by all nations, and the Baltic Nations are finally freed and their oppressors duly punished.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO EXTEND BENEFITS TO VETERANS SERVING IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ADAIR. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as well as other Members of the House of Representatives have been receiving

an increasing amount of mail suggesting that servicemen who are exposed to the combat conditions currently existing in South Vietnam be entitled to the same benefits that were granted to World War II and Korean veterans. An analysis of the veteran's benefit program reveals that the survivors of men who were killed as a result of the action in Vietnam are already entitled to the same benefits as were the survivors of World War II and the Korean conflict servicemen who were killed in that action. One possible exception, of course, is the National Service Life Insurance that was afforded to World War II servicemen and the serviceman's indemnity that was furnished Korean conflict veterans. At the time these two programs terminated, however, a new system of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors was established. The monthly payments created under this program were sufficient to replace the insurance or indemnity benefit which had been available.

Veterans who are injured or disabled as the result of action in Vietnam are similarly compensated in the same manner and to the same degree as were veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. Vocational rehabilitation and hospitalization for the treatment of service-connected disability is also available to this group. The following broad range of benefits available to veterans who serve in South Vietnam was prepared by the Veterans' Affairs Committee:

#### COMPENSATION

Service in South Vietnam is considered as extrahazardous service under conditions simulating war. For this reason a veteran suffering a service-connected disability while serving in South Vietnam is entitled to compensation at wartime rates ranging from \$20 per month for 10-percent disability to \$250 for total disability; and from \$340 to \$725 for more severely disabled.

Dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to the qualified survivors of servicemen now serving, where death resulted from a service-connected disease or injury. The formula is \$120 per month plus 12 percent of the base pay of the person who served—payable to widows; other amounts payable to children and dependent parents.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

All individuals serving after January 1, 1957, are covered on contributory basis. Examples of possible benefits under this program follow:

A man in pay grade E-3 (private, first class) with more than 2 years and less than 5 years' service, dies. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$128 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$113. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$62 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

A man in pay grade E-5 (sergeant or petty officer), with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for 8 years. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment

of \$202 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$143. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$78 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

A man in pay grade O-3 (captain), with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for 8 years. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$254 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$191. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$105 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

Disability payments are made to a veteran with sufficient coverage when total disability is found by social security standards and this benefit would be in addition to Veterans' Administration compensation.

#### HOSPITALIZATION

Medical care and treatment, inpatient and outpatient, for any service-connected disability. Inpatient medical care if discharged for a service-connected disability or entitled to compensation.

#### EDUCATION

A veteran of current service is entitled to vocational rehabilitation training if he has a compensable service-connected disability of 30 percent or more, or if less, can show clearly that he has a pronounced employment handicap resulting from a service-connected disability, and the Veterans' Administration determines a need for vocational rehabilitation.

War orphans' education assistance is payable (\$110 per month for full-time courses for 3 calendar years between ages 18 and 23) to a qualified beneficiary of a veteran whose death or total disability of a permanent nature is service incurred while serving in South Vietnam, based on the same criteria as is applied to a veteran of wartime service.

#### HOUSING

Assistance in the purchase of specially adapted housing through a grant of up to \$10,000 is available where the veteran has a service-connected disability entitling him to compensation for permanent and total disability due to loss or loss of use of both lower extremities or blindness plus loss or loss of use of one lower extremity.

#### SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

While serving and for 2 years thereafter, the premiums and interest on eligible commercial life insurance policies not exceeding \$10,000 on the life of the serviceman may be guaranteed by the Government under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. This same act provides protection in meeting financial obligations.

#### REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

This right is identical in coverage and purpose to that provided World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

#### INSURANCE

Available to veterans with service-connected disabilities. Application must be made within 1 year from date of determination of service connection.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Covered by a program similar to that provided for Federal civilian employees.

#### SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

This benefit ranges from a minimum of \$800 to a maximum of \$3,000 based on rank

and is payable to widow, children, parents, brothers, or sisters.

#### BURIAL BENEFITS

Reimbursement for burial expenses is provided for in the case of any veteran of current service if he was in receipt of service-connected compensation at the time of his death or was discharged or retired for disability incurred in line of duty and the next of kin is entitled to a burial flag if the deceased veteran had served one enlistment or was discharged for a service-incurred disability. Any veteran whose last period of service terminated honorably is entitled to burial in a national cemetery and a headstone or grave marker.

It will be noted that educational benefits, home loan guarantees, and hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities are not available to these veterans. It is my understanding that the omnibus housing bill now pending before this body contains provisions authorizing a liberal preference in housing under the Federal Housing Administration program. I am today introducing legislation that will authorize educational assistance on the same basis as that provided for World War II and Korean conflict veterans to any veteran who served for 10 or more days in Vietnam. Members will recall that the President recently designated Vietnam and certain waters adjacent thereto as combat areas for the purpose of income tax relief for persons serving therein. My bill establishes the same geographical boundaries and the same time limitations as the President's Executive order for entitlement. In summary, the bill will provide 1½ days of education for each day of military service performed between January 1, 1964, and the date Vietnam is no longer designated as a combat area to any veteran who served at least 10 days in Vietnam during this period. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

#### WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

Mr. NELSEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Diary column in the Washington Post disclosed June 8 that the Civil Service Commission's top-grade employees and officials have received invitations to the \$100-a-plate Democratic congressional dinner here in Washington on June 24.

The column comments:

Historically, employees and officials of the CSC have been bypassed by fundraisers of both major political parties. But it's different now.

The column further advises that these invitations were sent to their homes, and while no violations were involved "CSC people cannot help wondering who supplied the Democratic fundraisers with their names and addresses."

Previous Washington newspaper accounts over the last several weeks have divulged that political appointees in Federal jobs have been asked to illegally approach U.S. Government employees to buy tickets to this Democratic function.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than a little irony in all this. I have been badgering the Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department for months to act on cases involving illegal political shakedowns for campaign funds. The CSC has not acted, even though its investigation has been completed for 9 months. Now even its own employees are reaping the whirlwind.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has read over the last several years of the increasingly brazen efforts of politicians holding Federal jobs to bring their civil service subordinates to political heel cannot escape the feeling that the entire Federal workforce is tragically threatened. We have a fine and decent group of citizens presently in the public service. They have been free to carry out their responsibilities fairly and judiciously because they have been protected by Federal law from any political pressure from any political quarter.

Are we preparing now to turn these millions of dedicated public servants over to the evils of the spoils system? Are we going to sit back and watch while all the careful protections constructed in their behalf are ruthlessly destroyed by men seeking cold political power? Is there anyone so foolish as to think that political manipulation of the entire Federal work force will result in better government? In fairer, nonpartisan, and less costly administration?

Mr. Speaker, as a former Rural Electrification Administrator, I personally received complaints from Federal workers in the REA who were under pressure from politicians holding Federal jobs. These workers were asked to contribute parts of their salaries to expensive political dinner parties and other political fundraising functions. Provisions of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act clearly forbid this form of coercion, of course, and the penalties can entail fines and jail sentences.

Ever since these complaints were brought to me, I have sought justice for those subjected to these insidious shake-down attempts. I have been well aware how difficult it is to secure justice because too often civil service employees subjected to such intimidation fear speaking out, fear bringing charges. They fear jeopardizing their family's income through loss of jobs and they are reluctant to part with long-accumulated benefits. And so, with documentation finally at the Government's disposal, it is almost impossible to believe that no corrective action has yet been taken on these REA cases.

We can see now that failure to act is leading toward.

The time has come to ask this question: Are we going to have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or are we going to have

government of the politician, by the politician, and for the politician?

The choice may well be at hand.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT**

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the course of my subcommittee hearings on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act questions have been directed at the Department of Labor for written responses. Because I want to be absolutely fair to everyone interested in this major legislation, I promised that I would make public the responses of the Department insofar as this is possible. Some of the responses are so lengthy that they cannot be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but where this is the case, I shall cite the document which will be available to Members from the Department of Labor.

We have received several responses to date and I request permission to have them placed in the RECORD at this point. The responses include answers to questions raised with respect to the following seven points:

- First. Minimum wage in agriculture.
- Second. The impact of increasing the present \$1.25 minimum wage.
- Third. Effect of minimum wage on foreign competition.
- Fourth. Comparative costs of overtime pay and new hires.
- Fifth. The extent to which the proposed legislation would be affected by raising the \$250,000 enterprise test to \$500,000.

Sixth. The authority of the executive branch to require Government contractors to pay minimum wages in the absence of a statute.

Seventh. The effects of the first phase of the 1961 amendments on retail trade.

The first response was to the question regarding the impact of a minimum wage in agriculture. In addition to the following tables, the Department submitted data pertinent to determining the scope and level of a minimum wage for hired farmworkers, entitled "Hired Farmworkers," dated January 1964, published by the U.S. Department of Labor.

**1. MINIMUM WAGE IN AGRICULTURE**

The most complete data relating to wages of hired farmworkers are for May 1963. In view of the relatively small change in farm wage rates since then, it is believed that the estimates based on these data are substantially the same today.

Tables 1 and 2 show the proportions of hired farmworkers in the United States and the South earning less than specified hourly wage rates and the increase in the hourly wage bill of employees which would result from raising the wages of workers earning less than the specified rates to those levels. Data are shown separately for all farms and for farms which use 300 or more man-days of hired farm labor in a peak quarter.

We are sending you a copy of the report on "Hired Farmworkers" prepared for the Congress in January 1964 in accordance with the requirements of section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

**TABLE 1.—Hired farmworkers—Number of hired farmworkers earning less than specified wage rates, and increases in wage bill required to raise workers earning less than specified wage rates to those rates, United States, May 1963**

Wage rate (cents per hour)	Workers earning less than specified rate		Percent increase in wage bill
	Number	Percent	
<b>All farms:</b>			
50	404,000	22	4
55	546,000	30	5
60	605,000	33	7
65	716,000	40	9
70	765,000	42	12
75	814,000	45	14
80	887,000	49	17
85	932,000	52	19
90	969,000	54	22
95	991,000	55	26
100	1,020,000	56	29
105	1,217,000	67	32
110	1,302,000	72	36
115	1,343,000	74	40
120	1,387,000	77	45
125	1,429,000	79	49
Total number of workers		1,807,000	
<b>Farms using 300 or more man-days in a peak quarter:</b>			
50	176,000	23	4
55	215,000	28	5
60	237,000	31	7
65	258,000	34	8
70	279,000	37	10
75	294,000	39	12
80	311,000	41	14
85	318,000	42	16
90	334,000	44	19
95	339,000	45	21
100	354,000	47	23
105	396,000	52	26
110	467,000	62	29
115	490,000	65	32
120	516,000	68	36
125	539,000	71	39
Total number of workers		758,000	

Source: Special tabulations of the 1963 enumerative survey, U.S. Department of Agriculture, prepared for the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the Department of Labor.

**TABLE 2.—Hired farmworkers—Number of hired farmworkers earning less than specified wage rates, and increases in wage bill required to raise workers earning less than specified wage rates to those rates, South, May 1963**

Wage rate (cents per hour)	Workers earning less than specified rate		Percent increase in wage bill
	Number	Percent	
<b>All farms:</b>			
50	340,000	37	8
55	469,000	51	12
60	506,000	55	16
65	592,000	64	21
70	625,000	68	25
75	655,000	71	32
80	704,000	76	37
85	728,000	79	43
90	748,000	81	50
95	754,000	82	56
100	765,000	83	62
105	820,000	89	69
110	829,000	90	76
115	840,000	91	83
120	847,000	92	90
125	856,000	93	98
Total number of workers		922,000	

**TABLE 2.—Hired farmworkers—Number of hired farmworkers earning less than specified wage rates, and increases in wage bill required to raise workers earning less than specified wage rates to those rates, South, May 1963—Continued**

Wage rate (cents per hour)	Workers earning less than specified rate		Percent increase in wage bill
	Number	Percent	
Farms using 300 or more man-days in a peak quarter:			
50	156,000	42	10
55	195,000	52	14
60	207,000	55	18
65	227,000	61	23
70	245,000	66	28
75	258,000	69	33
80	272,000	73	38
85	277,000	74	44
90	288,000	77	50
95	291,000	78	56
100	298,000	80	62
105	313,000	84	68
110	321,000	86	75
115	330,000	88	81
120	335,000	90	88
125	337,000	90	95
Total number of workers	373,000		

Source: Special tabulations of the 1963 enumerative survey, U.S. Department of Agriculture, prepared for the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the Department of Labor.

The second response was in reply to a question relative to the impact of increasing the present \$1.25 minimum wage. The subcommittee requested information to show the effect of raising the minimum wage up to \$2 per hour. The response breaks this down into 5-cent and 10-cent intervals.

**2. THE IMPACT OF INCREASING THE PRESENT \$1.25 MINIMUM WAGE**

Attached are four tables showing by 5- and 10-cent intervals the proportion of employees who would be required to receive wage increases if the minimum wage were increased. Data are also shown for the increase in the annual wage bill which would result from raising wages of workers earning less than the proposed rates to those rates.

The data are shown separately for coverage prior to 1961, coverage resulting from the 1961 amendments and for coverage under the present proposal.

**INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE**

**TABLE 1.—Employees covered prior to the 1961 amendments**

[Estimated number and percent distribution of employees earning less than specified hourly wage rates and increases in annual wage bills required to raise employees earning less than these amounts to those amounts, 1965]

Proposed minimum wage rate	Employees earning less than specified amounts		Increase in annual wage bill	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Under \$1.30	1,885,000	7.6	\$109	0.1
Under \$1.35	2,311,000	9.3	388	.3
Under \$1.40	2,760,000	11.1	640	.5
Under \$1.45	3,195,000	12.8	942	.8
Under \$1.50	3,533,000	14.2	1,282	1.1
Under \$1.60	4,435,000	17.8	2,098	1.8
Under \$1.70	5,177,000	20.8	3,072	2.6
Under \$1.75	5,572,000	22.4	3,614	3.0
Under \$1.80	6,001,000	24.1	4,197	3.5
Under \$1.90	6,896,000	27.7	5,491	4.6
Under \$2	7,664,000	30.8	6,955	5.8
Total	24,872,000	100.0	119,256	100.0

**TABLE 2.—Employees covered by the 1961 amendments**

[Estimated number and percent distribution of employees earning less than specified hourly wage rates and increases in annual wage bills required to raise employees earning less than these amounts to those amounts]

Proposed minimum wage rate	Employees earning less than specified amounts		Increase in annual wage bill	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Under \$1.30	773,000	21	\$70.8	0.5
Under \$1.35	870,000	24	153.9	1.0
Under \$1.40	1,030,000	28	250.6	1.6
Under \$1.45	1,153,000	31	360.9	2.4
Under \$1.50	1,276,000	35	483.7	3.2
Under \$1.60	1,520,000	41	763.3	5.0
Under \$1.70	1,728,000	47	1,088.1	7.1
Under \$1.80	1,900,000	52	1,450.9	9.5
Under \$1.90	2,046,000	56	1,845.5	12.1
Under \$2	2,182,000	60	2,208.3	14.9
Total	3,666,000	100	15,218.6	100.0

NOTE.—Estimates are projections for the end of 1965. Employees covered by the 1961 amendments are not required to be paid at least \$1.25 an hour until Sept. 3, 1965.

**TABLE 3.—Employees covered by the proposed 1965 amendments (H.R. 8259, May 18, 1965)**

[Estimated number and percent distribution of employees earning less than specified hourly wage rates and increases in annual wage bills required to raise employees earning less than these amounts to those amounts, 1965 (cash wages only)]

Proposed minimum wage rate	Employees earning less than specified amounts		Increase in annual wage bill	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Under \$1.30	1,761,000	39	\$996	6.4
Under \$1.35	1,923,000	42	1,175	7.5
Under \$1.40	2,055,000	45	1,365	8.7
Under \$1.45	2,175,000	48	1,576	10.1
Under \$1.50	2,351,000	52	1,796	11.5
Under \$1.60	2,554,000	56	2,275	14.5
Under \$1.70	2,778,000	61	2,794	17.8
Under \$1.80	2,970,000	65	3,353	21.4
Under \$1.90	3,119,000	68	3,951	25.2
Under \$2	3,279,000	72	4,562	29.2
Total	4,561,000	100	15,659	100.0

**TABLE 4.—Employees covered by the proposed 1965 amendments (H.R. 8259, May 18, 1965)**

[Estimated number and percent distribution of employees earning less than specified hourly wage rates and increases in annual wage bills required to raise employees earnings less than these amounts to those amounts, 1965 (with an allowance for tips)]

Proposed minimum wage rate	Employees earning less than specified amounts		Increase in annual wage bill	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Under \$1.30	1,591,000	35	\$876	5.5
Under \$1.35	1,765,000	39	1,043	6.6
Under \$1.40	1,927,000	42	1,215	7.7
Under \$1.45	2,079,000	46	1,331	8.4
Under \$1.50	2,241,000	49	1,623	10.3
Under \$1.60	2,450,000	54	2,081	13.1
Under \$1.70	2,691,000	59	2,582	16.3
Under \$1.85	2,851,000	63	3,127	19.7
Under \$1.90	3,065,000	68	3,709	23.4
Under \$2	3,215,000	70	4,319	27.3
Total	4,561,000	100	15,833	100

The third response was to the effect of the minimum wage on foreign competition. Supplementary to this response the Department submitted a study of "Foreign Competition in the Jewelry and Silverware Industry in the United

States," dated February 1965, and published by the Department of Labor. As is mentioned in the response, this is a question which was considered in 1961. The Congress then amended the Fair Labor Standards Act to include a new section 4(e) which gives the Secretary of Labor authority to investigate into problems relating to minimum wage and foreign competition.

**3. EFFECT OF MINIMUM WAGE ON FOREIGN COMPETITION**

A question on the effects of a minimum wage on foreign competition was raised at the congressional hearings on the 1961 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. In response to this question, section 4(e) was incorporated into the act. Thus, there is now machinery in the act to take care of the problems which were raised.

Section 4(e) provides that "whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that in any industry under this act the competition of foreign producers in the U.S. markets or in markets abroad, or both, has resulted, or is likely to result, in increased unemployment in the United States, he shall undertake an investigation to gain full information with respect to the matter."

The only complaint which the Secretary has received involving an industry under this Act came from the jewelry and silverware industry. Investigation by the Department showed that increased unemployment did not result from the competition of foreign producers in the U.S. markets or markets abroad. Enclosed is a copy of the report which was submitted to the Congress on February 18, 1964.

The fourth response shows the comparative costs of overtime pay and new hires. These are the facts upon which the calculation is made that an increase in the penalty overtime requirements to double time will create approximately 300,000 new jobs by deterring most of the presently scheduled overtime work.

**4. COMPARATIVE COSTS OF OVERTIME PAY AND NEW HIRES**

Attached are copies of pages 13 to 17 and of table 6 of the testimony presented by the Secretary of Labor before the General and Select Subcommittees on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 9802 on February 17, 1964.

**Comparative costs of overtime pay and new hires**

In recommending a bill to curtail excessive overtime work by increasing the overtime premium, no claim is made that this alone will solve the unemployment problem. There are many complexities in the overtime rate issue, and a reduction in overtime hours cannot be translated into an equivalent reduction in the number of unemployed workers. It is obvious that not all overtime work can be eliminated. Overtime may have to be scheduled in emergencies. In temporary rush work the plant may not have enough machinery and equipment for the employment of additional workers, or space to locate new machinery, or sufficient supervisory personnel. I am aware that some employers may balance the relative costs of scheduling overtime against the costs of training and of making new employees eligible for social insurance, supplemental unemployment benefits, pensions, vacations, and other fringe benefits.

Unless the employer assumes that the increased demand for his product will last over an extended period of time, he will be reluctant to add workers. Training and hiring costs are high if they are spread over a rela-

tively few weeks of employment. If the employer has to lay off these workers after a short time, he runs the risk of increasing his unemployment insurance tax rate under experience ratings. In most companies with supplemental unemployment benefits the employers contribute to the supplementary unemployment benefits fund only when it is depleted below certain predetermined levels. The fewer workers laid off, the less chance there is that additional contributions to the fund will be needed. The deterrent effect of increased unemployment insurance tax rates and resumption of supplementary unemployment benefits contributions may be substantial since, if these costs increase, the increase applies to hours worked by all employees—not merely the hours worked to produce the increased output. If the employer hires or rehires workers, he must pay for vacations, holidays, and insurance for the new employees, whereas if his existing labor force works overtime, his costs for these supplementary benefits remain practically unchanged.

In view of these considerations, a substantial financial deterrent is needed to discourage overtime and encourage employers to hire workers. Such a deterrent was provided by the time and a half penalty rate under the Fair Labor Standards Act when it was enacted. However, the growth of supplementary benefit costs has substantially reduced the incentive, since the time and one-half rate is generally computed on hourly earnings, not on fringe benefit costs.

When the time and a half provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938, blue collar workers received relatively few supplementary benefits. Few blue collar workers were entitled to paid vacations, pensions, insurance, or even paid holidays. The social security system was in existence but social security taxes were lower and few States varied their unemployment insurance

taxes with the experience of the individual employer.

Since that time, social security taxes have increased substantially. Paid vacations are now the rule, and a survey made in 1960 of workers covered by collective bargaining agreements disclosed that 60 percent were covered by pensions to which their employers contributed and 78 percent by insurance. Employer contributions to pension and deferred profit-sharing plans have increased from about \$830 million in 1945 to \$4.7 billion in 1962.

It is evident that when the time and a half provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, employer expenditures on social security and supplementary benefits amounted to about 5 percent of the hourly wage rates. Today, while expenditures on supplementary benefits vary from company to company and industry to industry and tend to be greater in large than in small companies, they probably average about 20 percent. This increase in benefit expenditures has cut by 40 to 50 percent the effectiveness of the time and a half premium rate. If in the future expenditures on supplementary benefits continue to grow at the current rate, the deterrent effect of the present time and a half overtime rate will continue to shrink.

We have prepared a special tabulation comparing the hourly cost of rehiring workers with the cost of paying premium overtime at time and one-half or double time to employees already on the payroll (table 6).

The calculations on this table apply to employees who have previously been laid off but subsequently reemployed. If it were assumed that new workers were hired, the costs of fringe benefits would be somewhat lower since the costs of such items as vacations would be reduced, but except for unskilled workers these would probably be offset by costs of training and hiring.

To illustrate our approach, I refer to the figures for the automobile firm shown in table 6. It has been assumed that the rehired workers in this industry receive an average of \$2.97 an hour in straighttime hourly earnings, but to this must be added the cost of supplementary benefits. If it is assumed that the subsequent layoff of these workers results in a substantial increase in the unemployment insurance tax rate paid by the employer as well as resumption of contributions for supplemental unemployment benefits, this can raise the ultimate cost of rehiring these workers to \$4.71 an hour. This compares with an estimate of \$4.51 for premium overtime at time and one-half and with \$5.99 with premium overtime at double time. Even if the person hired were a new hire and not a reemployed worker, in the least favorable situation the cost would still be less than \$5.99 an hour. It would be about \$5.13 if training costs were as much as \$1,000 per employee.

I should like to caution that the tabulation is included only for illustrative purposes. The calculations in the table are based on the best information available, but an individual company using detailed cost records might well calculate its costs somewhat differently. Drastic shifts in unemployment insurance tax ratings occur only slowly, although the possibility of increasing unemployment insurance tax costs by layoffs and of reducing them by stable employment records are clearly considered by employers in decisions whether to hire or not.

The tabulation does, however, serve to illustrate the fact that the difference between the cost of hiring or rehiring workers and the cost of paying time and a half for overtime is much smaller than would appear from simple comparisons of hourly earnings and the overtime rate.

TABLE 6.—Estimated hourly costs of overtime versus rehiring workers in selected situations (assumes 20,000 hours in addition to regular production, either by rehiring 20 employees for 1,000 hours each or by having regular work force of 100 each working 200 hours of overtime)

Item	Situations				
	Motor vehicles (Michigan)	Farm equipment (Illinois)	Basic steel (Pennsylvania)	Electrical equipment (Pennsylvania)	Cotton textiles (Massachusetts)
1. Straight-time average hourly earnings.....	\$2.97	\$2.67	\$3.21	\$2.38	\$1.60
2. Cost if overtime is worked—					
At time and one-half and—					
SUB contributions are made.....	4.51	4.05	4.91	( <sup>1</sup> ) 3.57	( <sup>1</sup> ) 2.40
SUB contributions are not made.....	4.46	4.00	4.82		
At double time, and—					
SUB contributions are made.....	5.99	5.39	6.52	( <sup>1</sup> ) 4.76	( <sup>1</sup> ) 3.02
SUB contributions are not made.....	5.94	5.34	6.42		
3. Cost if workers are hired: <sup>2</sup>					
A. Assuming SUB contributions and unemployment insurance taxes are not affected by hiring and laying off and assuming company has—					
(1) Most favorable experience rating—					
Assuming SUB contributions continue whether or not workers are laid off.....	3.78	3.35	4.49	( <sup>1</sup> ) 2.99	( <sup>1</sup> ) 1.83
Assuming no SUB contributions are made whether or not workers are laid off.....	3.73	3.30	<sup>3</sup> 4.49		
(2) Middle experience rating—					
Assuming SUB contributions continue whether or not workers are laid off.....	3.83	3.40	4.51	( <sup>1</sup> ) 3.01	( <sup>1</sup> ) 1.85
Assuming no SUB contributions are made whether or not workers are laid off.....	3.78	3.35	<sup>3</sup> 4.51		
(3) Worst experience rating—					
Assuming SUB contributions continue whether or not workers are laid off.....	3.89	3.45	4.53	( <sup>1</sup> ) 3.03	( <sup>1</sup> ) 1.87
Assuming no SUB contributions continue whether or not workers are laid off.....	3.84	3.40	<sup>3</sup> 4.53		
B. Assuming that layoff of workers hired for marginal hours results in resumption of suspended SUB contributions for workers remaining on payroll after marginal workers are laid off <sup>4</sup> and—					
No change in employer's experience rating for unemployment insurance <sup>5</sup> .....	3.99	3.56	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Shifting unemployment insurance rating from—					
Middle to least favorable.....	4.40	3.91	4.62	3.13	2.05
Most favorable to least favorable.....	4.71	4.15	4.71	3.22	2.23

<sup>1</sup> No SUB plan.

<sup>2</sup> Assumes workers who are hired have 3 to 5 years' seniority but were previously laid off long enough so that company has ceased to pay for their insurance and other benefits and that they are subsequently laid off for an indefinite period. Unemployment insurance rates assume funds are in poor condition.

<sup>3</sup> Steel bargaining agreements do not provide for suspending SUB payments.

<sup>4</sup> Assumes that SUB costs are resumed for 6 months for all workers remaining on payroll after marginal workers are laid off.

<sup>5</sup> Assuming most favorable experience rating.

Source: Based on data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The fifth response shows the extent to which the proposed legislation would be affected by raising the \$250,000 enterprise test to \$500,000. This answer will give the subcommittee information on the impact of reducing the annual dollar volume test for coverage from \$1 million down to \$500,000.

5. THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION WOULD BE AFFECTED BY RAISING THE \$250,000 ENTERPRISE TEST TO \$500,000

The attached table indicates that a \$500,000 enterprise test would extend coverage to about 3.3 million employees as compared with 4.6 million under H.R. 8259.

*Estimated number of nonsupervisory employees who would be brought under the minimum wage provisions of the FLSA by using a \$500,000 enterprise sales size test for section 3(s) and by eliminating certain exemptions*

Industry	Employees added to minimum wage coverage by the proposed extension, total number
All industries.....	3,268,000
Retail trade.....	1,155,000
Food services.....	80,000
Auto and farm equipment dealers.....	475,000
All other retail trade.....	600,000
Hotels.....	240,000
Restaurants.....	300,000
Laundries.....	150,000
Hospitals and nursing homes.....	775,000
Motion picture theatres.....	55,000
Local transit.....	7,000
Construction.....	300,000
All other industries 3(s).....	90,000
Agricultural processing within area of production.....	34,000
Cotton ginning.....	87,000
Small logging.....	75,000
Taxicabs.....	75,000

NOTE.—Retail, retail service, and laundry establishments with less than \$250,000 in annual receipts would remain exempt.

In response to our sixth request the Department submitted the following statement regarding the authority of the executive branch to require Government contractors to pay minimum wages in the absence of a statute. I became aware of this problem recently when a constituent made a bid on a Government service contract assuming that the Government would require the payment of the Federal minimum wage. He was wrong. The answer, in brief, is that without specific statutory authority the Government cannot require the payment of the minimum wage for employees of employers providing a contract service.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,  
Washington, June 4, 1965.

Memorandum to: Clarence T. Lundquist, Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division.

From: Charles Donahue, Solicitor.

Subject: Authority of executive branch to require Government contractors to pay minimum wages in the absence of a statute.

I am attaching hereto copies of a memorandum, prepared in this Office, on the above subject for submission to the House General Subcommittee on Labor along with the other materials which I understand you are sending the subcommittee today.

Attachments.

AUTHORITY OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO REQUIRE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES IN THE ABSENCE OF A STATUTE

I. BACKGROUND

In the course of FLSA hearings before the House Labor Subcommittee the chairman requested a memorandum on the authority of the executive branch to provide wage protections for Government service contract employees through administrative action.

II. CONCLUSION

A search of pertinent decisions of the Comptroller General indicates that wage requirements cannot be stipulated in Government contracts, in the absence of specific statutory authority. The major premise of these decisions is that wage requirements in contract specifications unnecessarily increase the contract price which the United States must pay for its goods and services.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Comptroller General decisions specifically relating to attempts to stipulate wage protections in Government contracts

1. Action by Contracting Agencies

In 19 Comp. Gen. 294 (1931)<sup>1</sup> the Comptroller General had occasion to rule on this precise point. He said:

"Conceding for the case that, as suggested by the Works Projects Administration, 'the policy of the Federal Government is to encourage the payment of fair wages in industry,' it is likewise the policy of the Federal Government, evinced and established by extensive enactments of the Congress to conserve public funds by obtaining supplies and services for Government needs at the lowest available prices, and it has been held consistently that in the absence of statutory provision therefor the insertion in Government contracts of any provision—not essential to the accomplishment of the purpose of the appropriation under which the contract is made—the necessary or probable result of which is to increase prices which the Government must pay is not authorized."<sup>2</sup>

2. Action by the President

The Comptroller General has applied the same restrictions to action taken by Executive order, or at the suggestion of the President.

See, for example, 10 Comptroller General 294, involving contract stipulations in Department of the Treasury contracts to establish prevailing wage protections and provide employment preference for citizens and ex-servicemen (inserted at the suggestion of the President); and 17 Comptroller General 700, holding "that the power [of the President through Executive order] to standardize Government contracts does not include the authority to prescribe for inserting in such contracts substantive provisions not required by law \* \* \*."

B. Other significant decisions of the Comptroller General

Even outside the wage requirement cases the Comptroller General has followed the general rule that—

"Contract stipulations tending to restrict competition and to increase the cost of performance—and thereby the charges against the contract appropriations—are unauthorized unless reasonably requisite to the accomplishment of the legislative purposes of the contract appropriation, or unless such stipulations are expressly authorized by statute \* \* \*." (18 Comp. Gen. 285, 295.)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A case involving an attempt by the Works Projects Administration to require Government contractors to pay equipment operators not less than the prevailing wage rates.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 10 Comp. Gen. 294 (1931); and 20 Comp. Gen. 18 (1940).

<sup>3</sup> This general rule has been applied in a long line of decisions, including 17 Comp.

The seventh response was the submission of 2 reports totaling 348 pages on the effect of the 1961 amendments upon retail trade. These are: "Report Submitted to the Congress in Accordance With the Requirements of Section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act," January 1963, "Effects of Minimum Wage Rates Established Under the Fair Labor Standards Act in Retail Trade in the United States and Puerto Rico," November 1963. These two documents were published by the U.S. Department of Labor. The Government's conclusion is that the industry adjusted well to the 1961 amendments.

7. STUDIES OF THE EFFECTS OF THE FIRST PHASE OF THE 1961 AMENDMENTS ON RETAIL TRADE

The 1963 report to the Congress in accordance with the requirements of section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act shows hours and earnings in retail trade before and after September 3, 1961. The November 1963 report is a special study based only on a matched sample of retail establishments. It is limited to establishments in business in both 1961 and 1962 and does not reflect new businesses in the latter period.

SAN ANTONIO TO WELCOME ASTRO-NAUT WHITE WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on tomorrow in the great queen city of the Southwest, San Antonio, Tex., which I have the honor of representing as the county seat of the County of Bexar which is located in the 20th Congressional District of Texas, we will have the great honor of hosting the great American hero, Astronaut White, who was born in San Antonio and is returning to his native city.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the city of San Antonio, I herewith extend a heartfelt welcome to each and every one to join us tomorrow for the day-long festivities honoring this famous American.

DOCTRINE OF DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in this day of the cry of "Yankee go home" from our advisers and critics in this country, there are men of the caliber of Luis A. Ferré in Puerto Rico who are

Gen. 37 (1937) (authority to reject a bid because of the bidder's noncompliance with the National Labor Relations Act); 31 Comp. Gen. 561 (1952) (authority to reject the lowest bid because the low bidder may not employ union labor).

U.S. citizens first and Puerto Ricans second.

I recommend to my colleagues of the Congress the suggestion of Mr. Ferré for a "Doctrine of Democratic Solidarity" in our approach to the assistance for our emerging democracies.

Mr. Ferré's remarks follow:

**DOCTRINE OF DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY**

(Statement by Luis A. Ferré at seminar on government and politics held May 5, 1965, in the Americana Hotel, San Juan, for members for the Harrisburg, Pa., Chamber of Commerce visiting Puerto Rico)

The recent landing in the Dominican Republic of U.S. forces to protect American citizens and property and to prevent the Communist takeover of this young Republic has been criticized by those who would sacrifice the lives of many innocent people in order to stick to wornout clichés of pseudo-champions of democracy. These people belong to two groups: Those who use such clichés and phrases as a smokescreen to induce paralysis of the defensive forces of democracy's friends, keeping the way open for the takeover of a Communist-protected tyranny, or those who have lost contact with the realities of the mid-20th century world, and continue dreaming of the conditions of the 19th century which gave birth to our present democratic systems.

The world has changed very radically since those days, and what were natural methods for young democracies during their formation periods, are not sufficient anymore to help them through that period. We need to think boldly of new approaches to meet new challenges. Today there is a worldwide conspiracy of Communist centers of power, perfectly organized, with well-trained cadres of men and unlimited amounts of military equipment, ready to seize upon the slightest opportunity within an inexperienced democracy, to move in at a moment of crisis and establish the tyrannical government of a well-organized minority, such as exists today in Russia, Cuba, and China.

It is against this reality that the true democracies of our time, and principally the United States with its greater experience in self-government and more military strength, must weigh their responsibilities. In the first place, let us study what are democracies' responsibilities. Democratic government is government by the people, with the consent of the people, for one prime purpose: the elimination of any form of tyrannical government that might endanger the respect to the dignity, the life or the freedom of all and every one of its citizens. I emphasize every one, because people have developed the mistaken notion that if a government has been elected by a vote of the majority, it is legitimately democratic, even if some of its citizens are viciously killed or arbitrarily deprived of their natural rights to freedom and the pursuit of happiness.

This is, of course, a false conception of democracy, and has led to the mistaken notion that when people are being killed and denied their natural rights under a government that is unable to establish law and order even if duly elected, the rest of the world should stand by and permit such crimes without raising a hand to prevent it, even if such situation leads to a Communist takeover and the institution of a tyranny.

Such selfish nationalistic notions are contrary to the spirit of a society which is integrated today into a world community where the more mature and wealthier nations, are being daily requested to help the emerging nations with their economic means. The nations of today, under what we might call a law of human solidarity, are responsible not only to their nationals, but also to humanity as a whole. They cannot pretend to commit crimes against innocent human

beings within their boundaries unmolested, claiming that their territories are inviolable. Such concept of nationalistic freedom to violate the rights of man certainly is not in agreement with the concept of a world under the principles of a United Nations and a World Court. The American foreign aid program was a complete reversal of the old practices of a world where every nation was guided only by selfish interests taking advantages of other peoples through military conquest and a colonial policy of exploitation. It established what we might call a code of international moral responsibility under which the wealthier nations voluntarily assume the responsibility to help the emerging nations to solve their economic problem. It proclaimed our Christian set of values and our democratic standards, as the guiding principles of the world community. The United Nations with its four freedoms and its enunciation of a bill of rights protecting all men of all races, was the culmination of the U.S. efforts toward the establishment of a world under moral law, in which the human being is fully protected.

To achieve our objective, in the face of the present communist conspiracy to destroy our democratic concept of life, we must be ready to extend our help with a three-pronged approach. Economic, cultural, and military under what we may call the doctrine of democratic solidarity. The democratic community must organize itself to help in extending economic and cultural aid to all emerging democracies. But we must also be ready to offer military protection to prevent the Communist conspiracy from destroying our efforts to help young democracies gain experience and maturity in involving their free societies. Such military actions which are not inspired by selfish motivation of territorial or economic gain and which conform to the spirit of the Declaration of Bogotá and Punta del Este, cannot be judged in the same light as the oldtime military interventions. They constitute our acceptance, and the acceptance of the democratic community together with us, of our responsibility for protecting the success of our efforts to extend economic and cultural aid to all emerging democratic societies.

**BALTIC NATIONS FREEDOM**

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the occupation and oppression of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. It was just a quarter of a century ago today that the Soviet Union by force of arms took over and occupied the proud but defenseless states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history such as extermination and annihilation of their citizens as during this Soviet occupation. During the last 25 years these nations have lost more than one-quarter of their entire population. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not Balts but are Soviet colonists.

Despite the terror of the oppression they experienced, these proud and cul-

tured Baltic people still cry out for freedom, and as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I have been privileged to work closely with many leaders of endeavors to focus national and world attention upon the plight of the Baltic nations and the captive nations of Europe. On this tragic anniversary, it is proper for us to remind ourselves of this condition and to renew our dedication to the cause of freedom and to the principle that justice must triumph over tyranny.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 416 to urge the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples. This resolution has been approved by the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and I am confident of its prompt passage by the House.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the text of the concurrent resolution as approved by the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs:

**H. CON. RES. 416**

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—*

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

**THE CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR  
FIASCO**

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from California [Mr. TALCOTT] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, three very misleading comments regarding the farm labor fiasco in California have been resurrected recently by persons without knowledge, often some 3,000 miles away, or with a special personal interest.

First, Frank Valenzuela, a labor contractor in San Benito County, Calif., is still being quoted as having said in April 1965, that "domestic workers can do farmwork" and "that there are more workers than there is work." He is also quoted as saying "some growers are not making a sincere effort to employ locals."

Mr. Valenzuela is a farmer labor contractor—a farm labor broker—a broker of human beings. He gets a cut or a percentage based on the number of workers he digs up to work on farms. A labor demand situation is a boon to Mr. Valenzuela and other labor brokers. He can make no money off braceros nor off domestic workers hired directly by the grower. The Department of Labor requirements of recruitment are made to order for labor brokers and, of course, all the evils of the farm labor contractor system—so eloquently described by Dale Wright in his recent book entitled "Harvest of Despair"—are rapidly returning because of the labor shortage.

Those of us who have been battling to improve the conditions and welfare of the unfortunate migrant farm laborers deplore the renewal and revival of the boon for labor contractors who deal in the sweat, toil, and worry of the lowest skilled, most disadvantaged group in our country.

I have never said domestics will not do farmwork. They will. But there are not enough who are willing and competent at peak harvest times in certain areas. There are no unemployed farmworkers in California. Many more are needed now.

Mr. Valenzuela declined to respond to my written letter requesting the names and addresses of growers who were not making an effort to employ locals. There are none.

Second, The U.S. Department of Labor has reported that welfare cases during the months of April in Monterey County, Calif., were reduced from 313 families in 1964 to 77 families in 1965—because of the "farmworker recruitment" programs. This deduction is erroneous. The principle reason for the reduction in welfare cases was weather—we have experienced an early season, the best growing weather for strawberries in 10 years. Farmworkers obtained work in April rather than the usual later time in May. The people who know the true facts, who are on the scene, dispute the Department of Labor's conclusion.

Third, The Department of Labor has reported that the total seasonal force in California on May 15, 1965, was 139,400 compared with 120,000 the same date a year ago. In reality, few, if any, new

domestic workers have been brought into the farm labor pool.

Most of the alleged increase in numbers of farmworkers are green carders, not truly local or domestic workers. Green carders are Mexicans who enjoy the good U.S. wages, but who usually prefer to live in Mexico where costs are cheaper and taxes nil, or who have usually lived and worked in Texas but who have been attracted away from the border States by the high wages in California.

I suggest that figures presented by the Department of Labor be thoroughly scrutinized. No matter how figures or percentages are construed or misconstrued, the Department of Labor has unfairly demanded that the strawberry growers make a conversion from a 75-percent nonlocal, competent, reliable labor force to grossly inadequate, inexperienced help in the short period of 1 crop year.

No other industry has been so shabbily treated or so completely misunderstood by a department of the Federal Government. But, wonder of wonders, another Federal agency is promoting the raising of strawberries in North Carolina with loans and other forms of assistance. The right hand of the Federal Government evidently does not know what the left hand is doing.

#### COMPLACENCY AND MONETARY REFORM

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, several recent articles in the New York Times offer a striking contrast between the complacency of the Johnson administration toward international monetary reform and the urgency with which reform is viewed by the respected Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland.

On June 14, Edwin L. Dale reported that there will be no significant movement toward reform of the monetary system this year. By design, the United States and other key countries involved have decided to "permit the situation to drift a while longer." The U.S. position is that negotiations would not make sense until its payments deficit has been eliminated.

The Bank for International Settlements, which includes the ranking monetary officials of Europe, the United States, and several other countries, has warned of a breakdown of the international monetary system in its recent annual report. The Bank noted that the system would be heading for trouble soon after the United States eliminated its payments deficit and that the time for action on reform was now at hand. The Bank was also critical of the bias of the Johnson administration for low-interest rates and of European officials for high

rates. It urged all countries—both those in surplus and deficit—to take more positive and fundamental steps to restore equilibrium.

The Johnson administration is courting an international financial collapse by its failure to move now on monetary reform. If we wait until our deficit is eliminated, the crisis foreseen by the Bank for International Settlements will be upon us before the long, difficult negotiations have even begun. As the New York Times commented in an editorial today:

In the past, reforms have always followed crisis. Now, the major powers have an opportunity to act before crisis strikes.

Mr. Speaker, the administration must seize the unique opportunity which it has today to move on the monetary front and avert an international financial crisis that ultimately would mean high unemployment and loss of production both at home and abroad. The Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee, on which I serve, have long urged the administration to take the initiative in this area. While that advice has not yet been acted upon by the administration, it is clear that the national interest requires that it do so before much more time is allowed to slip by.

Under unanimous consent I insert articles from the Times of June 14 and 15, and an editorial from June 15, in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1965]

#### MONETARY DANGER SIGNAL

Another warning that the West faces a possible collapse of its monetary system has been issued—this time by the authoritative Bank for International Settlements. Its annual report calls for an international monetary truce; it insists that the major financial powers must agree on reforms of the international monetary system if serious trouble is to be avoided.

The BIS does not agree with those in Europe who fear that a monetary breakdown might come as a result of the chronic deficits being run up by the United States and Britain, the two key currency countries. Instead, it holds that the real danger lies in the shortage of liquidity that is likely to occur once Britain and the United States manage to erase their deficits. This is because the British and American deficits have been largely responsible for the increase in international liquidity—the amount of gold and currency reserves for settling international transactions. If the deficits are wiped out, there may not be enough liquidity to maintain the expansion of trade and economic development.

Yet even though the disappearance of the U.S. deficit may threaten a liquidity shortage, the BIS believes that Washington must press its campaign to reduce the outflow of dollars. It criticizes the Johnson administration for its predilection for low interest rates which spur an outflow of funds.

At the same time it condemns the European bias in favor of high interest rates, which act as a lure for funds. The BIS thinks that countries in deficit must move faster to correct their imbalances but that countries with a surplus must show greater willingness to make use of the funds that they gain.

In essence, the BIS wants both sides to exercise more responsibility toward each other. It fears that monetary history will repeat itself if they pursue the beggar-thy-neighbor tactics that proved so disastrous in the period between World Wars I and II.

The Bank rules out a revival of the gold standard, suggesting that it is preferable to build on the cooperative framework now in existence than to start all over from scratch. But it is clearly concerned that cooperation is less than it should be.

Those who are alarmed about the international monetary system are no longer voices in the wilderness. They have become a mounting chorus. Yet there are still few signs that their warnings are being heeded. In the past, reforms have always followed crisis. Now, the major powers have an opportunity to act before crisis strikes. There is a vital need to increase liquidity over the long term, but first they must see to it that no shrinkage in the liquidity presently available results from a shutting off of the dollar drain.

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1965]

**MONETARY REFORM IS SLOW BY DESIGN—CHANGES OR INNOVATIONS IN THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM SOON HELD UNLIKELY—URGENT TONE MISSING—U.S. BELIEVES TALKS MUST WAIT UNTIL PAYMENTS DEFICIT IS ELIMINATED**

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—There will be no significant movement this year toward reform of the international monetary system. This is the widely held view of officials in close touch with the situation, both from the United States and other nations.

The schedule of events, and of negotiations, is designed to permit the situation to drift a while longer. Further, there seems to be little sense of urgency in official circles that early changes or innovations are needed. The United States view is clear.

It is that no negotiations on changes in the world system make sense until its payments deficit has been eliminated.

#### SURPLUS DESIRED

In addition, the official view is that a payments surplus must be achieved not only for one or two quarters, but for longer than that.

Discussions on reform of the system—now based on gold, the dollar and, to a lesser extent, the pound—are taking place in two forums.

One is the "Group of Ten."

This unit comprises the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, Canada, and Japan.

The group will soon produce a report—known as the Ossola Report for the chairman of a subcommittee, Rinaldo Ossola of the Bank of Italy—describing the various proposals for creating new world monetary assets in addition to gold and dollars and pounds.

#### INFORMATION REPORT

The committee was never supposed to make recommendations. Its report, as such, is expected to be a valuable addition to the information of treasuries and central banks, but little more. There is no indication now that the Group of Ten this year will go beyond publishing the Ossola Report.

The second forum is the International Monetary Fund. Its staff, headed by Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, the managing director, has produced several ideas by which the Fund itself could add to international assets and thus to world "liquidity."

The executive directors of the Fund, representing the member countries, have begun to debate these plans. It is reliably reported that the staff ideas have come under sharp criticism, though the criticism has varied according to country and according to the particular scheme involved.

Thus, it now appears highly unlikely that the annual meeting of the Monetary Fund here in September will be ready to tackle the world liquidity issue in any detail.

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1965]  
**PERIL SEEN IN END OF PAYMENT ILLS—SUBSTITUTE MUST BE FOUND FOR OUTFLOW FROM UNITED STATES, WEST EUROPE WARNED—U.S. POLICIES SCORED—MAJOR POWERS ADVISED BY MONETARY GROUP TO END FISCAL STALEMATE**

(By Richard E. Mooney)

BASEL, SWITZERLAND, June 14.—The United States and Western Europe received an authoritative warning today that they were headed for monetary trouble and did not realize it.

The warning, in the annual report of the Bank for International Settlement, advised the major powers to break out of their present stalemate over future international monetary policy. The Bank said that there was likely to be a squeeze soon after the U.S. international payments were balanced.

The Bank, created 35 years ago to manage Germany's World War debt payments, is best known now for its monthly meetings of central bankers and for its annual commentary on world money affairs. The Bank's views have an unmatched respectability in the central banking community of the major powers.

The ranking monetary officials of Europe—East and West—as well as of the United States, Japan, and a few remote spots including Rwanda were here over the weekend for the annual meeting.

#### DIFFICULTIES FORESEEN

The main point of today's report was that the model monetary behavior that central bankers usually preach was going to lead to difficulties. In other words, when the U.S. outflow of dollars stops, the world will have to find a substitute to cover expanding demands for official reserves.

The point itself is not new, but after much debate it is still controversial. There remains a basic difference between governments that believe that there must be something more. Thus it is significant that the Bank should say that the need for something more is virtually certain.

The report also presented some blunt advice on current policy. Both the United States and Europe were found at fault for pursuing economic policies tailored too much to domestic political interests—Washington for its preoccupation with keeping interest rates down and Europe for putting them up too high.

The Bank said that the pattern of too much tightness in Europe and too little in the United States, combined with the U.S. curbs on loans and investments flowing out and European curbs on the same things flowing in, marked a dangerous retreat from the free convertibility of the dollar and other major currencies.

The report said that countries with balance-of-payments deficits—more money flowing out than in—had the primary responsibility for restoring order, but that surplus countries must help.

Of the two major deficit countries, it said: "The United States—last February's curbs on overseas loans and investments were evidently effective, but it was premature to say that the end of the deficit was assured. Moreover, the United States should aim for a surplus, not just a balance, now."

"Britain—without sounding any alarm, the report said that the British payments problem was still long range and that the end was not yet in sight. The Bank said that Britain's budget policy was probably not tight enough yet, and that its "incomes policy" for restraining prices and wages seemed unlikely to work in the present boom conditions."

But the essential point of the report was an assumption that these two countries would get back to balance somehow and that this would create new difficulties.

The report examined the problem itself, rather than the many proposals for reforming the monetary system. It analyzed only one reform idea in any detail—revival of the gold standard—and ruled it out. It predicted that reform would be evolutionary.

The report analyzed the monetary problem in two parts.

First, it analyzed the way countries attacked their payments problems. It found them mostly too slow and inadequate. "It is necessary for the pot to stop calling the kettle black," the Bank said, and for the major countries "to get down to realistic appraisal of their respective responsibilities to make adjustments."

Second, it examined the question of liquidity—official Government reserves of gold, dollars and pounds sterling. With the United States in deficit year after year, the outflow of dollars and U.S. gold had supplied expanding liquidity for other countries. But when this stops, as may be happening now, another source must be found.

The need for another source is not so immediately related to the need to expand international business, the Bank said, as to the natural tendency of all countries to try to build up their reserves when they can.

The report noted that there was generally less than \$650 million of new gold available each year for the expansion of official Government reserves.

#### BATTLE FOR SURVIVAL

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, to continue my story on Wilford Metcalf, a disabled veteran of Del Rio, Tenn., who lives deep in the heart of the Appalachia poverty area, I am inserting in the Record today a recent column by Ken Thompson, editorial staff writer of the Dallas Morning News.

It is a sad, sad story and Mr. Thompson has put his finger squarely on the problem.

I think it is a shame and a disgrace for this big Government of ours to prosecute Mr. Metcalf, who says that he is "poorer than poverty."

For the complete story on Mr. Metcalf, I refer you to my speech commencing on page 11682 of the May 26, 1965, RECORD, and also page 12943 of the June 9, 1965, RECORD.

In the meantime, the wheels of big government continue to spin and spin with this poor mountaineer caught in the steamroller.

If the President is sincere about his antipoverity program, I am sure he would intercede in this case to see that justice is carried out.

I compliment Mr. Thompson for his very excellent article entitled "Mountaineer—Real Poverty in Tennessee."

In closing Mr. Thompson states:

We have not heard the Agriculture Secretary's reply.

Mr. Thompson, neither have I. The Secretary refuses to answer my letters personally or to accept my telephone calls.

He obviously is part of the web of big government and is pushing the lever of the steamroller, which is destroying Mr. Metcalf and his family.

The article follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News]  
MOUNTAINEER: REAL POVERTY IN TENNESSEE  
(By Ken Thompson)

If you want to hear a sad story, read the case of Wilford Metcalf, a disabled war veteran and Tennessee mountaineer who is currently engaged in a battle for survival with the Federal Government.

Shortly after World War II, Metcalf bought a small mountain farm for \$800. The registered deed stated that his property went up "to the top of the mountain," so Metcalf has been farming and cutting timber up to that limit.

Now he has been informed that he is a trespasser on Government land. Recently he received two letters from Washington. One announced that 5 acres of the mountain land Metcalf thought he owned is actually government property, and ordered him to relinquish any claim to the land or face Federal action.

The other informed Metcalf that he would have to pay the Government \$1,717 for the value of the timber he had cut down on the land. If he failed to pay within 30 days, the letter threatened, he would be sued by Washington.

Well, Metcalf is broke. His whole farm isn't worth what the Government claims he owes it for cutting a little timber. So he did the only thing that every little man about to be crushed by the Federal steamroller can do. He wrote his Congressman. The letter, phrased in the simple but hard-hitting language of a Tennessee mountaineer, is a classic:

"I read in the paper that the President was fighting poverty," Metcalf began. "That's good and I am for it, but tell the President if he has any poverty left over from some other place to please send it down here. It's better than us mountain folks has been used to."

"It has been hard but it has also been rewarding, as Preacher Pat Davis says. We ain't complaining as we raised our younguns and have et good as most mountain folks. We raised our hogs for meat and grewed most of what else we had other than coffee, sugar, salt and the like. We ain't had to buy much so we don't need too awful much money til now that the Government is after us."

"There just ain't no way for a poor man like me to win when he laws with the Government. This big bill of \$1,717 staggers me. Why whole farm ain't worth that much, less a little dab of timber that was cut. Sometimes I think the Government just surveys and uses what deeds and lines is to their best advantage."

"You have my permission to trade with the Government. I will take the \$1,717 and give them my whole farm. I can take that and buy a better place out on the road. I don't have money to fight this case. Right now I ain't got the money to hardly buy clothes for my family, much less fight with the Government."

Metcalf's Congressman, Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, has forwarded the letter to Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman with the tart suggestion, according to the Chicago Tribune, that legal action against a poor mountain farmer is a funny way to carry out the antipoverty program.

"If you and I cannot work this small problem out," he bluntly told Freeman, "then we have betrayed our individual trusts. And we had better forget about winning any war against poverty."

We have not heard the Agriculture Secretary's reply.

### BALTIC FREEDOM RALLY

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian Americans residing in the southern California area held a Baltic Freedom Rally in Los Angeles. The rally marked the 25th anniversary of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Army and the tragic events of June 1940 and June 1941 when the first mass deportations of the Baltic people were carried out by the Russian Communists. No person, anywhere in the world with any respect for freedom and liberty, can be satisfied until the injustices inflicted on these peoples have been corrected.

Those elements in the world which would accommodate the Communists in the international power struggle would do well to recall what happened a quarter century ago.

In June of 1940, the Baltic States were invaded and occupied by Soviet armed forces. Duly elected and popular governments were deprived of their constitutional rights and the leaders of democratic forces were arrested and sometimes executed. Moscow-appointed officials set up puppet governments which carried out orders from Russia. Deportations started in June of 1941. It is estimated that some 200,000 persons were deported to slave labor camps. The memories of these events are still vivid to those who escaped this fate.

Yet, in spite of the terror and enslavement experienced by the Baltic peoples, their desire for freedom has not been destroyed. They are waiting, with hope for better days, when their homeland will once again be free. The patience and perseverance of these brave peoples deserves the highest praise of all of us.

I think it would be useful, as we think about the fight of the Baltic people for freedom and human dignity, to remember the words of one of our most vigorous anti-Communist statesmen, the late John Foster Dulles. He said in November of 1958:

There are some who seem to feel that, because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it. Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.

Communism is stubborn for the wrong; let us be steadfast for the right.

A capacity to change is indispensable. Equally indispensable is the capacity to hold fast that which is good.

But let us make our opposition not just a barren negative but a positive alternative.

Despotisms, with their iron discipline, their materialistic productions, their hard and glittering exterior, always seem to have the advantage over democracies, which advertise their differences to all the world and which often appear as about to fall apart.

The fact is that the despotisms are always weaker than they appear and the free nations are usually stronger than they seem.

Sometimes it seems easier to yield to the stubborn wrong than to be steadfast with the right—this used to be true when, in dealing with international communism, the stubborn wrong is on the other side of the world.

In recent years, we have found that the stubborn wrong of communism has come into our own hemisphere, as it did in Cuba. When this happens the folly of placating the distant wrong is very evident.

I do not think there are any among the displaced peoples of the Baltic States who have any question about the inadvisability of yielding to Communist pressures. Such observances as the one held in Los Angeles are a way for us to tell the Communists that we are alert to what they are doing and what they have done. Our participation in and cooperation with the captive peoples in the world, and especially those people from captive nations who are now enjoying the freedom of our country, is a good way to express our feelings in this matter.

We should continue to support observances of this type as long as Communist Russia refuses to give freedom to the peoples it has enslaved.

In recent years, this country has observed a Captive Nations Week during which the plight of the nations behind the Iron Curtain is officially noted. A Presidential proclamation is made and ceremonies are held around the Nation.

The people from the captive nations have a better understanding of the truth about Soviet communism than anyone. They know from firsthand experience how the Russians overran their countries and denied the people their freedoms.

These exercises are intended to show this Nation's continuing commitment to the principles of national self-determination. I applaud them and commend the fine people from these nations who, in the face of discouraging events, continue their drive for freedom.

### HOW LIBERAL IS CONGRESS?

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the role of Congress in the policymaking process is a problem of increasing concern to both students and practitioners of politics. Congress itself is currently investigating the adequacy of its procedures in meeting its responsibilities to the Nation and in my judgment few questions merit greater attention and reflection. In an effort to suggest some theoretical guidelines for the discussion of the proper place of legislative institutions in contemporary government, I am inserting an article originally written for an ill-fated journal.

The American Congress, to an alarming extent, is on its way to becoming overly subservient to the executive branch. Congress can rely on the executive for information, initiative, and expert study of policy proposals only up to a point before the legislative branch, in effect, commits suicide. Current trends, about which there is far too little debate in the country, remind me of the old story about how the animal kingdom once held a summit meeting to discuss plans for peace in the world of nature: after all the other animals agreed to lay down their arms the bear smiled and said now let me embrace you in a fraternal hug. Hugs may be more pleasant than conflict and friction between the component parts of our governmental system but I would like to suggest that we reread the Federalist Papers before we unconsciously accept the quiet revolution currently taking place in our Federal system.

We may, after prolonged study and deliberation, decide that Congress should go the way of the British Parliament, the French National Assembly, the German Bundestag, and other once viable legislative bodies. But, Mr. Speaker, should such a development be allowed to creep up on us almost unnoticed?

The accompanying article, written with the assistance of John F. Manley, a political scientist from Syracuse University who worked for me as a congressional fellow of the American Political Science Association, and who is currently doing research for the association's study of Congress, briefly sets forth some of my ideas on this vital topic:

#### HOW LIBERAL IS CONGRESS?

(By Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS)

With Republicans outnumbered 294 to 141 in the House of Representatives and 68 to 32 in the Senate, can President Johnson get just about anything he wants out of the 89th Congress? This is supposed to be the most liberal Congress since 1936 and, assuming that the administration's program is "liberal," the pundits say that the combination of Johnson's bargaining skill and Democratic majorities may be unbeatable.

And if Johnson's power of persuasion and control of Congress were not enough, I read, the changes in the House rules insure a bumper crop for cultivators of liberal legislation. But what, precisely, do the words "liberal" and "conservative" connote when applied to legislation and to the activities of Congress? More important, what does the current imbalance in the American party system mean for the proper functioning of the Federal Government? Is Congress an institution from which the President gets something? Or does the role of Congress involve more than affixing the seal of legitimacy on policies formulated in executive agencies?

Obviously these questions cannot be fully discussed here but students and practitioners of government must pay more attention to them than to whether or not particular bills are run unscathed through the legislative machinery.

One student of American conservatism, Clinton Rossiter of Cornell University, writes that conservatives and liberals have different attitudes toward liberty: The conservative thinks of liberty as something to be preserved, the liberal thinks of it as something to be enlarged. "Historically," Rossiter continues, "the conservative has stressed the social nature of man and the primacy of the

community, and the liberal has emphasized individual rights." Today, of course, we hear the conservative talking about individual liberty and the liberal about the needs of the community. Why the switch? Rossiter suggests, and I tend to agree, that the debate centers around the relationship between government and liberty; liberals believe that by and large government expands and protects liberty while conservatives are not so sure.

Conservatives, when asked what is necessary to insure the happiness and prosperity of the American people, answer with Jefferson who in his first inaugural said a "wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned." I, as a conservative, recognize that the Federal Government is properly supreme in the areas of national defense and foreign policy, but I am inclined to accept Jefferson's description of the proper scope of government in the social and economic spheres. The liberal, in my judgment, defines the scope of the Federal Government much more broadly than this.

Is the Government during the next 2 years likely to be wise, frugal and limited in its operations? The answer to this question depends, of course, on whether one is a conservative or a liberal, but looking at the lineup in Congress as a realistic conservative I fear that it will not be as wise, frugal, and limited as it ought to be.

In many ways the current situation resembles that in 1913 when Woodrow Wilson enjoyed strong majorities in both Houses. Of the 290 Democrats in the House, 114 had been elected in 1912. "Unusual circumstances," his biographer Arthur S. Link writes, "for a time enabled him to demonstrate conclusively that the President has it within his power not only to be the chief spokesman of the American people but also to destroy the wall between the executive and legislative branches in the formulation and adoption of legislative programs."

Not since Jefferson abandoned the custom of appearing before Congress had a President made a speech "from the throne", but this did not prevent Wilson from delivering his tariff message in person. Johnson's state of the Union message was hardly as dramatic as Wilson's break with tradition, but speaking to a nationwide audience during prime television time with Congress as a stage was a new, and regrettable, twist. Will Johnson carrying out the comparison with Wilson, also subordinate Congress to his will? Not if Republicans and like-minded Democrats work to maintain the autonomy and independence of the legislative branch.

Congressional Democrats are caught in a vise between two sometimes compatible but oftentimes contradictory loyalties: party loyalty and institutional loyalty. Theoretically, Congress is a deliberative body which is confronted by scores of problems and alternative solutions (ranging from inaction to countless forms of action) and which seeks, through study and debate, the most efficient means of promoting the common good. I will be the first to admit that Congress does not always live up to this ideal but it seems to me that unless we hold this conception of Congress as our goal we may as well stop calling ourselves legislators and adopt the title of "Ombudsman," the Scandinavian official whose primary task is to mediate and adjust constituents' complaints against the bureaucracy.

If Congress should legislate then Congressmen should not be rated on a piece-work basis, or on how fast we pass the President's program, or on how little we modify executive department proposals. Our job is to do what our constituents do not have time to do, namely, to analyze complex problems and the means offered to

resolve them, and if our collective judgment differs from the President's desires we are dutybound to assert our will. Blind, unthinking party loyalty should neither obscure nor supersede the duty we owe to the House and to our constituents.

American political parties function within a framework of separated but not unrelated institutions and they do, as Woodrow Wilson noted, "hold the things thus disconnected and dispersed together and give some coherence to the action of political forces." But they must not, if our legislature is to avoid the fate of other legislative bodies, hold things together so tightly that Congress becomes a mere appendage of the executive branch. A certain amount of tension between the branches reflects the articulation of the diverse interests which exist in the American political system, a system that is quite different from Great Britain's and hence needs its own method of expressing itself.

Some political scientists, most notably James MacGregor Burns of Williams College who recently made his quadrennial plea to the President to restructure the American party system, argue that democracy is deadlocked in America because the parties are not cohesive, tightly organized, and rationally controlled organizations. But others, such as Austin Ranney of the University of Wisconsin, argue that the American people were exposed to the arguments in favor of "responsible" parties long before Burns and his associates grew impatient with diffused power, and that the people have remained unmoved by the appeal to change. As A. Lawrence Lowell pointed out many decades ago, "responsible" parties are ideal for a people who do not mind unlimited majority rule, but for the United States where the rights of the minority are every bit as sacred as the will of the majority our perplexing but popular parties are quite suitable. Indeed, democracy would really be deadlocked if the visions set forth by Burns ever materialized.

Against this background I suggest that the real question is not whether Congress will be more liberal this year than it has been in the past. The President will probably get a few more pieces of liberal legislation this year. The fundamental problem concerns the very nature of Congress itself: is it going to be a deliberative body, which involves much more than simply saying "No" to the President or holding up controversial legislation, or is it going to stifle the voice of the Republican minority and shirk its duty in the name of a misguided conception of party responsibility.

Indications so far are not very heartening. When the House considered changing its rules, for example, it did so under the 1-hour rule (controlled completely by the majority party) which severely constrained the debate and precluded all amendments. The proposed changes had not even been made available in written form to the Members of the House at the time of the debate so there was no opportunity to look beneath the general language to see whether the specific proposals carry out the objectives.

Some bills, including most of the major legislation reported by the Ways and Means Committee, are considered under closed rules which deny to both the majority and minority the right to propose amendments, discuss them, and let the House work its will.

Minority views are not permitted in House-Senate conference reports even though some of the issues and points of contention may not crystallize until the conference stage of the process.

Other examples could be cited, almost ad infinitum, but the basic point is clear: The majority of the House should have an opportunity to work its will but only after the minority has had a fair chance to assert its views, and there has been a meaningful

discussion of the issues. Nothing short of this is fair. Indeed, anything less than full debate means that Congress is being derelict in its duty, both to itself as a legislative institution and to the people whom it represents.

The Republican Members of Congress constitute the loyal opposition whose job it is to review critically the policy proposals of the majority, make a case for any amendments which may improve legislation, and formulate alternative policies to be debated and judged in the Congress. In spite of the defects in the rules governing deliberation, is the Republican party equipped to perform these functions?

This is what the recent changes in House Republican leadership were all about. Republican programs conceived, and formulated, must be better presented if the party is to perform its role as the loyal opposition. More important, Republican policies, carefully thought through and ably articulated, must continue to be developed if the party is to remain something more than the loyal opposition and if the two party system is to endure. Becoming the majority party depends upon our ability to be an effective loyal opposition, our sensitivity to the needs of the time, and our creativity. The process of reconstruction is underway and with hard work and unselfish effort it will be completed. Nothing short of this will suffice.

#### WHY NOT HAVE HEARINGS ON VIETNAM?

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. commitment to the people and government of South Vietnam remains unchanged. However, recent events make it obvious that the President is ready to commit the United States to a much deeper involvement in the continuing conflict that threatens to engulf that tragic nation than most of us have been realistic enough to anticipate.

The latest indication of this was the reluctant and round-about confirmation by the White House of the fact that at least some of the U.S. forces now in South Vietnam have been authorized—when requested by the Vietnamese military commanders—to assume a direct role in combat.

White House spokesmen went to some lengths in an effort to leave the impression that this would not represent any major change in U.S. policy—and, perhaps, for the time being at least, it does not. Nevertheless, I think we must accept the fact that the war in Vietnam has entered upon a new, and probably crucial, phase. Our military forces there have more than doubled since March, and there are evidently accurate reports that it will soon be necessary for us to still further and substantially increase the supply of men and war materials now streaming into South Vietnam if we are to successfully preserve through the long summer months the precarious military and political balance now existing there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of proper concern to every American. It is also, I

believe, of special concern to those of us who serve in this body and who have strongly supported the President in the steps he has taken thus far in an effort to honor our commitment in South Vietnam, but who have grown increasingly troubled by the strong tendency on the part of this Congress to leave the conduct of our foreign policy—in Vietnam and elsewhere—wholly, and practically without question, in the hands of the President.

I am not at all sure that this is in accordance with our responsibility; nor am I sure that this is wise.

I am well aware of the questions that can be raised under our Constitution with respect to the part that Congress may properly play in helping to shape foreign policy. Prof. E. S. Corwin once described those provisions of our Constitution which are pertinent to this point as "an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy."

With the passage of time it is true that that struggle has been quite generally resolved in favor of the Presidency, an Office which has, in the words of the Supreme Court, "the very delicate, plenary and exclusive power as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations."

Perhaps this would have been the inevitable result, anyway, in the kind of age in which we now live—an age in which it is difficult to contemplate the spectacle of a Congress attempting to legislate a declaration of war while the Capitol was under nuclear attack.

Still, in the present situation, there are voices, some of which must be acknowledged as coming from critics of the President, who urge upon Congress the necessity for now examining into the nature of the course we have so evidently embarked upon in southeast Asia.

For instance, the New York Times in recent editorials, said:

The country deserves answers \* \* \*. It has been taken into a ground war by Presidential decision, when there is no emergency that would seem to rule out congressional debate. The duty now is for reassurance from the White House that the Nation will be informed on where it is being led and that Congress will be consulted before another furious upward whirl is taken on the escalation spiral.

And again:

The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

Similar expressions have been heard from other quarters. In the other body, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], recently urged the President—

not to permit this new level of U.S. participation in the ground struggle to occur without obtaining the kind of mandate from Congress and from the people which, alone, can make such a policy feasible without grave divisions in the country.

My purpose here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not to debate our Vietnam policy—whatever it may be. I think that must perforce be left to those of us whose committee assignments or

whose special responsibilities make them more qualified to do so than I.

My purpose, instead, is to ask my colleagues if they do not agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body, and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the other body, should now reconsider the possible usefulness of full-scale hearings on Vietnam at the present time.

I say "full scale" in the sense that such hearings—if they are to serve the purpose I envision—should include not just the anticipated administration witnesses in support of its policy, but should also provide a forum for the presentation of the views and the suggestions of broadly selected representatives of those other persons, outside the administration, who have had constructive criticism to offer concerning that policy. In view of the rapidly changing nature of the scene in southeast Asia, it would be essential that any such hearings move along as expeditiously as possible, so they might well be joint hearings, with the committees determining whether or not they should be open or closed.

At the conclusion of such hearings, it is possible that the committees might determine to report to Congress, for appropriate action, another joint resolution—similar to that of August 10, 1964, to which the President so often refers—but updated to reflect the changed circumstances stemming from the continuing intransigence and the escalation of the conflict by those who refuse to end their acts of aggression against South Vietnam, or to join with us in seeking the basis for an honorable and just settlement of that conflict.

Perhaps it may now be said by some of my colleagues that this course of action is unnecessary in view of the recent and near-unanimous congressional approval of the President's request for an additional \$700 million appropriation with which to carry on our support of the South Vietnamese in their struggle for freedom. However, in response to that I think it must be said that, even in this brief period of time, the situation we now face in Vietnam is drastically different, and the prospects for the immediate future considerably more grim.

For it has by now become apparent that whatever hopes we had of making progress toward some sort of an acceptable political solution of the conflict, by the methods thus far applied, have at least had to be postponed through the long summer months that lie ahead, and that the President has therefore had forced upon him the necessity to review his policies and reconsider at least our short-term objectives.

Congress may well have only a supporting role to play in that kind of review and reconsideration—but it ought to play that role rather than sit idly by, content to subsequently criticize the President, perhaps, as President Truman was criticized, if the course on which we have seemingly embarked turns out to be a long-drawn-out and costly ground war similar to that in which we were involved in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the country stands strongly united behind

the President—though the people we represent have many unanswered questions and deep, unspoken concern about what lies along the road ahead.

As my colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS, put it, in those remarks of his to which I earlier referred:

Once again I say the Congress will undoubtedly support the President. But, just as he could not forgo the salutary announcement of U.S. willingness to negotiate—although he felt he had said it many times before—so he cannot forgo the salutary effect of a congressional debate and action on this new and crucial U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I, too, am convinced that Congress will again indicate its support of the President—and, thus, the popular support of the President—in the new and dangerous circumstances in which we find ourselves.

And I, too, am convinced that this would be a salutary thing, for the kind of full-scale hearings and subsequent congressional debate I am suggesting would be a far cry from that sporadic type of "debate"—and I have put quotation marks around the word on purpose—now going on concerning Vietnam in the other body, and of infinitely more value than the kind of Vietnam "debate"—once again in quote marks—now going on in the syndicated columns and on the editorial pages of our newspapers, and which can do little more than add to such public confusion and uncertainty as exists over what is happening in Vietnam.

By comparison, too, to that congressional approval of the President's appropriation request, on which action was taken with unusual haste and an absolute minimum of committee consideration and floor debate, I think that the sharply focused, true debate that such full-scale hearings and subsequent congressional action would engender would not only be of great value to the American people but to our allies, as well, who need added reassurance that the American people do, indeed, understand the full dimensions of the challenge and willingly accept the risks inherent in the present situation we face in Vietnam.

And I further suggest that, in the same way, such a debate and subsequent congressional action in support of the President would also help to sweep away any remaining tendency on the part of those who are the aggressors in South Vietnam to miscalculate the depth of American resolution.

Finally, as one who has faithfully supported the President in the delicate and difficult course he has been following to bring this conflict to an honorable solution, I suggest that such a debate could also be of great value to him for, though his course may be both right and necessary, he may well begin to find in the weeks and months ahead as the going gets even rougher that the American people have not been psychologically prepared to accept the sacrifice and risk that course involves.

For, Mr. Speaker, it would be at that critical point that any semblance of wavering, any evidence of disunity on the part of the American people over what must be done in South Vietnam, would be most dangerous to our cause.

By comparison, whatever risks may be involved for the President in agreeing to such hearings and debate—and I know full well that without his consent they will not take place—would be minor; whatever distraction, inconsequential.

One can well appreciate the President's annoyance with some of his critics—his feelings that it should not be necessary for him to continually explain and defend his policies. However, always before in the history of our Nation when a President put his full trust in the strength and resolution of an informed citizenry—always before when a President who believed himself to be right patiently gave even his sharpest critics the hearing they sought—the American people have given that President the full measure of their support in return.

I am confident that they will do so again—and I am equally confident that this Congress is ready and anxious to play its proper part in helping to bring this about.

#### COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of the House today with regret and sorrow in my heart. I wish to place before this House the facts of a situation which make all civilized men react with anger, disgust, and almost disbelief at a system which would allow crimes against humanity to be performed by their followers. I speak of the atrocities being committed in Vietnam, today, by the Communist Vietcong.

We as a nation are committed to uphold the dignity and worth of the human being. Criminal acts have been committed in Vietnam, by the Communists, which do violence to the basic principles of our civilization. This policy of organized terror, brutality, and assassination inspire horror and revulsion in any civilized mind. We as God-fearing and civilized Americans cannot allow these atrocities to go unchallenged or distorted from their true meaning by Communist propaganda.

The issue I bring before this House involves the honor and dignity of the great Vietnamese people, our own fighting men now in Vietnam and the integrity of U.S. policy in Vietnam. It is a subject which we in all honor cannot let rest and which we cannot avoid. It is not a pretty story. It is one of unspeakable moral degradation by an enemy and of atrocities almost beyond comprehension performed by this same enemy on the people of Vietnam and on our own soldiers. It concerns the activities of a Communist system which has shown no

respect for the human person dead or alive, a system, the sole purpose of which is the progress of communism by any effective means, no matter how evil.

I trust that no Members in this Congress will tend to dismiss this story as without significance. Some may say that war is always the source and cause of brutal acts and those in Vietnam are no different. Such a view can only be one of despair, fear, or ignorance, without knowledge of the true facts. We have read in history of the frightful acts of Hitler, Stalin, and Ivan the Terrible, but this does not forgive Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, or Brezhnev.

The sins of the past are no excuse for those of the present. We are the custodians of the present and of mankind's future while we live. The atrocities I will speak of today are those that go beyond the terrible demands of war. In our age, if we are to call ourselves civilized, an individual human life and an individual body are as sacred in war as in peace. We have been taught to respect the dead even in death. Adversely, the Communists as a conscious act of their policy, maim, torture, and mutilate, the living as well as the dead.

This record of atrocities in South Vietnam deserves our attention. Again in our lifetime we witness a frightening abandonment of respect for the laws and standards of humane and civilized conduct. We have lived through Stalin's bloody purges, Khrushchev's butchery, Hitler's gas chambers, atrocities against U.N. forces in Korea and now Communist atrocities in South Vietnam. I for one cannot get hardened to, or accept, such acts of horror and terror. The covenants or solemn agreements entered into by responsible nations signing the Geneva Convention which bind all belligerents in war have again been tossed aside by the Communist aggressor in South Vietnam.

The conduct of the aggressor is not the result of personal cruelty by isolated individuals or of Vietcong who, without authorization, express their ideological sadism, but a conscious act of Communist policy. The pattern proves that these atrocities are deliberate. They reflect a system which consciously and actively rejects, subverts, and destroys decent standards of conduct and the entire structure of humane values. This system denies that men are created in the image of God. They believe man is no more than an animal, and should be treated as such. This is the same system which displays by its acts, as Stalin said in words and deeds, "Terror is the supreme argument of any power."

President Johnson is being criticized in some circles for his firm stand in Vietnam. However, very little is being heard from these same outspoken critics on the terrible atrocities committed by the Communists.

In a news conference on April 27, 1965, President Johnson said:

I do sometimes wonder how some people can be so concerned with our bombing a cold bridge of steel and concrete in North Vietnam, but never open their mouth about a bomb being placed in our Embassy in South Vietnam.

I agree with this practical observation and feel that these same people who

scream so loud for free speech and the right to present both sides of the picture, when it suits their purpose, should begin to learn and speak the truth about events in Vietnam. Hardly a word is spoken of the war that the Communists are conducting on women and children in South Vietnam.

In the same press conference of April 27, 1965, President Johnson also said:

As long as aggression continues, and as long as they bomb our sports arenas, and our theaters, and our embassies and kill our women and children and the Vietnamese soldiers \* \* \* we think that we are justified in trying to slow down that operation and make them realize that it is very costly, and that their aggression should cease.

Secretary Rusk in a news conference on March 24, 1965, made the following statement:

It is a mean, dirty, struggle, carried out without regard to ordinary norms of conduct by the Vietcong.

Those who are concerned about tear gas, I would hope would be concerned about the fact that during 1964 over 400 civilian officials were killed, and over a thousand were kidnaped in South Vietnam \* \* \* village chiefs, schoolteachers, public health officers. Among other civilians, 1,300 were killed, over 8,000 were kidnaped, but entire villages have been kidnaped and burned to the ground, when families of those who were in the armed forces were kidnaped and held hostage.

American soldiers are not immune to this savagery. U.S. servicemen and Government agents have been found dead after being tortured and shot to death. Shockingly reminiscent of the atrocities committed by the Chinese and North Korean Communists during the Korean war, American servicemen have been discovered with their hands tied behind their backs and shot in the back of the head. Their bodies were not given a decent burial, but thrown in jungle underbrush by their Vietcong captors.

South Vietnamese working for the U.S. military forces have been found floating in rivers and swamps with their arms, heads, and legs cut off. The Communist butchers use these methods to dissuade others from defending freedom in their homeland.

In another case the Communists used poison to kill more than 100 anti-Communist tribesmen fighting against them, and who had been captured in battle.

The atrocities recorded by U.S. authorities include the "beheading of village chiefs" and the "the cutting off of arms and legs of innocent women and children" whose fathers and husbands are serving in the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. The same inhumane treatment is applied to the families of those who refuse to desert to the Vietcong.

In a summary from a pamphlet printed in Saigon, July 1964, the following is extracted:

First. Summary of cases of victims of Vietcong terrorists acts during 1963:

Persons assassinated:	
Civil population.....	1,558
Local officials.....	415
Civil servants.....	100
Persons injured.....	8,375
Persons kidnaped.....	7,262
Total.....	17,710

Second. Communist atrocities and acts of terrorism in South Vietnam:

Vietcong terrorists, masquerading under the guise of the so-called front for the liberation of the south, continue their deliberate and indiscriminate attacks on the defenseless civil population and on institutions of social service. These criminal acts occur daily and result in serious damage to public and private property as well as cause a great number of deaths among innocent victims, including many women and children. Some specific instances are:

#### Acts of terrorism:

The assassination of Mr. Tran-phuoc-Thanh, a civilian official by a band of armed Vietcong on the night of October 7, 1963, at Khanh-Hoi hamlet (Kien-Hoa Province). A written sentence of death was pinned to the victim's body.

The assassination by some 20 Vietcong of Mr. Ngo-Tien, aged 58, a councilor of Phu-Hai hamlet (Thua-Thien Province) at about 8 p.m. on January 19, 1964, 400 yards from his house. A bill of Communist indictment was also discovered on the victim's body.

The assassination of Mrs. Hoang-thi-Con and her 9-year-old daughter Truong-thi-Loi on the night of March 17-18, 1964, at Bach-Loc hamlet in the Trung-Luong district of Quang-Tri Province (demilitarized zone). The Vietcong had hacked the victims to death with knives.

Mr. Nguyen-Phuoc-Dang from Phu-Thuan village in the Binh-Dai district of Kien-Hoa Province was decapitated by the Vietcong on the night of October 1-2, 1963. A written sentence of death was likewise pinned to the victim's body.

#### Acts of sabotage:

On April 27, 1963, the UNESCO Basic Education Center at Tan-An in Long-An Province was attacked.

On April 21, 1964, the maternity clinic of Long-Hoa Village in Long-An Province was destroyed and the medical supplies plundered.

On May 3, 1964, a civilian bus was blown up by a mine on the road between Nhon-Hoa in Kien-Tuong Province. Fourteen persons, among them 2 children, were killed and 11 persons including 4 children were injured.

On March 22, 1964, a bus operated by the Hiep-Huu Co., hit an electrically detonated Vietcong mine on the road between Tan-Tru and Long-An. A total of 22 passengers were killed, among whom were 1 pregnant woman and 6 children between the ages of 2 and 5.

So thorough is the Vietcong terror planning that no part of the social structure is passed by. A report by the World Confederation of Organizations of Teaching Professions compiled the following statistics:

During 1962, 636 schools were destroyed, 250 teachers were kidnaped, and 30 were killed. This tactic of destruction of the educational system by elimination of the educators is continuing in an accelerated form today.

As in Korea, the Communists are now making reckless and wholesale violations of the provisions of the Geneva Convention. The Vietcong have clearly and flagrantly violated the following articles of the convention:

First. Article 13: Prisoners must at all times be humanely treated.

Second. Article 16: Prisoners must be treated without regard for political or other such factors.

Third. Article 120: The death of any prisoner, his identity, and the location of his grave must be reported to neutral authorities.

Fourth. Article 130: That willful killing or torture of prisoners, among other things, shall be considered grave breaches of the Convention.

The Communists' propaganda emanating from Moscow, Peiping, or Hanoi, all claim that they are reaching the perfection of our civilization and adhere to the principles of the Geneva Convention. If this is to be taken at face value by their followers and only savages commit atrocities, then these same followers must face the reality that the facts indicate a common dedication to wholesale brutality is part of the Communist system. It, therefore, can only be concluded that the violations occur on such a scale as to indicate that they reflect a conscious policy of Communist governments and their so-called perfect civilization.

No Communist has ever disavowed or is allowed to disavow Marx or Lenin. Their teachings on conscience and morality are consistent with their activities in South Vietnam. Karl Marx said:

Social existence of men; that is, the economic class to which they belong, determines their consciousness.

As to morality, Lenin said:

We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all fables about morality; at the basis of Communist morality lies the struggle for the consolidation and consummation of communism.

Modern interpretations of Lenin's teachings on morality are as follows:

The basis of Communist morality, Lenin taught, is the struggle for strengthening and achieving communism. For the Soviet people everything is moral that serves the victory of the Communist order.

This is a clear indication that the Communists reject universally accepted moral values.

The forces against which we fight today in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic all owe allegiance to a single political movement known as world communism.

That the atrocities being committed is due to a conscious policy is suggested by the following facts which follow the same pattern as we knew it in Korea:

Mass executions of civilians which include women and children, carried out under the authority of the North Vietnamese political officers and security agents.

Prisoners are subjected to political jargon, preaching hatred and violence, prior to being executed in cold blood.

In addition, we cannot ignore the following facts: That the top officials in the North Vietnamese Army and Government were largely trained in the Soviet Union and Communist China.

That Communist Chinese cadres and advisers are directing the operation.

That Soviet Russian troops in the thousands are present in North Vietnam. They are headed by Lieutenant General Sherbakov, Russian Ambassador to North Vietnam. This Russian is a guerilla warfare expert. He headed Russian partisan units in the Ukraine dur-

ing World War II. He recently left from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. There he headed the National Liberation Movement Branch. He has earned the nickname, "The Assassin."

These facts indicate a common dedication to a system which encourages and practices brutality and terror as a basic instrument of policy. These acts are perpetrated by an authority which has a close bond with the Soviet Union and Communist China. Their actions reveal a vast, systematic, and deliberate assault upon universally accepted standards of conduct and morality. They are criminal activities which offend civilized conscience and attack those basic tenets which we consider essential to freedom and the survival of all civilization.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for an objective, systematic exposure of Communist atrocities in Vietnam. The American people are entitled to have the full facts on these atrocities so that they may be completely aware of the nature of Communist aggression in Vietnam. In my judgment Congress is the proper arm of Government to undertake this objective and systematic exposure of truth.

To that end I have written a letter to the able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, urging him through his committee to undertake this inquiry. A copy of my letter to Chairman RIVERS dated June 8, 1965, and copy of the letter of response by Chairman RIVERS follows:

JUNE 8, 1965.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While the United States is committed to defense of human dignity and freedom in Vietnam, a situation has come to my attention that makes civilized men react with anger, disgust, and almost disbelief at the extent and manner of atrocities being committed by the Communists in Vietnam.

It is my hope that your committee will make a full and complete study and investigation of atrocities committed by the Communists in South Vietnam, particularly with respect to: (1) Atrocities committed against U.S. military and civilian personnel in Vietnam and Laos; (2) atrocities committed against Vietnamese military and civilian personnel; (3) the policies and practices of the Communists to determine whether or not this practice is an instrument of conscious policy; (4) whether these terroristic policies are also being applied to other countries and people of the world as a deliberate technique to further Communist expansion.

I am convinced that an investigation of this type will go a long way toward tipping the scale of justice and truth in our favor and thus bring more solid support for President Johnson's firm stand in Vietnam. Knowing your strong feelings about getting the truth before our people, I have brought this matter to your attention because I am confident you will take the required action.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1965.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FEIGHAN: I appreciate very much your letter of June 8, 1965, concerning the CXI—868

atrocities that have been committed by the Communists in South Vietnam.

As you may know, we have a special subcommittee that left for South Vietnam on Thursday, June 10, and I hope that they will receive full information with respect to some of the points raised in your letter.

In the meantime, I am writing to the Secretary of the Defense and asking the Department to be prepared to brief the full committee concerning these atrocities that have been committed by the Vietcong in South Vietnam. I agree that a full disclosure of these facts might do much to bring about more solid support for President Johnson's stand in South Vietnam.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
Chairman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to my very able and distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who has fought longer and harder against communism in all of its phases than my distinguished friend from Ohio. He has never let up in his attack upon that which is a menace to freedom.

Will the gentleman inform me, the Communists who are fighting in Asia now, are they respecting any of the rules of war?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would say no, they certainly are not conforming to the Articles of the Geneva Convention which I have just outlined.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I remember as a boy reading American history, and it would make one's blood run cold, about the early days of America when the Indians would come in and find some of the settlers, their wives and children, scalp them and kill them. Am I to understand that that is about what is happening over in Asia today?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The atrocities being committed by the Communists in South Vietnam are much more horrible than those that were committed by the persons to whom the gentleman has just referred.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I saw a photograph, I think it was today or yesterday in one of the Washington newspapers of a soldier crying; he had just found that his wife and his children had been killed, murdered, while he was off fighting. Did the gentleman happen to see that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I did not see that particular one, but I have seen many similar photographs.

There was one, particularly, in the recent issue of Time magazine, showing a man lying on the ground with his head decapitated about 5 or 6 inches from his neck, which represents a typical example of the terrorism and atrocities which are being, unfortunately, committed by the Communist Vietcong.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I take it that all that the gentleman has told us in his talk today is well documented—the incidents which the gentleman has given of these atrocities in his talk today, all of that has been well proven?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is no question about it; yes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course the only thing that we Americans are interested in is peace—peace with security, peace with honor, peace with freedom. But until we reach that objective certainly we must keep our eyes open and we must not hide from our countrymen and from ourselves the atrocities that are being committed by the enemy which we are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio on his remarks today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much for his contribution. I share with all the Members of the House the high esteem for our colleague whose knowledge of and experience in world affairs stands as a bulwark of strength in the House.

#### TO CONSERVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE, WE SHOULD ASK THE UNITED NATIONS TO CALL A CONFERENCE AND UNDERTAKE AN ACTION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Concurrent Resolution 440 expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State shall take steps to convene an international conference under the United Nations to further the worldwide conservation of wildlife.

I am pleased to state that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH, will soon introduce a similar resolution for an international wildlife conservation conference in the other body.

Such a conference is greatly needed to help revoke the sentence of doom that man has pronounced on some 250 species of animals and birds. Some of the most famous and interesting creatures the world has produced during millions of years of evolution will be wiped out in our lifetimes, unless we act to save them.

Man—

Said Mark Twain—

is the only animal that blushes or needs to.

Surely, we cannot look at the list of the 200 creatures already exterminated by man or the names of those earmarked for destruction without a sense of sorrow and shame.

#### MANY FAMOUS ANIMALS ARE THREATENED

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has recently published lists of rare mammals and rare birds. A relative handful among these rare creatures are safe because small but adequate breeding stocks are under continuing protection.

But the others are threatened with obliteration. There are many familiar names on the list: the orangutan, the mountain gorilla, the blue whale—the world's largest animal—the polar bear, the giant panda, several species of tiger, several species of rhinoceros, the pigmy

hippo, and many more. Last July, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listed 50 birds and mammals in the United States that are threatened with extinction. The whooping crane and the ivory-billed woodpecker, the grizzly bear, and the bighorn sheep were among those on the list.

But it is in Africa, known throughout history for the marvelous abundance and variety of its wildlife, that the threat is most acute.

Even animals which now exist by the thousands are doomed if man continues his present practices. Fabulous abundance by itself will not suffice to save a species. Great flights of passenger pigeons once darkened the sky over America. Yet by 1907, the last free passenger pigeon had been shot and 7 years later the last forlorn survivor of a species that had numbered in the billions expired in a Cincinnati zoo.

A similar fate seems in store for the leopard. The demand for leopard skins to supply the fad for leopard skin coats has brought a hoard of profit-seeking poachers into Africa. The leopard is ominously reduced in numbers and may be wiped out in a few years unless something is done to stop the slaughter. According to recent reports, the leopard population in Kenya is so low that Kenya has been importing leopard skins from Bechuanaland to allow sales to tourists.

Many of the famous animals of Africa which still roam the continent in huge herds are on the slippery downslope to oblivion.

These animals can be saved, as we in the United States showed when we came to our senses at the last moment and rescued the American buffalo. In 1900, only 541 buffalo were left of the millions that had lived on our Western Plains. Under a system of protection, substantial herds have again built up.

**CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS ARE WORKING TO SAVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE**

A valiant and dedicated band of private citizens and organizations is working to save endangered species and to promote sound wildlife conservation practices throughout the world.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources is one of the leading organizations in this effort. Its membership includes the Governments of Belgium, Cambodia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malagasy Republic, Malaya, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Senegal, the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Zambia, Venezuela, and South Vietnam, and more than 240 organizations throughout the world.

A small professional staff collects and distributes information on wildlife preservation. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources Survival Service Commission catalogs threatened species in its red book. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources studies have been the basis for action to save wild animals native to the Middle East and southern Asia and have led to the foundation of a group to pre-

serve the remarkable animals of the Galapagos Islands.

With aid from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has made country-by-country surveys of the status of nature protection in many parts of the world. In eight general assemblies of its members, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has focused attention on important world conservation needs.

The World Wildlife Fund, International is the sponsoring organization for national fundraising groups in six countries: the United States, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria.

Among the projects to which the World Wildlife Fund has contributed are the establishment of the Charles Darwin Research Foundation to preserve the giant tortoise, the penguin, the flightless cormorant, the flamingo, and the fur seal; an expedition to take into captivity a breeding stock of the Arabian oryx, a type of antelope; purchase of part of the famous Marismas at the mouth of the Guadalquivir in Spain to save the most important marshland wilderness in Europe; and the return of 28 Hawaiian geese, bred by the Wildfowl Trust in England, to a national park on Maui Island from which they disappeared some years ago.

The African Wildlife Leadership Foundation of Washington has devoted itself to the training of Africans in conservation and wildlife management. It has paid for the education of a number of African students studying conservation in American colleges and universities. Perez Malande Olindo, the first graduate in this scholarship program, has returned to his native Kenya and assumed the post of Deputy Director of Kenya National Parks. The foundation started and is supporting the first school in Africa to train middle and top level African conservationists, the College of African Wildlife Management at Mweka, Tanzania. The success of the college at Mweka has led to plans for a similar institution in West Africa.

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations has set up an office of wildlife management in Rome. It will provide limited technical assistance to developing countries in the use and protection of their wildlife resources.

UNESCO is also providing some aid in promoting training of scientists and in supporting technical assistance and research.

Other noteworthy international conservation organizations include the Conservation Foundation, the International Council for Bird Preservation, the Fauna Preservation Society, the American Committee for International Wildlife Protection, and the International Wildfowl Research Bureau.

Many other organizations whose activities are largely confined to a single country or region make important contributions to international conservation, such as National Wildlife Federation and

the Wildlife Management Institute in the United States and the Canadian Wildlife Federation.

**BUT THESE CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS NEED GOVERNMENTAL HELP**

Despite these many organizations and their utmost efforts, the need for international conservation measures far exceeds the resources of these groups. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—and other existing agencies are not capable of meeting the problem without much greater aid. The IUCN operates on an annual budget of about \$100,000. The African Wildlife Leadership Foundation has been able to spend only about \$80,000 a year for the last 3 years in its efforts to meet the enormous need for Africans trained in conservation.

Only a relative handful of the governments of the world, and only two major nations—West Germany and Italy—are fully involved in the conservation efforts of the IUCN.

The participation of the governments of the world is urgently needed. They control the conservation programs within their own borders. The governments of the developed nations have the experts and technicians, the information and experience that can be crucial to the programs of the developing nations. Governments control imports and exports. And they can provide the quite modest sums that are required to reap the great benefits of conservation and to avert the loss of world assets that are literally priceless.

House Concurrent Resolution 440 seeks an international conference called by the United Nations which would draw all world governments into a cooperative effort to conserve the world's wildlife. The survival of a species is in the common interest of men everywhere, and the activities of their governments should reflect this truth.

House Concurrent Resolution 440 proposes that the conference consider action in three major areas.

First. International trade in wildlife and its products must be controlled.

The United Nations conference should consider joint action by all countries to control international trade in wildlife and its products, especially rare or endangered species.

A large part of the threat to wildlife stems from deliberate killing to provide ivory, horn, skins, pelts, and other animal products for export.

Elephants are being killed for ivory for chessmen and billiard balls. Rhinoceroses are being slaughtered so their horns can be cut off, ground into powder and peddled in the Orient where the powder is believed to be an aphrodisiac. The tails of wildebeest and giraffes are in demand as fly swatters. Fashion fads have created a booming demand for leopard skins to clothe the fashionable ladies of America and Europe.

Only a fraction of the demand for these products can be satisfied within legal limits, even though the laws are unfortunately lax in some of the countries. The remainder is met by a well

organized and highly profitable system of poaching.

Entrepreneurs from the developed nations, where most of the demand for wild animal products originates, descend upon the African bush in a search of quick profits. Typically, this type of white hunter hunts nothing more than an African or Asian middleman who in turn easily finds natives willing to poach for a paltry share of the profits. The African poacher runs no great risk anyway, for he is hard to catch and when caught faces very little real punishment. The authorities tend toward the view that he is doing what comes naturally. If they try to impose punishment at all, fines are virtually impossible since few natives have any money. A jail sentence is usually prized as a sort of paid vacation in which the government provides the food and lodging which are constantly struggled for in the bush.

So the native goes gladly about his poaching, with hair-raising cruelty. Wire loop snares are spread widely around the landscape, particularly at gaps in thorny barriers set up by the poachers. Wire of sufficient strength to hold even an elephant is cheap and readily available. One end is attached to a tree or a log. Zebras, wildebeests, antelopes, rhinos, and elephants are caught by the leg in these devices and suffer intense pain as their struggling causes the wire to cut deeply into their flesh. They die slowly in agony. The poachers visit the snares only infrequently, so as not to be troubled by arriving while the animals still live.

Arrows smeared with a poison that acts so slowly that the animal is subjected to long suffering are also much in favor among the poachers. Another weapon frequently used is the muzzle-loading gun, of which there are reportedly more than 100,000 in the hands of natives of Kenya and Zambia alone. These firearms, loaded with whatever miscellaneous hardware lies at hand, are fired into herds, maiming and wounding many animals. In some cases the wounded creatures may be more easily tracked and killed but often they die unnoticed in the bush. Of five rhinos caught recently by the Tanzania Game Department for transfer to a protected area, every one bore wounds inflicted by snares, arrows, or bullets.

Another poacher's device is the pitfall covered with branches and studded with pointed stakes. A lingering death awaits the animals falling into these pits, for they are seldom killed outright.

Sometimes the animals are used for meat which is shipped to nearby African towns by "bicycle boys." More often, only the horns, tusks, skins, or other wanted parts are removed and remains left to rot. Frequently, the animal blindly killed is not the one whose parts are currently in vogue and it is merely left where it fell. The illegal exports start their journey to America or Europe by long overland routes to places from which they may be exported without hindrance by tramp steamer or by air.

High profits for the poaching master are the rule in this grisly trade. For ex-

ample, the native poacher in East Africa will probably get about 7 to 10 shillings—98 cents to \$1.40—per pound for rhino horn which sells on the open market for 90 shillings—\$12.60. Much of the difference is pocketed by the white entrepreneur. Some of them have boasted of earnings of \$50,000 a year in their callously destructive undertaking.

The developing countries, with their limited resources, find it difficult to stop this illegal trade.

On the other hand, nations like the United States, with laws banning the importation of animal products illegally exported from their land of origin, find the laws virtually unenforceable since there is usually no way of telling whether a particular leopard skin or other animal part was exported legally or not.

International action to ban or limit imports of wild animal products would strike at the poachers' incentive to crime and put new difficulties in their way. But for import restrictions to be effective, they must be imposed by all importing countries.

It would be of little value to prevent the ladies of America from having leopard skin coats, for example, while their counterparts in England or Germany continued to buy them apace.

Joint actions by the developed and developing countries, which could be worked out at an international conference, could go a long way toward bringing the disastrous poaching of wildlife to an end.

Second. The economic value of wildlife must be demonstrated and developed.

The international conference should consider joint study by the developing and developed countries to demonstrate how wildlife conservation and management can increase tourist revenues for developing countries and increase their food production.

Wildlife is threatened by man's expansion into animals' habitats even more than by poaching.

The developing countries are bent on building modern nations. Their populations are growing rapidly. This adds up to great pressures to expand the areas available for agriculture and pasturage, for industry and hydroelectric projects. As man moves onto the land and transforms it for his own uses, the wild animals are left without food and hiding places.

African settlers of these lands regard the wild animals as threats to the safety of their domestic animals, crops, and villages. The nomadic tribesmen who drive great herds of scrubby cattle, which they use as money and measures of prestige as well as for food, look on wild animals as competitors for grazing land. Because modern veterinary practices have resulted in a vast increase in the number of sheep, goats, and cattle, the competition for pasturage is becoming more and more acute. Herds of Masai cattle have even invaded wildlife reserves and parks, causing untold damage to habitats.

Many Africans are inclined to conclude that wild animals stand in the way of progress.

This is not so. The cases of direct conflict between man's interest in developing the country and the conservation of wildlife are few. To the contrary, a sound program of conservation and recognition of wildlife as an important natural resource can aid significantly in the development of the emerging nations. The African is a realist. In the long run, conservation of wildlife can succeed only if its economic benefit can be shown.

Wildlife can produce a significant amount of foreign exchange earnings for developing nations. With proper game management, the developing countries can have a continuing supply of animal products to sell in world markets.

As urbanization and industrialization continue in Europe and North America, more and more people will want to enjoy a facility such as the Treetops in Kenya where visitors can spend a night in a tree shelter with the certainty of seeing a wide variety of wild animals going their way unaware of human presence. Incomes in Europe and America are going up and the cost of air travel is declining, so that trips to Africa will be within the reach of more people.

Already revenue from tourism is an important source of foreign exchange for some of the nations of east Africa. If the developing nations protect and use their wildlife resources wisely, this source of income can grow.

But they need the assistance of the developed nations in taking advantage of their opportunity. They need help in building roads and hotels and restaurants and other tourist facilities, and in creating a strong park system complete with films, guides, lectures, and information bureaus in the manner of our own national parks.

Through a sound program of game cropping, wildlife can be the best source of much-needed meat on much of Africa's land.

Undoubtedly, in some areas long roamed by wildlife, the animals will have to give way to settled agriculture. But large parts of Africa, particularly in the semiarid savanna belts, are not suitable for permanent cultivation or even continual grazing by domestic animals.

Attempts at farming run the risk that the land may deteriorate into desert when the covering vegetation is stripped off. Domestic animals tend to overgraze and trample the land. The former pattern of absorption of rainfall, subsoil percolation and year-round streamflow is supplanted by quick runoffs, flash floods, and reduced dry seasons stream flows. Parts of Africa are already suffering from this sort of deterioration of the environment as a result of unwise use of the land.

Wild animals can live off the same land without ruining it because they are perfectly adapted to the environment. Over centuries, nature has created animals to eat practically all of the different types of plants and leaves in a habitat. It is not unusual to find 20 or more herbivores, ranging from the 11 pound dik dik to the 5-ton elephant, inhabiting the same area and using it fully, but not harmfully.

The advantages of depending upon game ranching are also very great in areas where use of cattle or other domestic animals is barred by the presence of disease and pests.

Experts estimate that game ranching can produce much more meat per acre in many parts of Africa than domestic animals. The crops of domestic livestock, mostly cattle, on east African savanna are under 16,000 pounds per square mile. For wild animals, the figures are between 66,000 and 90,000 pounds.

Even though there is wide agreement that game ranching is a land use superior to agriculture or domestic livestock ranching on much land in Africa, the developing countries need aid in establishing sound programs to use their great resource.

A scientific program of game cropping must be devised. Systems for meat inspection, processing, and marketing must be set up. Market research is needed to determine what meats can be sold and at what prices.

Developed nations can help the developing nations in Africa and elsewhere to make the best possible use of their animal and fish resources.

An international conference, in which the governments of the world are represented at policymaking levels, can lead to the actions to develop the economic potential of wildlife which can be crucial in preventing the extermination of species.

Third. The developing countries need help in developing conservation programs.

The conference should consider increased assistance by the developed countries, either unilaterally or multilaterally through the United Nations or other international agencies, to establish and improve training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists, establish conservation departments in the developing countries, prepare model conservation laws, and give other assistance in establishing national or regional conservation programs.

There is a tremendous need for persons trained in wildlife conservation and management throughout the developing world. In the past, conservation and natural resource management have not been attractive fields for the citizens of the developing countries who have been fortunate enough to get high school and college training.

Most Africans employed in conservation programs have been at the lower levels, as scouts and rangers. With the pressure for Africanization of government posts, there is an urgent need for Africans trained to take middle- and top-level posts. The College of African Wildlife Management, which I mentioned earlier, is an excellent beginning. Besides the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, it has received support from the Governments of Tanzania, the United Kingdom, Germany, and the United States through the Agency for International Development, and from the American Appeal of the World Wildlife Fund and the Zoological Society, of Frankfurt, Germany.

The college will graduate 18 from the senior class in June and 32 from the junior class in September.

But this institution needs more money and equipment and teaching help to expand its enrollment and offer a stronger curriculum. Other similar colleges of wildlife management and the offering of conservation courses in existing institutions such as the University of East Africa, at Nairobi, are also required to meet the need for African conservationists.

#### THE REASONS FOR CONSERVING OUR WILDLIFE HERITAGE

One must acknowledge that many species have no significant economic value. Why, then, are they worth preserving?

We are the beneficiaries of the extraordinary richness of nature. We enjoy animals—by watching them free in their natural state or brought together for us in zoos. The exalted place that animals have in the world of children is evident from the stories that youngsters love best. Interest in the animals that cohabit the earth with us is simply part of our being. We diminish ourselves when we destroy species that can never be restored. Let us stop to imagine what it would be like if our grandchildren or great grandchildren have to ask: "What was a bear, what was a leopard?"

I hope we shall all take the words of King George VI to heart:

Wildlife today is not ours to dispose of as we please. We hold it in trust and must account for it to those who come after.

#### THERE IS GROWING RECOGNITION OF THE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 440 is similar to House Concurrent Resolution 107, 88th Congress, which I introduced on March 4, 1963.

The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] also introduced a similar resolution in the 88th Congress, Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, submitted on October 3, 1963.

The need for an international conference was great then. It has become even more acute since. In the intervening 2 years, support has been growing for effective measures to protect the threatened wildlife of the world, and for an international conference for that purpose.

President Kennedy, in his memorable speech to the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations on September 20, 1963, said:

A worldwide program of conservation [that] could protect the forest and wild game preserves now in danger of extinction for all time.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall fully recognizes the seriousness of the threat to the world's wildlife. He has been expanding the U.S. efforts in international conservation. He was the leader of a substantial U.S. delegation to the Eighth General Assembly of the IUCN at Nairobi, Kenya, in September 1963.

The Agency for International Development, recognizing the economic potential of wildlife, has approved grants of \$230,000 for the College of African Wildlife Management within the past 2 years.

The IUCN at Nairobi in 1963 adopted the following resolutions:

#### RESOLUTION ON A WORLD CONFERENCE ON THE SURVIVAL OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION

Whereas many animal and plant species and subspecies are at present threatened with extinction, the Eighth General Assembly of IUCN meeting at Nairobi, in 1963 recommends that IUCN through its Survival Service Commission in collaboration with the World Wildlife Fund, the International Council for Bird Preservation, the Fauna Preservation Society, the International Union of Directors of Zoological Gardens, Directors of Botanical Gardens, and other appropriate organizations, should call for a conference in 1965, to review the status of such animals and plants and to consider the general and particular steps to be taken to save them from extinction and to prevent other species and subspecies from becoming so threatened.

#### RESOLUTION ON ILLEGAL TRAFFIC IN WILDLIFE SPECIES

Whereas many rare and vanishing species of wildlife are threatened with early extinction through illegal export from their native land and whereas such illegal export would be much less frequent if import into other countries were prohibited; recalling resolution 2.213 adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 12th session and resolution 1931 (XVII) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its 17th session concerning economic development and conservation of natural resources, flora and fauna, the 8th General Assembly of IUCN meeting at Nairobi in 1963 recommends that the practical and political problems involved in illegal export be studied and that an international convention on regulations of export, transit and import of rare or threatened wildlife species or their skins and trophies be drafted and submitted for the approval of governments by the appropriate international organizations possibly on the occasion of a worldwide conference convened for that purpose.

In addition, the IUCN adopted a resolution inviting "all Governments to participate actively in the conservation of the World's Natural Resources."

Expressions of support for an international conference on wildlife conservation have been made by such leading conservationists as Judge Russell Train, president of the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation; Peter Scott, first vice president and chairman of the World Wildlife Fund, International; His Royal Highness Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, president of the World Wildlife Fund; Lee S. Crandall, general curator emeritus, American Committee for International Wild Life Protection; Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute; Samuel H. Ordway, Jr., president of the Conservation Foundation; and S. Dillon Ripley, president of the International Council for Bird Preservation.

According to plans laid by Peter Scott, first vice president of the World Wildlife Fund, an expert study group comprised of representatives of the Survival Service Commission of the IUCN, the World Wildlife Fund, the International Council for Bird Preservation and the Fauna Preservation Society, will meet in London within the next few months to draw detailed plans for a conference agenda.

Secretary Udall, responding to Scott's initiative, wrote:

Your proposal is especially timely. I am heartily in accord with it and shall be pleased to work with you to make it a reality. [W]e will be glad to have representatives of this Department attend if you think it desirable.

LEADERS OF DEVELOPING NATIONS WELCOME  
WORLD COOPERATION IN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Backing for effective measures for international cooperation in conserving wildlife is coming not only from the conservation groups and leaders like Secretary Udall. The need for a world effort is recognized also by many of the leaders of the developing nations of Africa and Asia.

As early as September 1961, the Government of Tanganyika issued the Arusha Manifesto in which it promised to conserve the Nation's wildlife resources for future generations.

THE ARUSHA MANIFESTO

The survival of our wildlife is a matter of grave concern to all of us in Africa. These wild creatures amid the wild places they inhabit are not only important as a source of wonder and inspiration but are an integral part of our natural resources and of our future livelihood and well-being.

In accepting the trusteeship of our wildlife we solemnly declare that we will do everything in our power to make sure that our children's grandchildren will be able to enjoy this rich and precious inheritance.

The conservation of wildlife and wild places calls for specialist knowledge, trained manpower, and money, and we look to other nations to cooperate in this important task—the success or failure of which not only affects the Continent of Africa but the rest of the world as well.

J. K. NYERERE,  
*Prime Minister.*  
A. S. FUNDIKIRA,  
*Minister, Legal Affairs.*  
T. S. TEWA,  
*Minister, Lands and Surveys.*

Two years later, in 1963, the Government of Kenya also issued a manifesto pledging its best efforts in conserving wildlife and inviting world assistance:

The natural resources of this country—its wildlife which offers such an attraction to visitors from all over the world, the beautiful places in which these animals live, the mighty forests which guard the water catchment areas so vital to the survival of man and beast—are a priceless heritage for the future.

The Government of Kenya, fully realizing the value of its natural resources, pledges itself to conserve them for posterity with all means at its disposal.

We are confident of the cooperation of the other Government of East Africa in this important task but, at present, we are unable, unaided, to provide the specialist staff and money which are necessary. We therefore invite other nations, and lovers of nature throughout the world, to assist us in honoring this solemn pledge.

JOMO KENYATTA,  
*Prime Minister.*  
L. G. SAGINI,  
*Minister for Natural Resources.*  
R. ACHLENG OKEKO,  
*Minister for Information, Broadcasting, and Tourism.*

The representatives of 28 African nations meeting at Lagos, Nigeria, in August 1964, at the International Conference on the Organization of Research and Training in Africa in Relation to the

Study, Conservation, and Utilization of Natural Resources made recommendations which likewise evidenced an understanding of the need for wildlife conservation. Both the U.S. Interior Department and the United Nations Special Fund have had numerous inquiries from African nations about the possibility for greatly increased technical assistance in conservation programs.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is very great and very widespread interest in an international United Nations conference to bring the world's governments more fully and more effectively into the cause of world wildlife conservation.

By taking the leadership, the United States can make a decisive contribution to the preservation of the world's wildlife, under the auspices of the United Nations.

The 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nation's founding at San Francisco later this month would be a good time and place to start.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 440 follows:

Whereas it is in the common interest of mankind to preserve the world's wildlife; and

Whereas the United States and other countries have an obligation, pursuant to international agreements, such as the migratory bird treaties and the Inter-American Treaty on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation, 1940, to conserve and protect the species of wildlife; and

Whereas more effective international measures for the protection of wildlife are urgently needed; and

Whereas nearly two hundred fifty species of wildlife are in danger of becoming extinct; and

Whereas many other species of wildlife are being dangerously reduced in numbers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States shall promote the worldwide conservation of wildlife, particularly of species that are rare or threatened with extinction and that the United States, through the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall take all necessary steps to convene an International Conference on the Conservation of Wildlife under the sponsorship of the United Nations.

SEC. 2. The following countries should participate in such a conference:

(a) Those developed countries, including, but not limited to, the member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, whose citizens furnish much of the demand for animals, fish, furs, skins, pelts, tusks, feathers, or other parts of wildlife; and

(b) Those developing countries in which the major wildlife habitats of the world exist, including, but not limited to, the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior should cooperate with such international organizations as the Survival Service Commission of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, the World Wildlife Fund, the International Council for Bird Preservation, the Fauna Preservation Society, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in developing an agenda which includes:

(a) Action by each country to control international trade in wildlife and its products, especially rare or endangered species,

(b) Studies by the developed and developing countries to determine how wildlife conservation and management in the latter can increase their production of food, make optimum use of marginal lands, and increase tourist revenues; and

(c) Assistance by developed countries to developing countries, either unilaterally or multilaterally through the United Nations or other international agencies, to establish or improve training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists, to establish conservation departments in the developing countries, to prepare model wildlife conservation laws and regulations, and to carry out needed world conservation programs.

SEC. 4. As used herein, the term "wildlife" means wild mammals, wild birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, mollusks, crustacea, and all other classes of wild animals.

DEVELOPMENT OF GIANT RETAILING ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most striking changes in our economy in the years since World War I has been the development of giant retailing enterprises. In the early decades of the century, it seemed possible that the producing units by their very size would come to dominate the whole of their particular fields. It was this fear, for example, that led to the antitrust proceeding against the major packers in 1920 and the entry of the consent decree that barred them from broadening their activities and becoming masters of the entire process of food distribution. Since the entry of that decree, however, the picture has changed. For a variety of reasons the small merchant has tended to disappear and be replaced by the great retail chains—selling food and drugs and even operating department stores in large groups. The pressures once exerted by the producer on the retailer are now exerted by the retailer on his producer-supplier. We hear a great deal of talk about protecting the consumer. Our laws can do this if fairly applied.

With all these changes, we remain devoted to the principle of keeping economic power as fairly distributed as possible and of preventing the growth of monopoly. We did not want the producers to devour the retailers over a generation ago; and we do not want the producers devoured by the retailers now.

On the surface there may appear to be some advantages in having an economy integrated from the field to the store counter, but they are more than offset by the dangers of having economic power held and exercised by a few hands. The concentration of such power is contrary to our traditional view of what is desirable in our society generally. This has been both in theory and fact a social and economic order with many competing powers. Our aim in much of our legislation has been to maintain those delicate balances which insure a relatively large degree of independence and personal freedom within our already highly organized society. The antitrust laws, of course, have been well-recognized

legislation of this sort. They have been useful and have served well over the years. In the present circumstances, where producers and processors, especially of food, seem about to be overborne by the retail distributors, and the threat of an agricultural economy integrated and managed by a few retail chains has become very real, some changes in the antitrust laws may be called for.

I am, accordingly, introducing two bills today. One is an amendment to the antitrust laws, the text of which follows:

Chapter 1 of title 15 is amended by adding a new section to be numbered section 14(a) and to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to market a commodity which has moved in commerce and is supplied him by more than one producer in such a way as to injure any such producer, either by discriminating between such producers in the pricing of their commodity for resale, or in any other way, where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition between producers of such commodity or to eliminate one or more of the producers of such commodity; provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials in prices which make only due allowance for differences in the delivered costs of the commodity supplied by different producers.

"For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to have been supplied the commodity by two or more producers when he engages in the sale of a commodity produced by him, either directly or indirectly, and such commodity is supplied him by any other producer; and where such a person is a producer and supplies himself, the cost of such commodity supplied himself shall include a reasonable markup over the delivered cost of the commodity."

The other is an amendment to the Lanham Act regulating trademarks, the text of which follows:

Section 1064 is amended by changing the period at the end of subsection (d) to a semicolon; by adding the word "or" immediately thereafter; and by adding a new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Or at any time upon a finding that the mark has been, or is being, used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States."

Section 1064 of title 15 is further amended by amending the proviso clause to read as follows: "Provided, That the Federal Trade Commission may apply to cancel on the grounds specified in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section any mark registered on the principal register established by this chapter and the prescribed fee shall not be required."

Mr. Speaker, taken together these amendments should, in my opinion, offer effective protection to many producers and processors whose independence has been increasingly threatened by the growing power of the great retail distributors.

The amendment to the antitrust laws would make it unlawful for a person marketing a product supplied from a number of sources to market it in such a way as to discriminate between the various suppliers in the pricing of the product for resale, or in any other way, with the effect of destroying the market position of the individual suppliers and eventually their economic independence.

The amendment to the Lanham Act would make the use of a trademark in

conjunction with other marketing practices which tend to create a restraint of trade or constitute an unfair method of competition a ground for its cancellation. The act presently provides that a defendant in an action for infringement may defend by showing that the mark has been, or is being, used to violate the antitrust laws. The proposed amendment would be more effective, I believe, than this provision in deterring the owners of important and valuable trademarks from engaging in violations of the antitrust laws. Section 14 already provides for cancellation in certain circumstances so the remedy proposed by my amendment is in accordance with tradition in this area of the law.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD following the special order of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

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

There was no objection.

#### TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET OCCUPATION OF THE BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in observing and discussing the 25th anniversary of the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union.

Mass deportations, suppression of basic rights, and Russification has been imposed on the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. And yet, regrettably, large segments of the world are unaware that this has even taken place. Indifference to their plight extends to much of the free world. Thus, they are forgotten people to too many.

Nevertheless, they refuse to be made over in a single generation, or in several generations. Despite enormous handicaps, sparks of culture, language and religion are maintained. Americans of Baltic background, and the U.S. Congress itself, are helping to preserve the sparks. In this, we find some comfort in the historical fact that roots of nationalism run deep, and that dedicated peoples can rise again after decades and centuries of suppression.

Regardless of the sober realities which show no change in the Baltic States from year to year, we must continue to speak for the right of self-determination there as well as in Eastern Europe and, indeed, in the world. We must help in-

form the world that alien rule has been imposed on independent people.

This is more than practical politics, or good politics. It is a matter of international morality and law.

Some would seemingly prefer to forget this brutal example of Soviet colonial policy. Some would like to forget about it, or to ignore it, perhaps out of a feeling that "we should not be beastly" to the Russians, perhaps out of a feeling that the Baltic nations are irreversibly lost.

I believe we can reject both the view of violent liberation and the view of political realism that holds that Soviet Russia's old conquests should be accepted as irrevocable and no longer worthy of discussion.

Admittedly, the conditions of change which are from time to time emerging in Eastern Europe cannot easily penetrate the Baltic nations. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been absorbed by Russia, unlike their Polish neighbors, for example.

I do not feel it is our prerogative to ever dice away the hopes of human beings for freedom. While we can negotiate with Russia, while we can and should reduce tensions, there is no need to acknowledge the irrevocability of her occupation.

We can pursue our national policy of independence for all nations by enlarging our contacts with the people of Eastern Europe—almost all of whom are attracted to the West, and by refusing to forget that there are captive nations.

Moreover, it would be inconsistent, to say the least, to call for self-determination in Asia and Africa and ignore self-determination for East Europeans who have often demonstrated a far greater capacity for self-rule. In other words, one's espousal of freedom should not vary inversely with the indecency and power of the captors.

We can preserve memories and lend encouragement until that day when all nations will be free nations. I am glad to participate in this observance and in this cause.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO XIV CON- FERENCE OF INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-American Bar Association during the period of May 22-29, 1965, held its XIV Conference at San Juan, P.R. In this connection, the Inter-American Bar Association, which is celebrating its 25th anniversary, was honored by House Concurrent Resolution 349 of the current Congress, which resolution welcomed the association and wished it outstanding success in accomplishing its purposes.

Our distinguished colleague, Mr. CLAUDE PEPPER, represented the Third District of Florida, is an outstanding lawyer and a member of the Inter-American Bar Association.

A magnificent address, which our colleague prepared for delivery at the Inter-American Bar Conference, has recently come to my attention. It urges the conference to establish a committee to make studies and recommendations as to how the Organization of American States might effectively, on the part of the free American nations, meet the threat of Communist military and subversive aggression. The wisdom of our colleague's recommendations to the conference is so apparent, and his message is so eloquently set forth that I bring them to the attention of all of our colleagues and give them the widest possible distribution.

The Honorable Presiding Officer, gracious host, and members of the Inter-American Bar Conference meeting in San Juan, you will please accept my profound regret that the pendency of the foreign aid bill before the House of Representatives Monday and Tuesday and other important legislative matters coming thereafter prevent Mrs. Pepper and me from being with you as we had so keenly anticipated.

The gracious hospitality of the host members of the Inter-American Bar Conference of Puerto Rico and the importance of the issues confronting the free nations of the Western Hemisphere at this time assure that this will be a delightful and at the same time a challenging conference of the Inter-American Bar Association.

All of us recall with a thrill the letter which the great patriot and liberator, Simon Bolivar, in 1815 wrote to an Englishman in Jamaica of his dream for the Americas:

"How beautiful it would be for the Isthmus of Panama to be for our nations what the Corinthian Isthmus was for the Greeks. Would to God that some day we might enjoy the happiness of having there an august congress of representatives of the republics, kingdoms, and empires of America to deal with the high interests of peace and of war with the nations of the other three parts of the world."

Simon Bolivar realized part of his dream when he convened the first Pan American Conference in 1824. This noble Bolivar dream became a more meaningful reality when a permanent inter-American organization was established in 1890 in Washington. Since 1890 the Organization of American States has become one of the great institutions of the world through 13 inter-American conferences and many less formal assemblies. The Organization of American States has become the voice of the free American nations bound together in fraternal accord and by sense of common interest and destiny, standing indissolubly together against any threat to their security and to their freedom. We are helping one another to make life healthier and richer and happier for all of our people. We now know if we continue to work together and to stand firmly together against those sinister forces who would rob us both of our freedom and of a chance to realize our high hope, that the ancient dream of the good life shall become the common enjoyment of all free Americans.

Yet today, as we stand upon the threshold of our greatest victories of human ills and limitations and danger to our security, we face our greatest danger to our liberties in the fullness of our lives. This danger is of the same character as that which threatened the restoration of foreign tyranny over the liberated American states who achieved their

freedom under the great Bolivar. But it takes a more subtle and a more sinister form today. External threats to overthrow the liberated American states could be resisted solely by navies and armies arresting the penetration of foreign military forces. Such defenses, while still effective against similar aggression, are no longer adequate to meet the subtle forms of Communist invasion by subversion which we have to face today. So the immediate and pressing challenge to all the free nations of the Americas at this hour is for the free American states to form the kind of a unity, an organization with all the necessary organs and entities required to resist military and subversive aggression.

This is a common problem for all the free nations of the Americas—not for any one state—for a threat to any American state is, of course, a grave danger to all and we must indeed stand together or risk failing separately.

Therefore, to this great organization of the members of the bar of the free American states, may I, as one of your members, urge you as leaders of the free Americas to set up a committee, if one does not exist, at this great conference to make an immediate study and recommendations as to how the Organization of American States may be strengthened so that it shall effectively meet the dangerous challenge of Communist military and subversive aggression with a common unity, a common effort, and a common purpose. Out of such a study may I respectfully suggest that you consider recommending the following:

1. An early Inter-American conference to discuss any necessary reorganization of the Organization of American States and any necessary amendments to the charter;

2. That the Organization of American States shall have a continuing Council which will be a constant organ of consultation and recommendations for necessary or desired action of the member states in respect to all matters pertaining to the progress and the security of such states; and such Council shall be the instrument of the Organization of American States for the peaceful settlement of disputes between or among member states and in the direction of the peace-keeping forces of the Organization of American States wherever danger to a member state appears.

3. At least semiannually the Foreign Ministers of the member states shall meet to discuss the purpose and the interest of the member states;

4. An Inter-American Court of Justice for the peaceful judicial settlement of disputes between or among the American states;

5. And most importantly of all the creation of an adequate ever-ready military force to protect the free American states or any member or members thereof against any external danger to the state or states threatened, whatever form such external aggression may take.

I believe we all agree that the Organization of American States faces its most supreme crisis—either it shall rise to the challenge of this crucial moment and master the danger and thereby build the enduring foundation for the realization of our hopes and dreams as we work and struggle together, or we shall fall apart into frustration and failure, tragically losing all that Simon Bolivar, and everyone who has followed in his illustrious footsteps, for one and one-half centuries put into the building of the noble edifice of the free and prosperous American states.

You and I know it is primarily the lawyer who is the architect of political institutions—let us as lawyers, in this critical moment, lead the way to a grand design of the American states so that we may achieve that for which Bolivar prayed—the happiness of having an effective organization of

the Republics of the Americas to deal with the high interests of peace and of war among ourselves and with other nations of the world.

#### TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in wholehearted support of the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs, convinced that its passage will answer a legislative need for a majority of our citizens.

Historically, this great Nation once was agrarian in nature, but has developed to the point where the city has taken its place as the focal point of our society. This trend has been reflected throughout the Western civilization as well.

Today, the majority of Americans live in cities and their suburbs. We have heard estimates—and some say they are conservative—that by the year 2000 more than 80 percent of what will be a 350 million population will live in large metropolitan concentrations.

This migration to cities has not developed without creating unique problems. Action on the highest possible level of government must be taken now, not only for correction but also for prevention of new problems which will be caused by this continuing growth and change within our society.

This is a vital problem, because the health of American society is linked directly with the well-being and progress of our cities and suburbs and the people who live in them.

Today, many of our cities and suburbs are in trouble, or are fast approaching such a state. In many places the corporate body that is the city is growing old. It is not keeping pace economically with its people in many places and with the suburban areas it serves and nurtures. In many urban areas transportation, sewage and utility systems are old and obsolete; housing is ravaged by age. These conditions create a plant—the city—which by most business standards is often too old and too overworked to be worth maintaining at today's costs.

The expense of municipal services is rising at an alarming rate. Local taxes this year are running about 140 percent higher than they were 15 years ago in many urban areas. And they are continuing to rise, Mr. Speaker. The burden on local government to meet the need for additional services grows daily. There is no end in sight. The growing complexity of living demands more services and increased dependence by individuals upon their municipal corporations. They need more and better schools, highways, hospitals, sewerage

and water facilities, more and better programs to house our urban population and improve our communities.

We must begin at once to give greater impetus to this program. We must solve the problem of how to help local communities, large and small, to meet their urgent needs today and to prevent even greater burdens which loom on the horizon.

The first step we must take is to create an executive department to represent our urban population. The voice of the city and suburban dweller and the expression of his needs must be heard at Cabinet level, so his problems can be considered at the proper level of government.

The existing agency—the Housing and Home Finance Agency—was created 18 years ago to coordinate two programs, the mortgage insurance program of the Federal Housing Administration and the program of Federal aid to local communities to provide public housing for low income families.

Since then, a vast new range of programs has been given to the Housing and Home Finance Agency to administer, for Congress has not failed altogether to recognize some of the problems of urbanization and has made provision to solve many of them. But it has ignored the pressing need for the best possible administration of some 40 Federal programs for community development that are now available to urban areas. We must take the reasonable and logical step toward more efficient administration of this complex program. We must establish a department, which because of the importance of its mission, will be heard in the highest councils of government.

The President has reminded us that we cannot define urbanization in terms of numbers alone. We are talking about more than geography and numbers—we are concerned with a way of life. We must remember that the social facts are as important and more so than the numerical definitions. These urban ways of living will be the subject of utmost concern to the new department that is proposed.

Let us not forget, however, that we are not dealing with the problems of the city dweller alone, but with the problems of American society itself.

Regretfully, this proposition has been before the Congress for the past 10 years, without positive result. During this decade of deliberation a new generation of slum-bred children has reached school age. The pollution of water sources and the tons of smog poured into the air has increased daily and threatens our lives. Clogged city streets and approaches and inadequate transportation facilities still plague the commuter and downtown shopper. Roadside slum towns, junkyards, and esthetic nightmares disgrace us and even raise some question of how civilized we really are in comparison to the barbarian—who built his house separate, apart from all others.

This new department certainly will not be able to answer all the questions or solve all the problems associated with urbanization, but it does offer a start. It can become the coordinating agency

for the enormous growth of interest and knowledge that the President has urged us to continue and expand “as we painfully struggle to identify the ills, the dangers, and the cures for the American city.”

This new department would provide the best possible administration for principal programs of the Federal Government, providing assistance in housing and in development of our communities. It would aid the President by maintaining maximum coordination of the numerous Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, and metropolitan development. It would encourage solutions to problems of housing and other areas of development through State, county, municipal, or other local and private action, including promotion of regional, metropolitan, and interstate cooperation.

It would guarantee full and appropriate consideration at the national level of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and the people who live and work in them.

The Secretary of Urban Affairs shall, among his responsibilities, advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; develop and recommend to the President policies to foster the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities and conduct continuing comprehensive studies and make available findings with respect to the problems of housing and urban development. These are responsibilities which must be assigned and carried out at once.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to add their support to this proposal so that we may start a new, coordinated effort to improve our cities.

#### LEGISLATION TO INCREASE FEDERAL ACTIVITY IN DEALING WITH WORLD POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to increase Federal activity in dealing with the complicated issue of the world population explosion.

This legislation was initially sponsored by two of our Democratic colleagues—the gentleman from Michigan, PAUL H. TODD, and the gentleman from Arizona, MORRIS K. UDALL. I am anxious to join with them in submitting this important measure.

In his state of the Union address, the President promised “to seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population.” The legislation introduced originally by Con-

gressmen TODD and UDALL is intended to help implement that pledge.

My bill is designed to establish two new Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to coordinate information and activities of Federal agencies in fields pertaining to the population explosion. It would also authorize President Johnson to establish a White House Conference on Population Problems which would assist in bringing this critical issue before the public, and would promote informed and expert discussion of population problems. The measure is also designed to generate intense research programs.

It should be clear to all who have investigated the population problem that we are living with a time bomb. If present rates of population growth are not checked, the next 35 years will see world population doubled, and that figure will double itself again in less than another 30 years. By the year 2000, the United States will probably be subject to an increase of 150 million people. Facts which dramatize the serious threat of the population explosion are not hard to find. What will be hard, however, is the search for viable and effective solutions to that threat. That search must begin now, and it must begin with the resources of the Federal Government dedicated to a program of research and discussion. The measures introduced by Congressmen TODD and UDALL represent an important step forward. I am happy to join them in urging such action.

#### POVERTY FIGHT ROLE APPROVED BY LUTHERANS

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, the Washington Star carried an account of the meeting of the Lutheran Maryland Synod. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted, immediately after my remarks, the article entitled “Poverty Fight Role Approved by Lutherans.”

It has been most encouraging to see the enthusiastic participation of individuals and organizations in this fight to eliminate poverty. Church groups have been outstanding in their efforts. Even before the Economic Opportunity Act came into existence, the National Council of Churches had issued materials and directives in this field. Based on a consultation held in January 1962, this organization published a report on the problem of poverty entitled “The Churches and Persistent Pockets of Poverty in the U.S.A.” Based on a later consultation in January 1964, this on the Church and youth employment, the National Council of Churches published “Jobs for Youth—A Concern of the Churches Today and Tomorrow.”

Since the declaration of war by President Johnson, religious groups have en-

deavored through magazines and periodicals and booklets to arouse the conscience of their members. The United Church of Christ has recently put out a booklet on "The Church and Poverty." The Methodist magazine *Concern* devoted its May issue to "The Attack on Poverty." The other faiths have been just as active in making members aware of the need for participation. The National Catholic Coordinating Committee of the National Catholic Community Service has a publication "The War on Poverty: a Handbook." The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc. is putting out a series of reports on the participation of the Jewish Community in the war on poverty entitled "Progress Versus Poverty." The Union of American Hebrew Congregations through its Commission of Social Action of Reform Judaism will shortly publish a book on poverty—"There Shall Be No Poor."

Activities of religious groups, resultant from their great interest as well as through incentive from publications and meetings, have been most inspiring. The National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, United Church Women, and the National Council of Negro Women are working together in a newly organized group known as WICS (Women in Community Service). This group is assisting the Women's Job Corps in finding young women who want and need the Job Corps program. Through local chapters, they talk with these girls, encourage them to apply, interview and screen them, as well as assist them in various other ways.

Other groups have been set up through the cooperation of two or more faiths. The Michigan Migrant Opportunity, Inc., was organized by the Michigan Council of Churches and the Michigan Catholic Conference and has received a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity to assist in their work with migrants. Religious leaders from the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths held a conference in March to discuss their participation in the VISTA program.

All of the activities are, of course, too many to even begin to talk about. There are the archdiocesan and diocesan conferences held by the Catholic Church with representatives of local organizations to plan how they can be more effective in the antipoverty program. The Jewish Vocational Service in Miami has submitted a program for job training and retraining, as well as vocational upgrading service, to both in- and out-patients of the South Florida State Hospital. The Jewish Vocational Service in St. Paul has submitted a proposal for work training program for unemployed youth. The Arizona Council of Churches and the North Carolina Council of Churches have received grants to carry on their work with the migrants. A unified field plan of the churches against poverty has been put into action by the National Council of Churches and its constituent denominations.

Added now to this impressive record of religious support for the crusade

against poverty is the resolution adopted by the Lutheran Maryland Synod. It encourages its members to participate in government-sponsored programs against poverty, through its statement that "where feasible, synod's congregations, agencies, and combinations thereof, institute proposals and engage both urgency and discretion in approved programs, government-sponsored or other, for the alleviation of social and economic ills of people due to or related to poverty."

Through this innovation, this unprecedented action, the synod recognizes the appropriateness of such participation while, at the same time, maintaining the principle of separation of church and state.

The article from the Washington Star follows:

[From the Washington Star]

The Lutheran Maryland Synod yesterday approved a resolution permitting its congregations and agencies to participate in Government-sponsored programs against poverty.

The action, unprecedented in the history of the synod, declared that "where feasible, synod's congregations [sic], agencies, and combinations thereof, institute proposals and engage both urgency and discretion in approved programs, government-sponsored or other, for the alleviation of social and economic ills of people due to or related to poverty."

In the past, Lutherans have been exceedingly strict against any acceptance of money for government programs, Federal or other, as constituting a breach of the "separation of church and state concept."

The Reverend Obed Lundeen, pastor of Augustana Lutheran Church, in Washington, in proposing the resolution asserted "the church cannot be blind to the poverty in our land today. This church must be relevant and speak to the needs of man."

Claiming the Lutheran Church in America, to which the Maryland synod belongs, has affirmed "a separation of church and state doctrine that is not absolute," Mr. Lundeen insisted "the church should be free to act with the government and with government-sponsored programs."

One speaker, the Reverend Dixon Yaste, of Trinity Lutheran Church, Reisterstown, Md., opposed the "entire idea of government-funded programs. To accept this new means the church is ready to get on the bandwagon (of obtaining funds)."

An amendment to strike out the phrase "government sponsored or other" was overwhelmingly defeated.

The more than 400 ministerial and lay delegates, representing 176 congregations having more than 118,000 members in Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, also approved a budget of nearly \$1.5 million for the coming year.

Among the allocations were \$70,000 for the National Lutheran Home for the Aged in Washington, \$65,000 for the Gettysburg Theological Seminary, \$50,000 for Gettysburg College, \$12,500 for the Lutheran Inner Mission Society of Washington, and \$12,000 for the Lutheran Student Foundation of Maryland and the District of Columbia.

A far-reaching program of cooperation by eight Lutheran churches of downtown Washington, to start this month, was announced at the meeting. Congregations involved in the proposed Cooperative Lutheran Parish of Washington are Reformation, Luther Place Memorial, Augustana, St. Peter's, Our Redeemer, Holy Comforter, St. Mark's-incarnation, and Keller Memorial Lutheran Churches.

The Reverend Daniel Pierotti, of Chicago, will head the program aimed at making the work of these congregations more effective, since together they can undertake ventures impossible for any single congregation to contemplate.

Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, Washington secretary of the Division of Public Relations, National Lutheran Council, was elected a delegate of the Maryland synod to the national convention of the Lutheran Church in America in June 1966 at Kansas City, Mo. Charles De Vries, of St. John's Lutheran Church, Rockville, was chosen as an alternate delegate.

Dr. J. Frank Fife, of Baltimore, president of the Maryland synod, presided at the 3-day meeting, which closed yesterday, in Gettysburg Lutheran Seminary here.

#### MARINE IS AMAZED—QUESTIONS APPARENT LACK OF FLAG WAVING

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a letter which appeared June 9 in the Wayne Eagle, a weekly newspaper published in the 15th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. The letter, written by a Sgt. Tony Cavarno, of the U.S. Marine Corps, describes his amazement and dismay at the few flags which were displayed on private homes last Memorial Day. I think that all Americans can take inspiration from the patriotism of this American boy.

#### MARINE IS AMAZED—QUESTIONS APPARENT LACK OF FLAG WAVING

(By Sgt. Tony Cavarno, U.S. Marine Corps)

My children and I went outside of our home at 853 Carlson early in the morning of Memorial Day to raise our American flag. A few seconds later our neighbor raised their flag.

Suddenly, my 7-year-old son asked me where everyone else's flags were as he could not see any other flag proudly fluttering in the slight morning breeze.

I answered that I was sure many more would be put up in a little while.

Later that morning I had cause to drive from one place to another in the Wayne area and became increasingly aware of how few flags were being displayed by private citizens.

Could this be the case in other areas also, I wondered?

Curiosity finally got the better of me. I took a drive up and down some of the streets in Nankin Township, Wayne, and the Garden City areas to see if this really was the case throughout the general area.

Much to my amazement it was.

Having satisfied myself on this point, I found myself confronted with yet another question. Why? Why were so few flags being displayed by private homes on such an important national holiday?

A few answers flashed through my mind. Maybe the cost of purchasing a flag was too high. Maybe the people just didn't care anymore. Or could it be that patriotism and "flag waving" had become a dim spark in our American way of life? If these were not the answers, what was it then?

When one can purchase a flag complete with flagpole and mounting bracket for a little more than the cost of a carton of cigarettes, I found it hard to believe that the cost would be considered too high.

I hesitated to think that Americans just don't care anymore or feel that it just isn't important particularly when many of them have had fathers, sons, brothers, nephews, cousins or just plain friends who have died fighting for this country and what it stands for. I dispelled the thought that patriotism and taking pride in owning and displaying our beautiful flag was going out of style in our wonderful country.

True there are several things happening in this country of ours that we cannot take too much pride in, but on the whole it is a country of which every American should be proud, and of its symbol, Old Glory.

Why do we spend many hours, many dollars, incurring aching backs and arms, and blistered hands in trying to make our yards, recreation rooms and homes in general a nice place to live in and to look at? I believe it is because we take pride in our possessions.

To own and display our national flag enriches any home from within as well as out, and says of the home displaying it "America is my home and of this I am proud."

I am a recruiting sergeant for the U.S. Marine Corps in this area and like to remind residents our recruiting office has a beautiful booklet entitled "Our Flag" which is free.

I am sure schools, civic organizations and private citizens would be enlightened by this colorful booklet as it tells the history, growth, customs and proper ways to display the flag.

A postcard to the address below asking for the free booklet is all that would be needed, U.S. Marine Corps' Recruiting Office, Federal Building, Wayne 48184. Or call PA 2-9500.

I am proud to be one of the few who can be a U.S. Marine and equally as proud and fortunate to be an American, and the concern I feel for the lack of display of our national colors by private citizens on holidays stems from these reasons and not because I own or have any interest in a flag manufacturing concern, which I do not.

With the coming of Flag Day, on June 14, and the 4th of July, let us hope more Americans will display our flag with pride in our past, and hope along with a prayer for the future.

As Henry Ward Beecher once said: "A thoughtful mind, when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbol, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principals, the truths, the history that belongs to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it."

#### EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF IMPACTED AREA LEGISLATION

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, the General Subcommittee on Education, of which I am a member, initiated hearings on a number of legislative proposals with respect to the extension and improvement of the so-called impacted area legislation, Public Laws

815 and 874. During the course of these hearings, it has become increasingly obvious that there is a great need for expanding the provisions of this law to cover urgent school needs in disaster situations, to remove inequities occasioned by the lack of uniformity in eligibility requirements and in the denial of program benefits to school districts where there have been recent announcements of cessation of Federal activities.

H.R. 9022, which I introduced yesterday, would expand the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 to provide Federal assistance to public school systems in disaster areas. Under the provisions of this legislation, the Commissioner, upon finding of a need therefore by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, immediately could make available funds which have been previously appropriated in order to repair, restore, or rebuild public elementary and secondary schools seriously damaged by flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe. In addition, this bill would authorize grants to local school districts affected by such disaster for current operating expenses of such schools on a reducing basis over a 5-year period in order to enable the affected school district to continue its educational program.

The bill specifically limits the amount of any Federal grant for school construction to the difference between the amount of funds reasonably available to the local educational agency from all other sources and the full cost of restoring or replacing the damaged facilities.

Under the provisions of the bill the local public educational agency would provide educational programs in which private school students could participate within the school attendance area if the operation of the private schools was impaired or disrupted due to the disaster, to the extent of such disruption or impairment.

The amount of any grant for operating expenses to local public educational agencies could not exceed the difference between the amount of funds reasonably available to such agencies from other sources and the cost of providing a level of education equal to that maintained in the schools during the last full year prior to the disaster including any reasonable costs for providing programs in which private school students also affected by the disaster, could participate.

The authority provided in this will provide funds immediately after a disaster and make it possible to resume normal school operations with a minimum of delay in areas affected by such catastrophes.

The source of funds to implement this disaster program would be regular appropriations, previously made, to carry out the purposes of Public Laws 815 and 874 and would enable the administering agency to request replacement of these funds through supplemental appropriations.

It would serve no purpose to elaborate fully on the consequences in many local areas of major disasters which have occurred in recent years because many Members of this body, who as represent-

atives of these localities, are well aware of the suffering and great inconvenience occasioned by them. Briefly to recite some of these disasters, I will mention the earthquake damage in recent years to Montana, Alaska, and Seattle, Wash.—the expensive flood damage suffered within the last 12 months in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, and Missouri. Many midwestern areas, including communities in my own congressional district, have suffered disasters by tornadoes. Schools seem to be primary targets for fire and other natural destructive phenomena.

In addition to the destruction of school buildings, these disasters—particularly the flooding, windstorms, and fire—destroy supplies, equipment, and teaching materials used in everyday instruction of students. In nearly all instances a school district affected by disaster has already established a budget and has no emergency funds available to put these facilities back into operation.

In addition to coping with disaster situations, the legislation that I have introduced would remedy inequitable situations created by the recent military base closing announcements in States where school districts were committed to the construction of facilities in anticipation of receiving grants under the school construction provisions of Public Law 815.

In addition, the legislation that I have sponsored would eliminate the inequitable requirement that large school districts must have at least 6 percent of the children in average daily attendance whose parents are federally employed. In the case of smaller communities the requirement is only 3 percent.

I am hopeful that immediate and favorable action can be taken on this legislation which will fulfill many unmet needs of our elementary and secondary schools.

#### BILL TO PERMIT FREE USE OF MAILS FOR REPORTING CERTAIN INFORMATION ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS TO TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government requires, under a 1962 amendment of the Internal Revenue Act, thousands of form 1099 information returns to be mailed to individuals receiving \$10 or more in interest or dividends. Unlike the individual taxpayer who spends a nickel sending in his tax return, the financial institutions and other corporations have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to send information to the Treasury Department in collection of taxes. This information benefits only the Treasury Department and must be sent at first class mail rates.

Unlike employers who send W-2 forms to the Government which may be sent in bulk, there is no employer or employee relationship between a depositor or saver and a bank or savings and loan. In other words, it has long been assumed that part of the responsibility of the employer is to withhold taxes and send W-2 forms to the Government as part of the employer-employee relationship.

Since the Treasury Department is the principal beneficiary of such information, and feeling they should pay the involved postage, I am today introducing a bill permitting the free use of mails for the sole purpose of informing the Treasury Department of the interest or dividends of \$10 or more received by the depositor.

This bill requires the Treasury Department to pay the Postmaster General an amount equal to the postage for information returns as required under sections 6042, 6044, and 6049 of the Internal Revenue Code.

I would also like to point out that the actual postage is only a small part of the total cost of preparing these returns; computing the payments, filling in the forms, addressing the envelopes and sending them to the individuals with copies to the Treasury Department.

#### MASS TRANSIT IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM AND THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION INTENDS TO SOLVE THAT PROBLEM

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress we enacted an urban mass transportation bill which was the beginning of the Johnson administration's attack on one of the most serious problems facing our Nation's cities.

That legislation, however, was only the beginning—the administration is acutely aware of the necessity for further action at the national level.

The following two articles appeared in the New York Journal-American on June 14, 1965, and are based upon a survey of mass transit problems in the current issue of Forbes magazine:

[From the New York Journal-American, June 14, 1965]

#### OVERHAUL FOR ALL U.S. TRANSPORT

The Journal-American presents these two important reports on the Nation's transportation crisis and the big city transit nightmare by special permission of Forbes magazine. The facts about the crisis and President Johnson's plans to deal with it and the big city transit mess are part of Forbes' current and extensive coverage:

#### A TEAM—NEXT A BLUEPRINT

President Johnson put together a team of top experts and directed them to draw a master blueprint for overhaul of the Nation's air, rail, maritime, and highway systems—and for modern rapid transit to cure the clogged and crumbling hearts of our big cities, New York in particular.

"This is the biggest thing we have on the back burner," the President is quoted as saying in a comprehensive article outlining goals in the current issue of Forbes magazine.

Heading the President's team is Commerce Secretary John T. Connor, assisted by Alan S. Boyd, former Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman recently named "transportation czar" as Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and Lee C. White, assistant White House legal counsel serving as liaison between the President and the team.

Other members include Gen. William F. McKee, successor to Mr. Boyd as CAB Chairman; Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, John C. Kohl, University of Michigan professor and authority on mass transit; Budget Director Charles L. Schultze, who worked on President Kennedy's transport legislation, and Arthur M. Okun, member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Forbes calls the team "the most impressive group of men ever assembled in Washington to deal with transportation, none political appointees, none party hacks."

While opposing nationalization of any transit facilities, the President "makes no secret of the fact that he intends to represent the general public interest in transportation," the article states.

Slated for top priority handling in the program, according to Mr. Connor, are:

Keeping commuter services going.  
Giving railroads more leeway in competing with their rivals.

Solving the labor problems that have crippled the U.S. merchant marine.

Financing the research and development for all forms of private enterprise transportation.

#### Secret report alarms experts

The magazine says a still-secret report by a Presidential task force on transportation headed by UCLA professor George Hilton has alarmed Mr. Johnson and his advisers and alerted them to two major dangers in the current transportation trend:

Spiraling transportation costs that threaten an inflationary trend with rising business expenses that add nothing to the intrinsic value of a product.

Gigantic traffic congestion, especially on the commuter level, that will offset gains made by the American people in increasing their leisure time.

"A crisis is already at hand for the 16 million people who live in the Greater New York area, stretching from Fairfield County, Conn., through 9 counties in New Jersey," the Forbes article states.

"Only the miserably overcrowded, crime-ridden subway systems and decrepit and nearly insolvent commuter railroads are preventing total collapse; the highways couldn't possibly solve the problem.

"But the subways are a drain—\$35 million in the last fiscal year—on the city's empty purse. And of the four major commuter railroads, one is bankrupt, one is nearly so, a third is in the process of going into public ownership.

#### Traffic forcing factories out

"Eventually, public ownership for the whole system seems the only way out. The President and his aids agree that it is unfair to ask the railroads to continue to subsidize urban-suburban transportation.

"As things now stand, only those people who have to come into the city do so. Suburbanites are increasingly reluctant to come into the city to shop, because of the insane traffic problem; the stores have been forced to move out into the suburbs after them.

"What is true of New York's stores is also true of its factories. Loading and unloading have become a nightmare in New York traffic. One by one, the factories are moving

out. The city is steadily losing factory employment.

"The Port of New York is losing business compared with other more efficient ports. For years the population of the city was decreasing. As things are going now, by 1970 New York no longer will be the biggest city in the Americas. The title may well go to Mexico City."

The article also cites New York's air travel headaches, explaining:

"Jets bring passengers from Los Angeles International Airport to John F. Kennedy International Airport, about 2,500 air miles in as little as 4½ hours; getting from Kennedy Airport to downtown Manhattan by cab in the rush hours may take as much as 2 hours.

"What good will it do to build a supersonic transport plane to cut 2 hours off the coast-to-coast run if the 2 hours will be lost in getting to and from the airport?"

Forbes says the President is committed to a major restructuring of transportation aimed at integrating national policy on mass transit to cope with the growing crisis.

"The bell that is tolling for New York will soon be tolling for at least a dozen other U.S. urban areas," the article states.

Forbes stressed that heretofore every Government office concerned with transportation has worked almost entirely for the interests of its particular mode—rails, roads, air or seaways.

#### The lobbyists—Public's second

And the powerful transport lobbies on Capitol Hill have worked zealously for legitimate private interests but not for the general public interests, it adds.

The magazine says the President's goal is to forge a strong Federal policy that will replace current "weakness and dispersion" that has fostered present conditions.

Pointing up Mr. Johnson's concern over the plight of the railroads, Forbes says:

"Quite clearly, President Johnson thinks that regulation has held back the railroads. So has public money lavished on highways and airports, the railroad's competitors."

The article cites as one of the first steps in the President's plan his proposal calling for some \$500 million a year in new "user" taxes on the trucking, bus, and airline industries.

Stressing the President's determination to push his program to a successful conclusion, the magazine asserts:

"Anyone who thinks Johnson is merely putting up trial balloons or playing for urban votes is going to be surprised."

#### THE MESS IN THE CITIES

For Boston, Monday, December 30, 1963, was a preview of the 1970's. It was the day that Boston came to a stuttering halt. By 3:45 p.m., the central artery was clogged. By 4:45 p.m., not a car was moving in downtown Boston.

Not only were the outbound highways choked with traffic; the inbound highways soon became choked, too, because so many cars were attempting to get on the new southeast expressway that none could get off.

Not until 9 p.m., 5 hours and 15 minutes after the jam began, were the cars moving easily again.

The experience taught Boston a lesson: There's a limit to how many cars a city, any city, can stand.

If people are to come into a city from the suburbs, they cannot all come by car. Some other means of transportation must be provided for them.

Infuriated drivers started clamoring for a mass rapid-transit system, not to replace driving into Boston but to supplement.

Even a big gas and oil company, the Jenney Manufacturing Co., with about 650 outlets in New England, joined the cry. Robert M. Jenney, the president, ran full-page ads

in the newspapers, showing Paul Revere stalled in traffic.

"Paul Revere," the ads proclaimed, "could make it only at midnight." Other ads depicted Boston as the "home of the bean, the cod, and the jam."

People thought Jenney was crazy, propagandizing for mass rapid transit. If fewer people commuted by car, wouldn't that hurt Jenney's business? they argued.

Jenney said no it wouldn't. People would still use cars for other purposes. What really would ruin his business, he said, would be the strangulation of Boston by car.

Less than a year later, the State legislature caved in. The legislature increased cigarette taxes by 2 cents and earmarked the money for a mass transit system.

A new agency was established to create such a system for Boston and 77 of its suburbs.

President Johnson is determined not to let the Boston nightmare become a commonplace in the 1970's.

Last year, he persuaded Congress to pass a mass-transit bill appropriating half a billion dollars to help cities build mass transit systems. In charge of the program is John Clayton Kohl, working under Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Chief of the Federal Housing and Home Financing Agency.

#### *Rebuilding tab—\$10 billion*

Thirty cities already have applied to HHFA for seed capital to start mass transit cities. Another 370 have been in correspondence with HHFA.

"Right now," says Mr. Kohl, "we are on the threshold of new activities in mass transit, which could generate as much as \$10 billion in investment in additional equipment and services in the next 10 years."

When President Johnson's transit advisers talk about mass transit, they are not talking about the kind of commuter lines that almost everywhere are going bankrupt—the New Haven Railroad, for example.

Nor are they talking about the kind of subway system New York City has, a horror that gets deeper into the red every year.

Nor are they talking about high-speed "corridor" railroads such as the projected Boston-Washington-New York project.

These, too, are on the administration's transportation agenda, and they are related, too, to urban congestion.

They are thinking, instead of a system like San Francisco is building—at a cost of \$1 billion. When completed, this will be a 75-mile network of tracks radiating out from San Francisco and Oakland.

The trains will be driven by computers, eliminating the labor costs—and labor problems—that now plague the commuter lines and the subways.

#### *A little utopia: speed, comfort*

They will be air-conditioned and travel at a rate of 80 miles per hour.

Even counting stops at stations, they will carry a man to work at the rate of 50 miles per hour.

During the rush hours, a passenger will have to wait only a minute or two for a train. At each station, there will be a parking lot.

A man will be able to drive to his nearest station, board a train a minute or two later, and get to work in a twinkling—in comfort.

If Mr. Kohl's estimate that \$10 billion may be invested in mass transit in the next 10 years is valid (and both he and his boss, Dr. Weaver, say it's a conservative estimate), this will prove a bonanza, for the companies which have been doing research and development on the problem, like Westinghouse Electric.

Mr. Kohl notes also that several aerospace companies have been coming into the mass transportation picture, including Boe-

ing, Lockheed, North American and even tiny Aerona.

Actually, mass transit will prove a boon to all U.S. industry. For no industry can operate efficiently with workers who have spent 3 hours getting to work. They're bushed before they get their work clothes on.

Even the airlines are very worried about the problem. So, interestingly enough, are the more thoughtful truckers.

"Good mass transit systems," says William A. Bresnahan, managing director of the American Trucking Association, "would help clear the way in and out of cities for trucks."

The railroads, of course, are even more vitally concerned. Some of the sickest railroads in the country are sick because they are being forced to carry commuters to work on antiquated equipment at a heavy loss.

Even the Chicago & North Western, which has made something of a success out of commuter hauling, is netting less than 1 percent on its commuter investment.

A more extreme case is the Erie-Lackawanna. If it were relieved of its commuter losses, it would probably be an acceptable merger partner for the Norfolk & Western—and the entire eastern merger pattern would evolve faster.

There is even more at stake than this. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads estimates that going to work by car costs the average driver up to 15 cents a mile, if he counts—as he should—depreciation on his car and tires. A good mass transit system can do the job at perhaps one-fourth the cost.

Things like this affect both the commuter's standard of living and the pressure on industry for higher wages.

Item: In Chicago, poverty program officials recently found that jobs were going begging on one side of town while willing jobhunters from the other side had no practical way of getting there.

#### *Federal goal: aid, not control*

The Johnson administration does not plan to put the Federal Government directly into the business of moving masses of people to work. This is the farthest thing from its thoughts.

Sad experience with the maritime problem has shown Washington that direct subsidies and direct controls only involve it in the whole wage-price mess.

Under the mass transit bill, local bodies will probably get capital grants, "demonstration" projects such as are already underway in San Francisco, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia.

An outstanding candidate for help is the Long Island Railroad, which the State of New York is negotiating to buy and which offers possibilities for integration with the New York City subway system.

Basically, however, President Johnson feels Washington's job is to inspire, not simply to pump money in.

### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART XCVI

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the crime situation in New York City and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 23, 1965.

The article is part of a series on "New York City in Crisis" and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: 500 COPS ON OVERTIME FOR STREETS AT NIGHT

(By Edward J. Silberfarb)

Mayor Wagner's war on crime, which began in the subways 2 weeks ago, will move to the streets tonight with an emergency force of 500 uniformed police, working overtime on foot patrol.

The mayor revealed this as the first phase of a battle plan that also includes a permanent increase in the police force of 1,500 men, the release of another 564 able-bodied police from desk and laboratory jobs for crime fighting, and the addition of 175 radio cars for more intensive motor patrol.

In a special 15-minute television broadcast, his second this month on crime, the Mayor spelled out his plan to get more "men in blue—with gun, badge, and nightstick"—on the streets.

"I am determined that it shall be made as dangerous as possible for criminals to operate in New York City," he said. "New York must be made safe for New Yorkers. I am not going to rest until it is so."

He said the rising crime rate in New York is part of a national trend and, "the compelling fact is that there is fear in the hearts of our people, because of crime in the streets."

The mayor's statement came a day after Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy had reported that major crime in the city had risen 1.7 percent for the first 3 months of this year over the same period last year. And it comes in the midst of a continuing uproar among residents, newspapers, city councilmen, and citizen groups over the city's crime rate.

In his first broadcast, April 5, the mayor dealt with crime in the subways and announced a plan to press into overtime service 1,000 city and 200 transit police. Of the total, 650 have been riding the subway trains and 350 patrolling the streets, all as a temporary measure until 800 more transit police can be recruited and trained.

Reporting on the results of this program, he said last night: "This has been successful beyond our hopes."

In the last 15 days, he said, there were 12 reported felonies in the subways as compared with 37 in a comparable period last month. And there were 42 arrests for misdemeanors as against 17 for a corresponding period last month.

Then, referring to the city's 6,000 miles of streets, 578 miles of river and ocean frontage, parks, skyscrapers, and apartment houses, he said:

"Policing this endless expanse, teeming with 8 million people in 37 communities, from the wide-open spaces of Staten Island to the canyonlike streets of lower Manhattan, is an undertaking of tremendous proportions."

The first point of his plan will put 500 uniformed men on foot patrol at night on an overtime basis, at the cost of \$25,000 a day. Almost half of this force, as disclosed in Wednesday's Herald Tribune, will be drawn from the ranks of the detective division. The entire police force he said, will be mobilized, with each man giving a minimum of 2 days off a month to overtime duty.

These 500 will increase to 850 the number of overtime police patrolling the streets at night. These plus the 650 working overtime on the subways will bring the cost of overtime police patrol to \$2,550,000 a month.

Point two of the mayor's plan will increase the total permanent quota for the police department by 1,500 men, to 28,228. The cost of the increase will be \$12 million a year.

Commissioner Murphy, in his budget request last December, asked for money for 1,000 more police. In an interview following the broadcast, the mayor said his authorization for 1,500 more police includes the commissioner's request.

Commissioner Murphy could not say when all 1,500 will be mustered into service, but he gave a timetable that indicated the last 500 will begin training July 30. As the recruits take to the field, they will replace patrolmen on overtime.

The department's manning tables as of yesterday showed 26,121 police in service, or 607 below the present quota. To bring the department up to its new quota, Mayor Wagner vowed "to launch a major new recruitment drive."

And to strengthen further the army in blue on street patrol, the mayor announced he has authorized creation of 564 civilian positions in the police department to release that many able-bodied policemen for crime fighting. They had been doing the work of clerks, stenographers, fingerprint technicians, telephone dispatchers, telephone operators, and photographers. The price tag for this new civilian work force is \$2,612,505 annually.

And lastly, Mr. Wagner said he will provide 175 new patrol cars, in addition to the 700 now on the streets, at a cost of \$402,500, plus \$75,000 more for two-way radios.

Of the new cars, 77 will patrol "newly established sectors through the city, cutting the size of present sectors for more intensive coverage." And the other 98 will roam through outlying residential areas such as North Bronx, East Queens, South Brooklyn, and Staten Island. These will be one-man motor patrols and will concentrate on bus routes. They will add 4 million miles of street patrol a year, he said.

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XCVII

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the poverty program's operation in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This article appeared in the Tribune on April 24, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THREE-WAY TROUBLE—POVERTY PROBE, UNREST, WORKERS—HARYOU-ACT: AUDITING AHEAD

(By Barry Gottehrer and Alfonso Narvaez)

A team of Federal auditors has started the long-awaited probe of New York City's poverty program with special emphasis on Haryou-Act, the controversial Harlem project, the Herald Tribune learned yesterday.

Representatives of three Federal agencies—the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare—have been quietly conducting surveys of the city's poverty program since midweek.

One of the auditors said the survey was to pinpoint possible problem areas and determine whether a full-scale audit—and complete investigation of the books and financial records—was warranted.

The Federal representatives refused to comment on their findings. One said that

reports will be made to the proper Federal authorities "probably within the next 2 weeks."

Though the investigation was described yesterday as routine procedure and the first of a series of nationwide surveys, it is understood that Federal officials have been particularly interested in taking a look into the books of Haryou-Act.

After completing his survey in the offices of the city's antipoverty operations board yesterday, an Office of Economic Opportunity official said, "This is not part of any investigation and does not bear on the headlines that have appeared."

Asked if the "preliminary survey" of Haryou-Act might not lead to a full-scale investigation in the near future, an investigator smiled and said, "What do you think?"

Reports that this Federal investigation would take place were first reported in the Herald Tribune early last month.

Haryou-Act, which has been beset by internal conflict and external criticism since its formation last June, has been the target of increasing rumors and attacks during the last 2 months, from charges of padded payrolls.

The rumors have ranged from rolls and conflicts of interest, to questionable progress and reports that the entire project is controlled by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the Harlem Congressman.

Both Representative POWELL and Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-Act and a former aid to the Congressman, have denied these charges.

Mr. Wingate confirmed yesterday that an auditor had visited Haryou-Act Thursday but said he had not talked with him.

As chairman of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee, which is now studying possible changes in the Federal antipoverty act, Representative POWELL has bitterly opposed Mayor Wagner's plan to set up a private, city-controlled corporation to place New York City's poverty program all under one umbrella—Mayor Wagner's.

According to the Harlem Congressman, this would violate the Federal definition of community-action calling for the "maximum feasible participation" of the indigenous population in staffing, running, and programming the programs.

Representative POWELL has called on the Controller General's office to determine whether it is a violation and, if so, cut off \$16 million in Federal funds the city has requested.

Though the Controller General's office is still studying the Congressman's charges, the Office of Economic Opportunity reportedly does not feel the corporation would violate the act.

A spokesman for the Federal poverty office said yesterday that the city's request—\$1.5 million of which is slated for Haryou-Act—is "in the final stages of review" and the OEO is waiting for the city to set up the corporation.

City hall officials expect to have completed selection of the 6 community leaders for the corporation's board (the 11 others would be city officials) by the weekend and file the necessary papers of incorporation some time next week. To become a reality, the corporation must be approved by both legislature and Governor Rockefeller.

Earlier in the week, New York's two Senators both said they were interested in getting to the facts behind the rumors clouding the city's poverty program.

Senator JACOB JAVITS has called for an investigation by the minority staff of the Senate Education and Public Welfare Committee.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY would not comment on the controversy but an aid said that their office was already conducting an investigation.

#### FIRST CONFERENCE OF FREE ASIAN AND AFRICAN NATIONS

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in April 1955, the first conference of free Asian and African nations was held in Bandung, Indonesia.

It was my privilege then to be able to attend this historical and precedent-shattering conclave, not only as the sole member of any parliament in the Western world, but as an American and person of African descent. The House of Representatives in a generous gesture passed H.R. 239 commending me for my "statesmanship, patriotism, and forthright courage" at the Conference: One June 29 this year—10 years later—the same group of nations plan a second conference in Algiers, Algeria. While the comparable international amity, spirit of world brotherhood and feeling of common identity with past indignities of colonialism which prevailed at Bandung in 1955 are unfortunately absent today among these great nations, there is abundant evidence of human progress.

In 1955, there were 29 free Asian and African nations in attendance at the Bandung Conference. Today, there are 52 free Asian and African nations. Furthermore, the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations wields great influence and power in the cause of world peace.

As a personal aside, I was only a member of the House Education and Labor Committee in 1955. Today I am its Chairman. It is this fact with its attendant responsibilities for seven major pieces of legislation that prevents my attendance at Bandung II on June 29.

However, I am pleased to offer for the RECORD a preliminary record on Bandung II prepared by Dr. Homer A. Jack, former Associate Director of the American Committee on Africa and presently director of the Unitarian Universalist Association. A distinguished Unitarian minister, Dr. Jack is a well-known journalist and author who has acquired both a sympathetic and profound understanding of the problems of color at home and abroad. This report objectively outlines the issues in the conference at Algiers.

I also take this opportunity to extend to the delegates and participating nations my sincere best wishes for a meaningful and significant conference.

BANDUNG II: THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE  
IN ALGERIA

A PRELIMINARY REPORT

(By Dr. Homer A. Jack)

(NOTE.—Dr. Jack, director of the Department of Social Responsibility of the Unitarian Universalist Association, attended Bandung I as a journalist and the Belgrade and Cairo Conferences as an official observer.)

Two of the most important political events held since World War II were the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, in April, 1955, and the Conferences of the Heads of State of nonaligned countries at

Belgrade in September 1961, and at Cairo in October 1964. The first gave dignity to the Asian-African world, consolidated the independence of the new Asian States, stimulated the independence of the African states, and helped establish the Asian-African group at the U.N. The Belgrade Conference gave substance to the concept of nonalignment and cemented a working relationship of non-aligned states in the U.N. and elsewhere.

A year after the Bandung Conference was held, efforts were begun to call a second meeting. None developed until a preparatory meeting for Bandung II was held in Djarkarta, Indonesia, in April, 1964. This meeting agreed to hold a second conference in March, 1965, somewhere on the African continent. At the meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Cairo in August 1964, it was agreed to hold the second Asian-African Conference in Algeria. This was scheduled for March 10, then postponed until June 29.

#### PREPARATORY CONFERENCE

The Preparatory Conference for Bandung II was held in Djarkarta, Indonesia, from April 10 to 15, 1964. It was called upon the invitation of Dr. Subandrio, Deputy First Prime Minister of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia. Dr. Subandrio was elected chairman. The conference was held on a ministerial level. It was officially entitled the Ministerial Meeting of Asian and African Countries. Twenty-two states were represented, including 17 which attended Bandung I (see table I).

President Sukarno of Indonesia—one of the few "alumni" of Bandung I present—in his inaugural address enunciated the principle of Asian-African solutions for the settlement of Asian-African problems. He stated that this principle has been accepted and that Asia and Africa are determined to solve their problems in their own way despite strong opposition from outside. The Asian-African countries, he felt, must consolidate their own gains and eliminate any inferiority complex inherited from the colonial past. Pakistan's foreign minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, suggested that the Second Conference should chart the course for attaining the goals and aspirations that have still eluded Asian and African nations since Bandung. Chinese Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Chen Yi asserted that a second conference was welcomed because the Asian-African peoples wanted to strengthen their solidarity and continue their fight against imperialism and old and new colonialism. They should strengthen their unity and cooperation in opposing imperialist policies of aggression and war and in defending world peace.

While the preparatory conference agreed upon the necessity for holding a second meeting along the lines of Bandung I, there were differences of opinion as to the date. Some delegates wanted it to be held in 1964, but others felt that the diplomatic calendar was crowded, since some of the participants were committed to attend the Second Conference of Nonaligned Countries in October 1964. Some wanted the conference to be held on the 10th anniversary of Bandung I—April 1965—but in the end the month of March 1965, was chosen. It was agreed to hold the conference in Africa, at a site chosen by the Organization of African Unity.

A permanent Preparatory Committee was set up on the ambassadorial level to work out details at the site of the conference. This committee consisted of Algeria, United Arab Republic, Morocco, Ghana, Guinea, Ethiopia, India, China, Cambodia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Tanzania, and Iran, with two additional countries to be added which recently gained their independence. Malawi and Zambia were subsequently named to complete the committee. The group held its first meeting in Algiers on October 20.

#### INVITATIONS AND EXCLUSIONS

One of the most important questions confronting the Preparatory Conference and Preparatory Committee was to decide the countries to be invited and those to be excluded. Five categories were adopted at Djarkarta to determine the list of invitees: (1), countries participating in the first Bandung Conference; (2), countries becoming independent since Bandung I; (3), countries independent prior to Bandung I but which, for some reason, were not invited at that time; (4), countries which will become independent between April 1964, and the time the conference is held; and (5), national governments and movements which are still involved in a struggle for independence.

The above criteria indicate that, in theory, any independent state or national liberation movement on the continents of Asia or Africa would be eligible to attend Bandung II. There will be, however, exceptions in 1965 as there were in 1955. The Republic of South Africa is anathema to all because of her apartheid. She will not be invited to Bandung II any more than she was to Bandung I. However, several antiapartheid movements will be present—as in Bandung I. Israel is unacceptable to the Arab League States and other Asian-African States will go along with this boycott and so Israel will not be invited in 1965 as she was not involved in 1955.

There are less universal attempts at exclusion. China (backed by Pakistan, Indonesia, and Guinea) doesn't want the U.S.S.R. to be invited, although much of the Soviet Union is technically on the Asian Continent. India and Ceylon suggested Soviet participation, although the Soviets were not part of Bandung I. India also suggested Malaysian participation which is bitterly opposed by Indonesia.

A subcommittee composed of heads of delegations from all African countries present (with Afghanistan and Indonesia later added) deliberated in Djarkarta on these problems of the admittance of China and Malaysia for many hours. Reportedly, it was agreed that decisions would be taken by mutual agreement (unanimity) and thus the Soviet Union was at least tentatively turned down at Djarkarta. The invitation to Malaysia was deferred until "obstacles which prevented consensus at this Conference have been eliminated." On May 29, Japan reportedly urged the admission of Malaysia, but indicated that she would not cosponsor any movement in behalf of Malaysia's admission. Also Japan indicated that she opposed invitations to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and to the Pathet Lao of Laos on the basis that both are rebel movements against governments with which she maintains diplomatic relations.

Subsequent to the Djarkarta meetings, it appeared that some of the African states did not want to invite the Congo (Leopoldville) so long as Moise Tshombe is premier. Indeed, some African states may not attend, especially members of the 13-nation Inter-African and Malagasy Organization. This group includes at least the Ivory Coast, Senegal, Chad, Niger, Togo, Gabon, Malagasy, Upper Volta, Dahomey, and the Congo. At a meeting on May 26, they voted not to attend the meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Ghana in September. Significantly, the Cameroon, Mauritania, Central African Republic, and Congo (Brazzaville) were absent from this meeting. These last four are perhaps the more sure to attend the Algiers meetings from this Inter-African Organization.

Shortly after the Djarkarta meetings ended in April 1964, Chinese Deputy Premier Chen Yi made a public statement justifying the exclusion of the Soviet Union since it was neither an African nor an Asian country. In an official statement released on April 30, 1964, the Soviet Government severely criti-

cized this Chinese action of isolating her from the Asian-African countries on the ground that the majority of its population are whites. Claiming that two-thirds of its territory lies in Asia, the Soviet statement asked: "If the Soviet Union is not an Asian country and China is, how can they have a common boundary over 7,000 kilometers long, and in what continent does that boundary lie?"

China in a 2,000-word statement on May 30, 1964, asserted that "since the Soviet Union is a European country, it of course should not take part in such an (Asian-African) Conference." The statement added: "This is a matter of principle and we abide by principle." The Chinese stated that "the relations between China and the Soviet Union were very good in 1955, but we did not on that account stand for its participation in the first Asian-African Conference." The Chinese statement concluded: "And our objection to its participation in the second Asian-African Conference is by no means because the relations between China and the Soviet Union are at present not so good."

In still another statement, the Soviet Union on August 14, 1964, accused "some countries"—meaning China—"of not stopping at the use of the most unscrupulous means down to speculations on racial motives, gross distortions of the position of the Soviet Union, and all kinds of insinuations against it." The Soviet statement indicated its Asian relationship, asserting that "no subterfuges and exaggerations in politics and geography will be able to move the Ural Range which divides Europe and Asia to the shores of the Pacific." The statement concluded by suggesting that the Soviet Union "took no initiative in raising the question of its participation" and "cannot allow the question of its invitation to be embarrassing for these other Afro-Asian countries" which raised the question of its participation.

On May 19, official invitations to attend Bandung II were sent to 64 countries. In the first 12 days, 37 affirmative replies had been received. It is expected that about 60 nations will be represented, many by their heads of state or government. Among the nations invited is the Congo (Leopoldville), although it is reported that Algeria will not permit Congolese Premier Moise Tshombe to enter the country. (Congolese President Joseph Kasavubu would be acceptable.) It was also reported that the foreign ministers meeting preceding the conference may decide to admit Latin American observers. At this meeting final decisions will be made about admitting the Soviet Union and Malaysia.

#### DELAYS

After the second conference of nonaligned countries was held in Cairo in October 1964, there were rumors of the postponement of Bandung II or at least of a change in site—to perhaps Ethiopia, Kenya, or Ghana. In January 1965, there were reports from Algeria of a delay in convening the conference, due to bad weather preventing the completion of constructing the conference buildings. Subsequently the conference was officially postponed to late May. Then on February 8, Algeria announced a second postponement until June 29. It was reported that Egyptian engineers were aiding 4,000 Algerian laborers in completing a 1,000-seat hall and 65 identical, four-room, two-story villas at the beach resort, Club des Pins, 13 miles west of Algiers.

#### DASAWARSA

With the second conference due to convene after the 10th anniversary of Bandung I—April 1965—President Sukarno went through with his plan to hold a 10th anniversary celebration in Indonesia. This he labeled Dasawarsa. About 35 countries were represented, including such personalities as Premier Chou En-lai and Foreign Minister Chen Yi of China, Princess Ashraf of Iran, Food Minister Subramaniam of India, Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand,

Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, and Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam. The Thai Foreign Minister retreated after hearing anti-Western attacks. Private talks were held especially by the leaders of China, Indonesia, and North Vietnam.

One purpose of Dasawarsa was President Sukarno's hope to promote CONEFO—Conference of New Emerging Forces. This would be composed of NEFOS—newly emerging forces. A cornerstone of the building to house CONEFO was laid during Dasawarsa. President Sukarno hopes that the building will be ready for the first meeting of CONEFO now scheduled for August 1966. Here it is expected that Indonesia and China will attempt with other nations to begin to build a rival to the United Nations.

POSSIBLE AGENDA

The ambassadors of certain Asian-African countries accredited to Algeria are working in Algiers as a preparatory committee. On June 24 the foreign ministers of all states attending will gather in Algiers to complete the agenda and the final invitation list.

The general procedure and agenda are not hard to predict. There will be an opening address by President Ben Bella of Algeria and perhaps by President Sukarno of Indonesia, the latter as host of the first Bandung Conference. Then there will be a period of general debate lasting several days, during which each head of state will discuss how the world looks to his country. Concurrently, several committees will meet, probably on a foreign ministers level, to work out language for the final Algiers communique. The areas of this communique will probably be the major items on the world's agenda, as seen from Asia and Africa, and not dissimilar to the items on the agenda of Bandung I or the Cairo Conference. Following are the subtopics in those two communique:

BANDUNG I

- Economic development.
- World trade.
- Cultural Cooperation.
- Anticolonialism.
- Human rights.
- World Peace.
- United Nations.
- Disarmament.
- Principles of Coexistence.

CAIRO CONFERENCE

Elimination of colonialism, neocolonialism, and imperialism.

Respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and condemnation of use of force.

Racial discrimination and apartheid.  
Peaceful coexistence.

Respect for the sovereignty of states and their territorial integrity.

Settlement of disputes without threat or use of force in accordance with principles of U.N. Charter.

The United Nations.

Economic development and cooperation.

Cultural, scientific, and educational cooperation.

With every major item on the world's agenda up for discussion, Algiers will constitute a stage for sweeping ideological debate as well as for more parochial debates. The great debate is likely to be between expansion-minded China and peaceful coexistence-minded Soviet Union, except that the latter may be absent. The Soviet's place will be taken by India. In addition, the existing lesser battles will again be aired: Ethiopia versus Somalia, Tunisia versus United Arab Republic, Cyprus versus Turkey, India versus Pakistan, etc.

How could, for example, the disarmament debate shape up? China will come to Algiers as the first atomic power in Asia-Africa and with at least having made two detonations. India will come to Algiers as the next member of the atomic club. The Conference

will begin just several weeks after the conclusion of the U.N. Disarmament Commission. China will reiterate her plan for a summit meeting of heads of state to prohibit the use and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. India will ask that all nations sign the partial test ban agreement on that, in effect, the Conference condemn China and France for not signing and testing or (in the case of France) preparing new tests. The United States will be condemned for continuing underground tests (although not prohibited by the partial test ban treaty). The United Arab Republic, Algeria, and other nonaligned states will urge endorsement of the Cairo Conference proposal for a world disarmament conference under the auspices of the U.N. to which all nations (including China and West Germany) would be invited. China may resist this formula (preferring her own and not wanting to deal with the U.N. by the back door) and, for other reasons, so may India. In the end, the world disarmament conference proposal is likely to be endorsed as well as a general statement on next steps toward the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

TABLE I.—Bandung, Cairo, Bandung II: The rolloff of states

	Bandung	Preparatory, Bandung II	Cairo
Afghanistan	X	X	X
Algeria		X	X
Angola			(1)
Burma	X		X
Burundi			X
Cambodia	X	X	X
Cameroon		X	X
Central African Republic		X	X
Ceylon	X	X	X
China (Peiping) 2	X	X	(3)
Congo (Leopoldville)			X
Congo (Brazzaville)			X
Cuba			X
Cyprus	(4)		X
Dahomey			X
Ethiopia	X	X	X
Ghana	X	X	X
Guinea		X	X
India	X	X	X
Indonesia	X	X	X
Iran 5	X	X	
Iraq	X	X	
Japan	X		
Jordan	X		X
Kenya			X
Kuwait			X
Laos	X		X
Lebanon	X		X
Liberia	X	X	X
Libya	X		X
Malawi			X
Mali			X
Mauritania			X
Morocco		X	X
Nepal	X	X	X
Nigeria			X
Pakistan 6	X	X	
Philippines 6	X	X	
Saudi Arabia	X		X
Senegal			X
Sierre Leone			X
Somalia			X
Sudan	X		X
Syria	X	X	X
Thailand 6	X		
Togo			X
Tunisia			X
Turkey 6 7	X	X	
Tanganyika and Zanzibar			X
Uganda			X
United Arab Republic	X	X	X
Vietnam, Democratic Republic 2	X		
Vietnam, State of 2	X		
Yemen	X		X
Yugoslavia			X
Zambia			X
Total	29	22	47

1 The provisional government in exile.  
 2 Nonmember of U.N.  
 3 Premier Tshombe was barred, although his representatives were present.  
 4 Archbishop Makarios was present as a petitioner.  
 5 CENTO member (along with Pakistan and Turkey).  
 6 SEATO member.  
 7 NATO member.

HOW MUCH OF THE MINUTEMAN ARSENAL IS SUPPLIED BY THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT?

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last weekend the Nation was shocked by the revelation of a cache and camp of the rightwing extremist Minuteman organization located a little over 20 miles from Washington, D.C. The discovery of this camp is further confirmation of the charges I have been making about this paramilitary group for well over a year.

But there is more significance to the recent discovery than has been yet brought out in the newspapers. That is, the extent to which the Minutemen is supported and subsidized by the Department of Defense.

It is well known by now, that more than 400,000 persons belong to private gun clubs throughout the United States receiving free guns and ammunition from the Federal Government. They receive this special dispensation through the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the civilian marksmanship program, administered by the Department of the Army. Under this military weapons subsidy program the Army, from 1959 to 1964, gave away to private gun clubs 246.9 million rounds of free ammunition costing \$7.2 million. In the same period the Army placed \$2.3 million worth of guns on free loan to gun clubs. In other words, the American taxpayer has footed a \$9.5 million bill run up by private gun clubs. These figures are the costs of only the ammunition and guns given away under the program. They do not include the costs of administration. The costs of administration alone, for the conduct of rifle matches and other activities, ran to \$2.5 million during this period.

It is interesting to note the types of weapons and ammunition given away to private gun clubs by the Department of Defense. Over 4 million rounds of .45-caliber ammunition and 105 million rounds of .30-caliber ammunition was given away in 1964. In 1963 there were over 12,000 M-1 rifles on loan to private gun clubs. In the same year, there were over 4,000 .45-caliber pistols on loan to private gun clubs.

Now there are so few controls and the civilian marksmanship program is so sloppily regulated that it is quite easy for any group of 10 persons or more to form a gun club, affiliate with the National Rifle Association, and apply for their guns and ammunition. It is so easy to do this, in fact, that rightwing extremists groups, like the Minutemen, direct their members to form private gun clubs in order to obtain free guns and ammunition from the Defense Department. Furthermore, it is beyond dispute that rightwing fanatics have been

taking full advantage of this opportunity to arm themselves.

It is required for membership to the Minutemen that persons supply their own weapons, M-1 rifles and .45-caliber pistols, and their own ammunition. These, it is seen, are precisely the kinds of small arms and ammunition handed out so haphazardly by the Defense Department through the civilian marksmanship program. Furthermore, at the site of the Minutemen secret military camp, evidence of small-arms target practice, empty cartridges and ammunition boxes, and numerous bullet-punctured objects, littered the ground.

The question that needs to be answered, therefore, is this: How much of the ammunition, and how many of the weapons used at the Minutemen camp in Prince William County, Va., was actually supplied free of cost through the civilian marksmanship program of the Department of Defense?

We need an immediate answer to this question, as well as a review by Congress of this subsidy program. For I am of the opinion that there are more guns and ammunition in the hands of private persons than in any civilian law enforcement agency. There is some evidence that the Minutemen alone, with the small arms and ammunition obtained from the civilian marksmanship program and the heavy arms and automatic weapons, including mortars, submachineguns, and flamethrowers, obtained through the Defense Department scrap weapons program and through private sources, could completely overwhelm any State or local law enforcement authority. I consider the present situation to be critical, and one that could easily become a national emergency. The Minutemen are the potential "brown shirts" of America and it is fantastic and ironic that they are being aided and abetted by the Government they defy and would like to destroy.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD some of the news stories from the Washington Post and the Evening Star detailing the discovery of the Minuteman cache and camp of explosives and weapons in Virginia, a little more than 20 miles from the Nation's Capital:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 11, 1965]

**MINUTEMEN'S CACHE OF DYNAMITE FOUND—  
FBI TIP LEADS TO RIFLE RANGE IN VIRGINIA**  
(By Jack Kelso)

A guerrilla warfare training school built by the superpatriot Minutemen and a cache of dynamite big enough to destroy a multistory building have been uncovered a little over 20 miles from Washington in Prince William County, Va.

The discovery was made yesterday by Prince William County authorities and the Virginia State Police, based on information supplied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The FBI had no comment other than to say that it had furnished the information, which came from long and intensive investigation of the organization.

But Government sources would say that the close combat course was used by a newly formed unit of the Minutemen, and that the dynamite was hidden there by them.

The Minutemen are organized guerrilla groups pledged to spring into action in the event of what they fear is a Communist takeover of the United States.

**CHIEFLY IN WEST**

Activities of the group have centered chiefly in California and the Midwest, where heavily armed bands hold almost full-scale military maneuvers. Many of these groups have armed themselves with antitank guns, heavy mortars, machineguns, and similar weapons of war.

This Washington area unit, the first uncovered in this part of the country, was formed at the end of February and got underway fully by mid-March, sources said. It is believed to have 12 to 15 members.

The unit since has been training in deep woods, not far from heavily traveled Route 1 and, with another Minuteman unit, in mountains near Reading, Pa.

The Prince William site was raided yesterday by County Sheriff Ralph G. Shumate, Sheriff's Deputy Bobby Cornell, and Virginia State Police Lt. Charles E. Nicholls.

These authorities found the training site on 3,000 acres of second-growth hardwood timber on what is known as Bridge Road, just west of Occoquan.

Virginia Electric Power Co. power transmission lines cut through the forest nearby. Not far away is the new dam of the Occoquan Reservoir used by the Alexandria Water Co.

Just off Bridge Road, a dirt lane about one and a half lanes wide, the guerrilla warfare training course starts. Empty cartridges and ammunition boxes litter the ground.

Beer cans and trash cover the sides of what once was a logging road. The cans and the trash have been transformed into targets for combat drills.

Sources said the combat course is set up and used just as such courses are used in the U.S. Army.

**SHOOT AT OLD CANS**

The unit sets out down the old dirt logging road. The only other living things in the immediate area are deer, squirrels, and a few birds.

When the members of the unit spot a target—possibly an old can set on a stick, an old car door, a discarded refrigerator—they open fire. Half the trash along the road is torn apart by bullets. Some of the trees along the road are chewed half to pieces.

The Minutemen also have conducted exercises in surprise attacks, one man guarding a position on a hill while others attempt to sneak up and overpower him.

It was explained by sources familiar with the organization that each member must supply his own weapons—an M-1 Garand rifle and either a .38- or .45-caliber pistol—along with his own ammunition.

The M-1 rifle was the basic U.S. infantry arm during World War II and the Korean War. It is gradually being replaced by the M-14.

**CARBINES FIRED ALSO**

Among the spent cartridges found along the logging road were some fired from carbines, another military weapon. Both the carbine and the Garand rifle can be purchased from many outlets around the country.

It was obvious to the investigators that much training had gone on in the woods in the few weeks the local Minuteman unit has been in operation. It was explained that the training schedule calls for drills every weekend.

Sometimes the unit uses the Prince William County location and, now and then, travels to the mountainous country outside Reading, Pa., for their exercises, sources said.

The land that was being used by the Minutemen is private property and the use to which it was being put was not known to the owners.

**FIND 36 STICKS OF DYNAMITE**

Deep in the woods, off a series of weed-grown logging trails, the investigators found the cache of dynamite. A thin layer of dirt, tree limbs, leaves, and branches covered it.

There was a 2-pound coffee can, closed with a plastic lid, containing yards of fuse, 19 ordinary blasting caps and 6 electric caps used to set off the explosive.

Two 1-gallon plastic jugs and a plastic-wrapped cigarbox containing a total of 36 sticks of dynamite were nestled in the hole in the ground.

The investigators called for a team of Army explosives experts from Fort McNair. It could not be determined immediately how volatile the dynamite was—whether it had deteriorated to a dangerous state.

When they arrived the four demolition men, Sgt. 1c. H. H. Lee, Sp5c. Lawrence Crawford, and Sp5c. H. E. Jackson, all of the 67th Ordnance Detachment of Fort McNair, and S. Sgt. Alexander Kaczmarek of the 57th Ordnance Detachment at Fort Belvoir, scraped carefully around the containers. They first removed the can containing the fuse and blasting caps.

**STRENGTH OF 40 TO 65 PERCENT**

Then they gingerly removed the containers of dynamite, carefully unscrewing the caps of the widemouthed jugs and tearing away the plastic covering on the cigarbox.

Some of the dynamite, they found, was of the standard 40 percent strength. Some was even more potent, a full 65 percent.

The demolition men looked over the brown sticks of explosive and made sure that dangerous crystals had not formed on the outside and that none of the nitroglycerine was leaking out.

When they were sure that the dynamite was safe to move, they carried it out in their hands over the deeply rutted paths, under tree limbs, around bushes, to their Army carryall truck. They planned to take it to a safe place and blow it up.

**LEGAL STATUS NOT KNOWN**

The authorities were continuing their investigation into what, if any laws were broken in connection with the dynamite.

It was known that the explosive was bought over the counter in West Virginia, where such purchases are common, and carried, along with the blasting caps, in the saddlebags of a motorcycle to the Washington area.

The dynamite was carried to the training site itself in a panel truck used by the Minutemen, sources said.

Many authorities have been aware of the existence of the Minutemen, as evidenced by recent testimony of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover before a House Appropriations Subcommittee.

Hoover noted that the headquarters of the organization is situated at Norborne, Mo., and is headed by a man named Robert DePugh.

"Our investigation," Hoover said, "aims to determine the locations of units of the organization, the identities and backgrounds of the officers of each unit as well as the principal active members of each unit, whether the activities of the organization are in violation of any Federal statutes over which the Bureau has investigative jurisdiction, and whether the organization or its members pose a threat to the life of the President or other Government officials."

**PURPOSE EXPLAINED**

Hoover explained that the Minutemen organization "claims its primary purpose is to prepare its members to overthrow the Government of the United States in the event the Government is taken over by the Communists."

"DePugh has said that members of his organization are reading each issue of various

'leftwing' periodicals to obtain names of suspected Communists and fellowtravelers.

"In March 1963, the monthly newsletter of the Minutemen organization entitled 'On Target' referred to 20 U.S. Representatives in Congress as Judases and traitors because they had voted against increasing funds for the House Committee on Un-American Activities."

Commenting that some of the things DePugh says "are, indeed, hard to believe," Hoover pointed out that the Minutemen leader "avoids the responsibility of trying to prove that all he says of the Minutemen, their activities, or their size is true."

DePugh has placed the membership of the Minutemen at "more than 25,000," Hoover said. He told the subcommittee that "we have penetrated this organization, and our sources are keeping us advised of developments \* \* \*."

#### LITERATURE OBTAINED

Copies of actual recruiting literature used by the Minutemen in the Washington area have been obtained by the Star.

These include a letter signed by DePugh, explaining the Minutemen's desire to work as individuals to turn the Communists (sic) own tactics against them.

The enclosed business reply envelope for the application for membership was addressed to "Biolab Corp., Norborne, Mo."

Two single-space typewritten pages enclosed contained what was headed: "A Short History of the Minutemen." The history explained how the organization started in June 1960 with a group of 10 sportsmen who were organizing a duck hunting club. Then, the history goes on, "someone mentioned the current international crisis and another man said jokingly, 'Well, if the Russians invade us, we can come up here and fight on as a guerrilla band.'" The joke became serious.

Another of the documents is two pages of practical security measures, advising members to use deceptive measures, such as putting some opaque material like tin foil or carbon paper inside an envelope to prevent your mail from being read by infra-red cameras.

One of the security strictures urges members to prepare telephone codes ahead of time for future protection.

Finally, literature addressed to prospective Minutemen advises that the newspapers and television have pictured the Minutemen as a bunch of crackpots running around shooting off their guns without any idea of why they were doing it.

"This," the document says, "is exactly the type of person we don't want in our organization."

"We cannot emphasize this point too strongly. The Minutemen are most active, the most completely dedicated, and most selective in their membership of all the many patriotic organizations in America."

"We are willing to make any sacrifice for our country. We fully expect that we will have to fight in one way or another before victory is achieved. Our very lives depend on each other."

"There is no place in this organization for bunglers, playboys, or lukewarm conservatives."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,  
June 11, 1965]

HE TRAINED MINUTEMEN, JUDO INSTRUCTOR  
SAYS

(By James M. Coram)

An Alexandria judo instructor said he has been teaching guerrilla warfare tactics to the first known unit of Minutemen in this part of the country.

Mario Garcia Kohly, Jr. said that as recently as 2 weeks ago, he conducted maneuvers for Minutemen at a close-combat course, which he said "may have been south of Washington."

He would not say whether this was the site in Prince William County, Va., where authorities uncovered a guerrilla warfare training school and a cache of dynamite Thursday.

Prince William County Deputy Sheriff Bobby Cornell said "there are no further leads to be investigated at this time" in connection with the discovery of the training site, and the FBI added that it did not plan to pursue the case further.

Cornell said that if any new leads should turn up "the investigation would be resumed." He also said that there are no grounds at present for filing criminal charges against anyone in the case.

#### ADMITS MEMBERSHIP

Kohly first denied knowledge of the Minutemen, a rightwing extremist group which encourages private ownership of firearms for possible use against Communists, saying the only Minutemen he knew of were those in 1976.

Later, however, he admitted membership but insisted he was not the leader of the 12 to 15 member cell which has been holding field exercises in deep woods near Occoquan, Va., and in the mountains near Reading, Pa.

A Reading newspaper editor, Jerry Kobrin of the Berks County Record, said contingents of Minutemen train every Sunday at three sites near the city. His paper published a story about the training locations Thursday.

But Pennsylvania State Police refused to confirm or deny the story or to answer any questions about it. "This is intelligence information," said Sgt. Robert Schuck. "What we know we're not at liberty to reveal."

Kobrin said the Minutemen have been training with mortars, bazookas, hand grenades, rifles, and dynamite.

An FBI spokesman said that it is not illegal to possess such weapons as bazookas, hand grenades, and mortars.

He said they are not covered in Federal firearms statutes, which do, however, prohibit private ownership of machineguns and any sawed-off firearm which could be concealed on the person.

#### CONVOY REPORTED

According to Kobrin, the Minutemen unit in Reading includes at least two members of the American Nazi Party. He said the men assemble on Sunday mornings at a suburban shopping center, then drive in convoys to the Blue Mountains, to an old limestone quarry within a mile of the city or to an abandoned strip-mining location in adjoining Schuylkill County.

Kohly opened his Alexandria judo school in February. The Minutemen unit was formed at the end of that month, Government sources said.

He said he taught hand-to-hand combat at both the Virginia and Pennsylvania sites to "interested young men." He said not everyone present was a member of the Minutemen, but "there may have been some Minutemen among them."

Asked about the dynamite removed from Prince William County, he said, "I don't know what use the dynamite may have or why Minutemen would want it."

Kohly said he conducts his "classes" in "wooded areas where guerrilla warfare could go on." He said the instruction consists of target practice, hand-to-hand combat, and techniques for disarming a man holding a knife or gun.

#### "SORT OF PICNIC"

He said there was no need for the public to get alarmed about the "combat" outings. He described a recent one as "sort of a picnic" in which five or six men went to a National Park near Quantico, Va., for training.

"The only thing we had along was a rubber knife," Kohly said.

An American-born Cuban citizen, Kohly said he became interested in the Minutemen while teaching judo to Cuban rebels in Miami. He joined the organization, he said, "to teach them what I knew and to learn what they knew."

Kohly said he does not offer free judo lessons to Minutemen who attend his judo-karate school at 3925 Mount Vernon Avenue in Alexandria, nor does he attempt to influence his customers about joining.

He lives with his Cuban wife and two sons at 1121 South 18th Street in Arlington.

#### MINUTEMEN EXPLOSIVES FOUND HERE—DYNAMITE CACHE BURIED IN WOODS IN PRINCE WILLIAM

A cache of dynamite has been found on a rural Virginia tract believed to have served as firing range and combat training range for a Washington area unit of the Minutemen.

Virginia State Police and Prince William County authorities were directed to the wooded spot 20 miles from Washington by the FBI.

The FBI was reported to have infiltrated the right-wing, paramilitary group. An FBI spokesman said yesterday no violation of Federal law was found, so the matter was turned over to local officials.

FBI, State and county officers went to the 3,000-acre tract, west of Occoquan and three-quarters of a mile off route 641 (Bridge Road) on Thursday and found the dynamite, shallowly buried and thinly covered with earth and brush.

#### DYNAMITE BLOWN UP

Army demolition experts from Fort McNair and Fort Belvoir were called in. They removed 36 half-pound sticks of dynamite, 60 blasting caps, and 50 feet of fuse from plastic-covered jars and boxes and blew up the lot later in the day at Fort Belvoir.

The investigators also found "some evidence at the scene of small-arms target practice," County Sheriff Ralph G. Shumate said. This evidence included spent cartridges, bullet-punctured refuse such as a car door and ripped tree trunks.

No sign of heavy weapon use was found, Shumate said. In other parts of the county the Minutemen have been known to gather weapons like machineguns, mortars, and recoilless rifles. Headquartered in Norborne, Mo., and particularly active in California, the Minutemen claim to be readying for guerrilla warfare in event of a Communist "takeover" attempt.

#### CORPORATION PROPERTY

Shumate said the tract on which the dynamite was discovered is owned privately by a corporation outside the county, but he would not identify the firm. He said the owners apparently were unaware of the cache or shooting.

The dynamite was said to have been purchased in West Virginia and Pennsylvania communities where the explosive is commonly sold for mining operations.

According to Army Capt. Frank W. Hackley, of Fort McNair, some of the dynamite was 40 percent filled with nitroglycerin and some 50 percent—both what he called "medium velocity." He said the dynamite was in good shape and would have to have been detonated with caps. The 18 pounds of sticks would have been sufficient to demolish a frame building or a reinforced concrete or brick wall, he added.

The Washington area unit of Minutemen was reported to have 15 to 18 members who allegedly divide training time between the Virginia site and another near Reading, Pa.

An FBI spokesman said interstate transportation of dynamite alone does not amount to a Federal offense. The transportation must be shown to be for the purpose of destroying a religious or educational institution, he said.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, chairman of a Senate juvenile delinquency subcommittee which has been investigating weapons traffic, said although activities of the Minutemen "have been thought to be concentrated on the west coast, our investigation has shown they exist nationwide and within 15 miles of the White House."

He said the Minutemen "have also been recruiting members from college groups in the East and also in this area. \* \* \* The subcommittee has scheduled further hearings next week, and a spokesman said the Minutemen will be discussed then."

He added that the subcommittee consultant previously reported to have infiltrated the Minutemen in the Washington area unit. This consultant recently bought an assortment of heavy arms "with no questions asked" within 100 miles of Washington, Dodd reported.

The House Un-American Activities Committee also is investigating the Minutemen among other right-wing groups.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told a House Appropriations subcommittee last March the size of more than 25,000 members estimated by Minutemen leader Robert B. DePugh "is probably greatly exaggerated."

[From The Washington (D.C.) Post]

#### MINUTEMEN COULD GIVE LESSONS TO JAMES BOND IN SUPERSECRECY

(By James C. Hyatt)

HOUSTON—For techniques of supersecrecy, James Bond might take lessons from the Minutemen, the ultrarightists training for the day "when Americans will once again fight in the streets for their lives and their liberty."

A recent letter to their home office, P.O. Box 68, Norborne, Mo., brought this packet:

A plain outer envelope postmarked from Richmond, Mo., with no return address.

An inner assortment of material wrapped in a heavy gray sheet of mimeograph paper to prevent "your mail from being read by infrared cameras."

A membership application form, "Classification: Secret," and a return stamped envelope addressed to "Biolab Corporation, Norborne, Mo."

On a letterhead marked with the outline of a 1776 Minuteman with long rifle in one hand, Robert B. DePugh, National Coordinator, advised by form letter:

"Our members have long ago learned the futility of trying to wake people up and of writing to disinterested Congressmen. We are the only organization in America that is actively fighting communism right now."

"This is not a job for amateurs. It requires not only dedication to the cause of liberty but the willingness to study and train until we reach a degree of skill by which our members can compete with the Communists on their own terms."

By sending in the application and \$5, applicants may expect to be accepted as "provisional members." Full members must complete a "correspondence training course in the scientific principles of underground warfare."

In a separate notice to prospective members the Minutemen advise:

"Newspapers and television have pictured the Minutemen as a bunch of crackpots running around shooting off their guns without any idea of why they were doing it. This is exactly the type of person we don't want in our organization."

"We fully expect that we will have to fight in one way or another before victory is achieved. \* \* \* There is no place in this organization for bunglers, playboys, or lukewarm conservatives. If you join the Minutemen, there might easily come a time that your life would depend on how completely some other member had learned his job."

Dues are \$2 per month. "Every member will be expected to buy his own gun, ammunition, and other equipment."

In "practical security measures," new applicants are told:

"Use deceptive measures," by subscribing to leftwing periodicals or getting on "peace movement" mailing lists. "This will keep the postal inspectors guessing as to which side you are really on." Search this leftwing literature "for names and addresses of fellow travelers and forwarding this information for our Central Intelligence files."

Use two envelopes in sending mail. Avoid a return address on the outer envelope. Use opaque material between envelopes to avoid infrared cameras.

Use mail boxes or post offices "where you are not known."

Avoid telephone calls to headquarters or other members. "Prepare telephone codes ahead of time for future protection."

For new members, "make sure he is not an infiltrator, before you identify yourself as a member of the organization."

A "short history" of the group says:

"Our diplomatic war against communism has already been lost by bunglers or traitors within our own Government. \* \* \*

"A pro-American government could no longer be established by normal political means."

"The minority vote blocks (sic), controlled labor unions, and corrupt political machines so completely monopolize the American political scene that there is no chance for the average American citizen to regain control of his own destiny at the ballot box."

They turned to guerrilla training, the history said, because guerrillas "can fight on for years, even for generations. Guerrilla bands can fight in the cities, country, forests, swamps, deserts, or mountains. They are everywhere and yet nowhere. They strike without warning and vanish without a trace. They take away with them the arms, food, and ammunition they will need to fight again another day."

#### JUDGE DEVANE WAS OUTSTANDING JURIST

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the late Dozier DeVane was Federal judge for the northern district of Florida. At his passing, it was universally felt that the judiciary had lost one of its most outstanding members.

A brilliant attorney, Judge DeVane was noted for his fairness and impartiality. He was a dedicated member of the judicial system of these United States and I say categorically a man of integrity and honor.

It is for this reason that I am pained to see certain allegations and assertions made in a recent House committee meeting which tended to shed some doubt on the integrity of this honorable man, who is no longer able to defend himself.

It is often written that the good men do is interred with their bones. This is not so with Judge DeVane and I rise to defend his integrity.

It is unfortunate, regrettable, unfair, and unfounded that any such statements

should be uttered and I share the opinion of my other colleagues who felt this was a most unfair thing to have happen.

I would say, however, that the record of Judge DeVane is an open book. It is a record of service and of integrity. No unfounded assertions are going to change that.

#### VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY DELIVERS SPEECH AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUMPHREY was a Commencement Day speaker at Fordham University last week. His speech eloquently set forth the interrelationship between social justice at home and abroad. I thought that our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD might be interested in his remarks, which are as follows:

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N.Y., JUNE 9, 1965

Woodrow Wilson once said that "every man sent out of a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time."

A university graduate today who would be both a man of his nation and a man of his time must understand that the moral unity and interdependence of mankind, which has for centuries been the basis of Western civilization, has now become a physical fact of our lives.

We have long understood that the brotherhood of all human beings implies responsibility for our neighbor. But today, in an age where science and technology have shrunk our physical neighborhood, no crisis is wholly foreign to us, no curse or blessing is received in isolation. In this world, responsibility for our fellowman is inescapable.

In this contemporary era—where technology has led to a rapid multiplication of social relationships—interdependence has replaced solitary individualism as the central fact of our lives.

As Barbara Ward has noted: "In a world society in which hate is institutionalized in war and self-interest in our web of economic relations, we can hardly survive unless we also institutionalize the moral needs of man for community, for compassion, for dedication, and, let us not fear the word, for love."

Because the "greatness of our institutions" has not matched "the grandeur of our intentions," we are witnessing both in our Nation and in our world a revolution of peoples against what Emmanuel Mounier called the "established disorder." Everywhere we see populations caught between soaring hopes and immovable traditions.

In our Nation this has produced the Negro revolution, a revolution against centuries of indifference and neglect, of oppression and exploitation. It is a revolution that is not over—indeed it has only begun.

But it is a revolution that we know now is destined to succeed.

Its success is assured because the people of this Nation have realized that the perpetuation of a separate Negro nation in our midst, a nation whose people have been "de-

prived of freedom, crippled by hatred" in President Johnson's phrase—is morally intolerable.

While peaceful protest and legal redress of grievances have been important, in the end moral indignation has been decisive in bringing recognition of the validity of the Negro revolution in the United States.

Pursuit of justice has triumphed over narrow self-interest. Justice has triumphed because modern prophets—from John LaFarge to Martin Luther King—have aroused our consciences and incited our action against an "established" disorder based on racism, the most pernicious form of injustice to arise in our time.

In pursuing justice—the supreme virtue in the political order—an equally important challenge for a man of our time is that posed by the growing disparity between rich nations and poor, the widening gap between the affluent minority and the impoverished masses of the human race.

A central fact of this decade—which will loom larger and larger for graduates of the class of 1965—is that Western societies are exceedingly rich—and almost all others are exceedingly poor.

A small fraction of the human race living around the North Atlantic enjoys per capita incomes of \$1,000 to \$2,800 per year. Two-thirds of humanity subsists on a per capita income of less than \$200 per year.

It may be accidental—but it is surely not irrelevant—that most of the first group are white and most of the second are colored.

Since 1960, the gap between the two groups has accelerated. To understand why it has been growing, one need only recall that in 1964 the United States added \$30 billion to its gross national product—the equivalent of 50 percent of the total national income of Latin America and 100 percent of the income of Africa.

The relevance of this problem to the university graduate of today, and the obligation of nations that are rich and advanced toward those that are poor and undeveloped, was spelled out in bold language by Pope John XXIII in his encyclical "Mater et Magistra." He stated:

"The solidarity which binds all men and makes them members of the same family requires political communities enjoying an abundance of material goods not to remain indifferent to those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and hunger, and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person.

"This is particularly true since, given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persist."

He concluded:

"We are all equally responsible for the undernourished peoples. Therefore, it is necessary to educate one's conscience to the sense of responsibility which weighs upon each and every one, especially upon those who are more blessed with this world's goods."

Just as our generation has inherited the responsibility for bringing to fulfillment the Negro revolution at home, it lies with your generation to insure the triumph of the revolution against crushing poverty around the world.

We who live in the Western World have a special responsibility for it was we who launched the technological revolution that has produced dazzling wealth in the midst of squalor.

We not only initiated the technological revolution but we have spread it to the world at large. And today we tolerate—by limited exertion if not by inaction—inconceivable disparities of wealth and destitution.

As we in the United States are among those "more blessed with this world's goods," to use the Pope's phrase, we have a special obli-

gation to take the lead in reducing these inequities.

It is obvious that problems of poor nations will not be solved by external efforts alone. No transfer of resources from the rich nations to the poor will alone be sufficient.

It requires a massive effort by local leaders in a country to end the shocking inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between privileged urban enclaves and neglected rural areas.

It requires not only the availability of technical resources—but vision and will and determination on the part of those who would break the tyranny of poverty and bring to their peoples the wonders of the modern world.

But our recognition of this fact should not blind us to the compelling truth that nations that are poor and undeveloped stand little chance of success without the help of those which are rich.

It is not necessary here to engage in a detailed analysis of the process of development in undeveloped nations. Once we recognize the existence of a universal common good and of international social justice—and show a willingness to commit ourselves to it—the technical problems of assistance can be solved. Not without difficulty—but they can be solved.

Trade, aid, and private investment all will be needed to meet the requirements of developing nations—that is, if the poor nations of the world are to have a chance of breaking the ancient cycle.

Despite our efforts since World War II to accelerate economic and social development, we are just standing still.

During the past 3 years we have failed to progress at all, indeed we are slowing down.

Yet each day we learn anew that the disorder which persists cannot be ended by political maneuver or military power alone.

We learn anew of outbreaks of violence and turbulence, of peaceful revolutions turned into violent ones. We learn anew of disorder which invites communism—which so often comes as the scavenger of ruined revolutions.

We now know that peace can be threatened by other forces than armies crossing borders and bombs and missiles falling from the sky. Peace can be threatened by social and economic deprivation, by destitution and hunger. If we are concerned about "peacekeeping" in all its aspects, then we dare not ignore this explosive threat which can erupt at any time.

And it is time we learn that peacekeeping pertains not only to military forces and United Nations machinery. Peacekeeping pertains to every force that disturbs or threatens to disturb the peace of mankind.

We must strengthen every economic institution we have—and develop new ones if need be. If our existing financial and development institutions—all formed two decades ago with the establishment of the United Nations—need to be supplemented or modified, we should not hesitate to do so.

In our interdependent world, disorder due to economic deprivation and underdevelopment is the concern of all—the rich nations and the poor. When a crisis erupts—whether in the Congo or in Santo Domingo—the fate of all is affected.

Only by a massive assault—carefully planned and superbly orchestrated—can social and economic progress be made. Only by a massive assault can the burden of hunger and disease which brings disorder later be lifted from the peoples of mankind.

Congress must be convinced of this. The doubts about the foreign aid program in recent years must be replaced by a new insight into our obligation, a new resolution to do the job that needs to be done.

Our European friends—though they have expanded their programs during the past decade—still do far less than their capacity allows.

Similarly, unless we and the other wealthy nations of the northern hemisphere are willing to do our part to revise world trading patterns to take into account the problems of new developing nations, they stand no chance of achieving economic viability through peaceful means. And as we know better each day, if peaceful revolution is impossible, violent revolution is inevitable.

Once we recognize the dimensions of the problems we must then resolve to do the job that needs to be done—to expend the resources necessary. And we need to do this—not just because it is in our own interest, not just because of the Communist challenge—but as President Kennedy said in his inaugural message—"because it is right."

When one looks back on the landmarks of the Negro revolution in our time—such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964—some of the causes can now be clearly delineated. There can be no doubt that justice triumphed over injustice \* \* \* the conscience of the present over the memory of the past because men and women with consciences formed by a Juda-Christian tradition took their convictions seriously and translated them into action. This in the end was the difference between failure and success.

If a peaceful revolution against world poverty and the chaos that follows from it is to be won, it will require the same aroused action from men and women of religious inspiration—and all developed countries. It will require men and women who are determined to lead the rich peoples of the world to fulfill their obligations to the poor.

It is the task of both the graduation class of 1965 and of our generation to convince the legislatures and the executives—not only of the United States but of Europe as well—that moral imperatives as well as physical security require a substantial commitment to long range economic and technical assistance to the developing nations of the world.

We must do this out of compassion—for we are our brother's keeper. And we also do it out of self-interest as well—for our lot is their lot, our future their future, our peace their peace.

In pursuing the global war on poverty, we must remember that it is not just a matter of satisfying physical needs and raising material standards of living. What is equally important is to inspire hope among both the leaders and the mass of the people, hope of a better day to come.

In approaching the problem of poverty and chaos in an interdependent world, we should be guided by the vision of a great man who died here in New York 10 years ago—Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

Through this vision we can come to understand that the growing interdependence of mankind caused by the technological revolution can lead to a world civilization in which both persons and nations find their individuality enhanced, and their mutual dependence and mutual fate a condition to be welcomed rather than a threat to be feared.

Our concern about economic chaos and disorder, about world poverty and deprivation is a part of our larger concern about world peace. All men profess to seek peace. But peace is like a flower—it needs fertile soil to grow. It cannot grow in the rocks of bitterness and poverty, in the dry sands of backwardness and despair. It needs the fertile oil of education and food, of health and hope.

Peace is too important to be the exclusive concern of the great powers. It requires the attention of all—small nations and large, old nations and new.

The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many.

The pursuit of peace requires time—but we must use time as a tool and not as a crutch.

We realize that the hopes and expectations which may be aroused cannot all be satisfied in the immediate future. What can be accomplished in a limited time will always fall short of expectations.

This should not discourage us. What is important is that we be prepared to give some evidence that progress toward peace—progress in the global war on poverty—is being made, that some of the unsolved problems of peace can be met in the future.

It is the challenge to your generation to convert the hopes for peace, the hopes for progress, the hopes for social justice for all into reality. With the benefit of 4 years in a great university. I am confident you will succeed.

#### THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, once more it is my privilege to join with the many friends of the Baltic States in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the illegal occupation of Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and the 24th anniversary of the beginning of the first horrible mass deportations from all the Baltic States on June 14, 1941. Free Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians have issued a manifesto on this occasion with which I am in hearty agreement. The preamble to this manifesto traces the history of the terrible assault and oppression on the Baltic people and continues with the following statement of principles:

We—free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of east-central Europe;

We further request that the United Nations' De-Colonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic peoples and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political and ideological setbacks—inherent in the structure of their totalitarian system—have considerably weakened the Soviet Union

and thus raised the hopes of the captives for deliverance;

We pledge to intensify our joined organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We finally declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to insure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. Speaker, one of the items in this statement of principles is a pledge to intensify the organized activity of the free world in promoting the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries. Perhaps the best way in which this can be done, Mr. Speaker, would be for this body, the U.S. House of Representatives, to unanimously pass the bill which I introduced both in this and the preceding Congress, providing that the President of the United States bring the matter of the Baltic States before the United Nations.

As you know, my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 288, asks that the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw all troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States. It urges the United Nations to request that the Soviets return all Baltic exiles from Siberia prisons and slave labor camps. It further provides that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the people of the Baltic States.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the most sincere affirmation and the strongest indication of our interest in the Baltic States would be for both Houses of Congress to speedily concur in the enactment of legislation of the type which I have introduced. I urge that such action be taken without undue delay.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the sad anniversary of the Soviet takeover of the Baltic States.

For 25 years the brave people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have struggled for freedom against insurmountable odds. Despite cruel oppression, they have not lost their determination to see that they may once again live as freemen.

All of us deeply admire their dedication to democratic principles, dedication which has not wavered through the 25-year night of tyranny.

The United States has never recognized the so-called annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. We share with the brave people of these countries the common faith that they will once again be free.

The gallant citizens of the Baltic States have kept alive their determination to survive and to be free. Today, we reaffirm our belief that they shall once again breathe the air of freedom.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks a sad anniversary for the peoples of the Baltic States and for freedom-loving people everywhere. Twenty-five years—a quarter of a century—have now passed since the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were brought forcibly under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

Early in this Congress, I introduced a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 25, which would urge the President to direct the attention of world opinion to the denial of the right of self-determination for the Baltic peoples, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of this right. I very strongly urge the support of my colleagues for such a resolution.

As a result of continued domination and exploitation by the Soviet Union, the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been deprived of their most fundamental human rights. The liquidation and deportation of some of the best educated, courageous, and industrious elements of these populations represents one of the blackest marks on human history.

World opinion must be focused on the plight of the Baltic peoples, to the end that these peoples may once again be permitted freely to pursue their independent political, social, and cultural development.

Mr. Speaker, I place the full text of House Concurrent Resolution 25 at this point in the RECORD:

#### H. CON. RES. 25

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Soviet Union; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is urged to—*

(1) direct the attention of world opinion, at appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(2) bring the force of world public opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, since its rise and consolidation the Soviet Union has been an aggressive and expanding state. This aspect of Soviet communism may not have been apparent at first, and it was carefully concealed by its leaders. But whenever there has been a chance to seize a weak country and enslave its helpless people, they have not hesitated in carrying out their own designs. Their illegal seizure of the three Baltic countries and the enslavement of some 5 million Baltic peoples in 1940 clearly and unmistakably demonstrate this point.

These countries with their harmless and inoffensive governments were quite anxious to be on good terms with their neighbors and live in peace. Their sole desire was to be allowed to work out their own salvation. But it was the policy of the Soviet Union not to allow these democracies to thrive on its western borders, and it seems that the Soviet Government was determined to put an end to the free and independent status of these three Baltic Republics. They attained their goal in mid-1940.

Early in the last world war, when other democracies were involved in the war, Soviet Government took full advantage of the situation. The governments of these countries were ruthlessly bullied by Soviet authorities, first to sign mutual assistance agreements with the Soviet Union, then allow the stationing of Soviet garrisons in many parts of these countries, and finally not to oppose the occupation of these countries by the Red army. When the occupation was in effect by mid-1940, the three once free and independent Baltic States had ceased to exist. The Soviet Union had carried out its illegal seizure of these countries, and the enslavement of Baltic peoples.

Under Communist domination there was a reign of terror. No one felt safe, and wholesale arrests and imprisonment were carried out. In a systematic manner, all leading citizens in these countries, numbering hundreds of thousands, were arrested and exiled. That constituted the deportation of these Baltic peoples to the vast corners of Asiatic Russia. On the 25th anniversary of Soviet Union's illegal seizure of the Baltic countries, and the deliberate enslavement of some 5 million innocent inhabitants, let us all hope and pray for the liberation of these peoples from Communist tyranny.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the month of June reminds us of two tragic anniversaries in the history of the noble people of Lithuania. Twenty-four years ago yesterday the Soviet Union began its inhumane policy of deporting innocent citizens from Lithuania and other Baltic States; and today marks the 25th anniversary of the infamous conquest of Lithuania by some 300,000 Red army troops.

The Soviet conquest was carried out with all the brutal manifestations of Soviet terror to which the world has become accustomed. People who desired no more in life than to be free were jailed, deported, or executed. In a few days in June thousands were driven into boxcars and shipped off to distant parts of the Soviet Union. This was Stalin's answer to the Baltic question.

We cannot and, indeed, we should not forget those tragic days, for it is important to remember that the destruction of Lithuanian and Baltic freedom marked the beginning of the march of communism into Eastern Europe. I know that my colleagues share my hope that one day these great wrongs to humanity can be rectified and that freedom will once again be restored to the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this day the Red army of Im-

perial Russia invaded Lithuania and 2 days later invaded Estonia and Latvia for the purpose of imposing Communist puppet regimes upon those nations. These acts of military aggression were committed in violation of solemn treaties of peace, nonaggression, and mutual understanding between the three Baltic States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

After the Red army occupied the Baltic States the political commissars of Moscow immediately launched mass deportations in those nations. All the leadership elements in those three nations were subjected to a reign of terror the likes of which had not been seen since the days of Ivan the Terrible. Rump elections under the guns of the Red army paved the way for Moscow to install quisling regimes in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. These 25 years later there are still Russian quisling regimes in control of those countries. That tragedy exists because the Russians have prohibited free elections in the Baltic States since their first rigged elections in 1940.

This is a proper occasion to recall the evil pact between Imperial Russia and Nazi Germany which opened the way to World War II as the original source of the tragedy which now besets the Baltic States. It will be recalled that a secret protocol to that evil pact gave Imperial Russia a free hand to invade and occupy the Baltic States. The international Communist conspiracy must never be allowed to shed its guilt for these crimes against nations and peoples. Nor should we ever forget that the Communists were allied with the Nazis in an effort to dominate and exploit all the peoples of the world.

Those who today may believe that it is possible for civilized nations to do business with or count on treaties entered into with Soviet Russia would do well to review the Communist rape of the Baltic States. That black chapter in the history of nations demonstrates that treaties entered into with Soviet Russia are valid only so long as such treaties serve the purposes of international Communism. There is no exception to that harsh rule of Russian Communist behavior.

As is well known, the United States has not recognized the illegal incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We continue to recognize only the diplomatic delegations from the once free and independent Baltic States as the only legal and legitimate spokesmen for the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. This is as it should be and I trust as it shall remain until these three nations are restored to freedom and national independence.

The United States has demonstrated that we, as a people, have not forgotten the happy and constructive relations with the Baltic States in the era between the great wars. We have demonstrated that our hopes are undiminished for a return of that peaceful and constructive relation with the peoples of the Baltic States. There can be no question about our support for a return of freedom and national

independence to Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. The Captive Nations Week resolution, known as Public Law 86-90, makes our position on this vital issue crystal clear.

Twenty-five years of imposed tyranny and foreign occupation is a heavy burden for any nation or people to bear. What the Russians have done and are continuing to do in their efforts to contain and thwart the hopes of the Baltic peoples revolts the conscience of civilized men. It is to the everlasting honor and credit of the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia that they have not weakened their determination to regain their freedom, they have not been frightened by the loud propaganda talk of the Russian Communists, they have not compromised their love of God and country and they stand ready for the coming final test between freedom and the historic despotism of imperial Russia.

The peoples of the Baltic States are not alone in their hour of test and trial. They are cojoined in the common struggle against the ancient, corrupt and now corroding system of Moscow tyranny by several hundreds of millions of peoples in the other captive nations. There is an alliance, forged in the blood of common suffering, between all the captive nations of Europe and Asia. That alliance is the surest guarantee against world war III and the brightest promise that freedom and national independence will be restored to the people of all the captive nations.

Long live the freedom loving peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. We salute them on the 25th anniversary of their struggle against the imperial Russians. We reassure them that we shall not cease our efforts to emancipate them from the indignities and exploitation of reactionary Russian occupation rule.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that we should pause on the 25th anniversary of the illegal occupation of Lithuania—June 15, 1940—and the 24th anniversary of the beginning of the first horrible mass deportation from Lithuania and the other Baltic States—June 14, 1941—to demonstrate our interest and to reaffirm our intention of helping these afflicted peoples.

The terrible experiences to which these poor, helpless people have been subjected by ruthless Communist dictators is scarcely without precedent in world history and it was in direct conflict with many treaties, conventions, and the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Genocide Crimes Convention, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, all of which bear the official signatures of representatives of the Soviet Union.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples are freedom-minded and God-loving and all their hopes for liberation and freedom repose in our own great country and the community of the free world to restore their rights of self-determination and their status as free independent nations.

I think it would be in the interest of the Soviet Union as well as the oppressed nations, if they were accorded their

rights as freemen, because it would eliminate one of the most substantial barriers to universal peace and I hope it is an end that will soon be consummated by the united efforts of this Government and other freedom-loving governments.

The Soviet Government itself would make a historic contribution to world peace if it would sympathetically listen to the appeals of these nations for self-determination and accord to them their full rights as members of the family of nations.

Be that as it may, this Nation must stand firmly with the oppressed peoples and grant them every encouragement and assistance in reaching their heartfelt goal of self-determination at an early date.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, regularly in the course of history there are human atrocities that pain the sensibilities of man to the point of incredibility. Such an event took place in Europe, exactly 25 years ago this month; an event that caused untold human suffering. I am, of course, referring to the seizure of the three tiny Balkan nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, by the Soviet Union, and it is this illegal possession to which I wish to direct our attention for a few moments today.

One of the principal objectives of Russian foreign policy has always been to seek a foothold, or an outlet, into the Baltic, by which Russia could establish a direct link by sea with Western Europe. This objective was evident as early as the middle of the 16th century. By the end of the 18th century, after a number of wars and treaties, and several shifts in the balance of power structure in Europe, Russian holdings in the Baltic became a reality.

There was no serious threat to these holdings until the end of World War I, when a series of events gave these peoples what appeared to be the beginning of self-rule. Following the Russian revolution of 1917, Russia and Germany terminated their hostilities, and according to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Russia agreed to leave Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the Germans. Thereafter, Germany lost the war, Russia was involved in a civil war and the Baltic States through turmoil and bloodshed emerged sovereign states for the first time in centuries. In 1920 the Soviets signed treaties with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in which they agreed to recognize the independence and territorial integrity of these states. In the interwar period, and especially after Hitler came to power in Germany, Russia again recognized the independence of these three tiny states by signing non-aggression pacts with each of them.

The independence of these states was short lived, however, and the groundwork for reoccupation by Soviet forces was laid in the Soviet-Nazi pact of friendship and nonaggression of August 23, 1939, when it was agreed these countries would be under the sphere of Soviet influence. On June 14, 1940, Molotov presented the Lithuanian Government with an ultimatum demanding the Red army be given free access to the country, and that a new government

friendly to Moscow be established. On June 15, 1940, 300,000 Red army troops marched into the country. On June 17, Latvia and Estonia were given their chance to "cooperate" with the Russians. The Soviets had again settled the "Baltic question."

Under the "kindly" tutelage of Russian commissars in each of the countries, puppet regimes quickly came into being. Within a month, elections were held for "people's parliaments," with a typical Communist tactic: only one slate of candidates stood for election. The citizens of these countries were not fooled, and prior to the elections certain patriots tried to get the people to vote for a list of independent candidates, persons opposed to Communist rule. These persons were quickly rounded up and put in jail. On the day of "elections" a great number of citizens protested by staying away from the polls, yet before the balloting was finished, the Russians announced to the world that the citizens of Estonia had elected a pro-Communist ticket with 92.8 percent voting; that 97.6 percent of the Latvians had voted; that 99.19 percent of the Lithuanians had voted. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the results of the election were announced in London by the Russians before the votes could have been counted. What a mockery of the democratic process of government.

In the years that followed the peoples of these countries suffered as few peoples in history have suffered. The MVD raided homes in the middle of the night; the churches were placed under state control. The clergy mysteriously disappeared. Families were broken up when children were sent away like cattle in boxcars; fathers went out to work on state projects never to be heard from again; old people were beaten in public to teach others a lesson; the sick were left uncared for; and people by the thousands were sent to northern Russia and the wastes of Siberia. In 1 year alone, 62,729 Estonians, 64,250 Latvians, and 65,000 Lithuanians were executed. How many others were shipped out of the country to die elsewhere, we do not know.

The United States has never recognized the legality of Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, and for obviously good reasons. What happened there 25 years ago was not just a national issue, but also an international one; it did not affect only these enslaved peoples, but all of mankind. The cause of these peoples is not only their cause; it is our cause as well. Our Republic was founded on the belief that it is morally wrong to force people to live under a tyrannical form of government. In 1892, both the Republican and Democratic platforms condemned the Russians for their treatment of non-Russian peoples.

We recall today that the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were conquered by unprovoked Soviet aggression, and that aggression made a mockery of human desires to live unmolested and free of foreign domination.

We express today to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain our conviction that the Soviet system will not endure, and that someday the children of these peo-

ples will live in freedom as independent members of the international community.

We pledge today never to forget the illegal and brutal annexation of these Baltic States as part of the Communist system, and we further pledge to remind the world of past Communist crimes against non-Russian peoples.

We finally declare we are committed to the future independence and freedom of the Baltic countries and that their national identities will endure.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians and their neighbors, the Estonians and Latvians, in the Baltic countries are rugged, robust fighters and hard workers. They have been brought up in the school of adversity, and they are inured to hardships and sufferings. But in modern times, especially during the last 25 years, they have had more than their share of misfortune.

Three million Lithuanians and about 2 million Estonians and Latvians constitute the hard core of progressive and prosperous Europeans in northeastern Europe. At the end of the First World War they regained their freedom, instituted democratic governments in their homelands, and rebuilt their ravaged countries in their own image. In a short time the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian republics became model democracies, eliciting the admiration of their friends and the jealousy of their foes. For two decades the people there worked and enjoyed the blessings of freedom under free institutions. But this period could not be extended; and as the world situation deteriorated, war seemed inevitable, and these peoples knew that any war in Europe would spell disaster for them. Unfortunately their worst expectations came true.

Early in the war, in mid-1940, these countries were occupied and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thenceforth there could be no talk about independence and freedom. Independent Estonia, and Lithuania had ceased to exist, and their inhabitants were enslaved by Soviet agents. Their enslavement was made effective by the summary arrest, imprisonment and deportation of tens of thousands of prominent citizens in these countries. These arrests and deportations proceeded on a mass scale, and a week before the outbreak of Nazi-Soviet war on June 21, 1941, largest mass deportation of Baltic peoples took place, exiling many thousand innocent people to forbidding regions of Soviet Russia. To this day not much is known of the sad fate of these peoples. It is most likely that most of them are already dead and others are lingering on still in exile.

On the 25th anniversary of the mass deportation of the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians by the Soviet authorities, and the enslavement of more than 5 million Baltic peoples, we all hope for better days for these peoples in the near future.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Soviet occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the 24th anniversary of the start of the horrible mass

deportations from these three Baltic countries.

In 1940 the governments of these states, acting under duress and force, submitted to the arbitrary, Machiavelian demands of the U.S.S.R. whose army had occupied the countries.

The barbaric treatment of these people by the Soviets was incredible in its atrocity. The history of the mass executions and mass deportations is a matter of public record. In the period immediately following the occupation, in Lithuania alone, resistance leaders estimated some 400,000 deaths and deportations by the Soviet secret police. The men, women, and children of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were slaughtered mercilessly, deported to Siberia en masse in cattle cars, or sent to other parts of the U.S.S.R. for "reconstruction work."

The Soviets had destroyed the great social and economic progress made by the Baltic States during their 20 years of independence between the two world wars.

This period of independence witnessed remarkable progress for these dynamic people. Many beneficial land reforms were instituted. By 1939, industrial employment had increased fivefold over 1913 figures in Lithuania. Grammar and secondary schools doubled. Domestic and foreign trade had developed steadily. Literature flourished. Achievements were made in opera and music.

Then the three Baltic countries were caught in the destructive vise of totalitarian aggression. The countries were crushed—20 years of progress and achievement in government lay shattered, splintered by Soviet inhumanity.

But we need not condemn the policy of the Soviet Union any longer. The glaring, cruel facts speak for themselves. These facts alone provide warranted vilification. The gross injustices perpetrated against the Baltic peoples are defamation enough on the character of the Soviet policy. These people, in spite of threats and attempts at liquidation, have courageously struggled to maintain their own languages, customs and religious beliefs—their very identity. The Soviets took away human liberties from these peoples, but they never broke their wills. Their wills have not faltered.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia will not bow under the awesome weight of Russian oppression. They will continue to strive resolutely toward their goal of becoming, again, sovereign, free nations.

We know that the brilliant blaze of hope that burns for freedom in the hearts of the millions of Baltic peoples now in bondage will never wane, even for a moment. The people of the United States of America will honor forever that fervid flame of faith that glows within each individual of the three lost Baltic nations, so that, someday, these peoples may regain their basic human rights. So that they may, again, benefit from the political, economic, and cultural freedom they once had known and enjoyed.

The fire that warms the souls of the stout, persevering Baltic peoples licks relentlessly. It burns so brightly that

25 years of savage oppression and unremitting travail has only tempered and strengthened their wills for self-determination.

Peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, we applaud you.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, for the many freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, today marks the 25th anniversary of a very sad occasion.

Since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering in the Soviet captivity. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such an extermination and annihilation of their peoples as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire populations. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been the most educated, courageous, industrious, comprising the strongest elements of the countries, the losses in populations become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

But let us now return to the details of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania. At the same time that the forces of occupation were entrenching themselves and the mock elections were being carried out in 1940, leaders and active members of all non-Communist political parties and thousands of public officials were arrested. This was but a prelude to one of the most despicable acts of modern times; namely, the mass deportations that ensued. Interrupted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets re-occupied Lithuania, these deportations went on for about a decade. People from every walk of life, even old and dying people, were put on cattle freight cars for the 3-week journey to Siberia or remote areas near the Arctic Ocean. The number of all the deportees amounted to about 20 percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In 2 nights alone of June 1941, 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to the horribly miserable conditions of the slave-labor camps. The consequent death toll of these deportees was very high.

With the increase of physical terrorization by the Soviets, a strong Lithuanian underground resistance organization was formed and fought the Soviets. It was a heroic and widespread resistance movement, but it was a costly one: after the war about 30,000 died in battles with Russian Communists.

If we demand full freedom from Portugal for Angola, full freedom for the

black population of Africa, we should do exactly the same thing in Europe and elsewhere. The Baltic States are more than 700-year-old nations and they have the same right to be free and independent as any new state in Asia or Africa. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, anyplace in the world, including the Soviet Union is surely intolerable.

In this session of Congress there is a concurrent resolution urging that the House and Senate request the President to have the United States initiate discussions of the Baltic States question before the United Nations. My measure is House Concurrent Resolution 398. I urge my colleagues to introduce similar resolutions so that this cry-for-liberty legislation will be passed by the Congress.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians is marked by misery and misfortune. Centuries before the First World War they had lost their independence and lived under foreign regimes. But the end of that war ushered in a new era for these peoples. All of them regained their freedom, proclaimed their independence in 1918, and established their own democratic governments. These governments were duly recognized by other sovereign states. During their freedom of two decades they rebuilt their war-ravaged countries and were perfectly content with their lot. Then, very early in the last war, they were attacked, overwhelmed, and made part of the Soviet Union.

This treacherous act was committed by the Soviet Union in 1940 when the friends of the Baltic peoples in the West were involved in war. Stalin took full advantage of this situation, and had his henchmen resort to ruthless and barbaric methods to attain his goal. After these countries were occupied by the Red army, the Soviet authorities rounded up all those suspected of opposing communism in these countries and exiled them to the distant corners of the Soviet Union. Thenceforth there was no question of the sad fate of these Baltic peoples, whether living in their Soviet-dominated homelands, or in exile in Asiatic Russia. Neither during the war years nor since has there been any appreciable change in the status of these Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Today they are prisoners in their homelands and suffer under the Moscow-imposed Communist tyranny.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the world should pause today, if only for a brief moment, to commemorate one of the most flagrant examples of infamous betrayal in its modern history.

Just a quarter of a century ago, the demonic forces of Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany conspired with the armed might of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to take by force the Baltic States which had lived honorably and peaceably as neighbors for many years.

The tragedy of that day 25 years ago is not in the loss of Lithuania or Latvia or Estonia alone. The destruction of freedom and representative government is always a tragic matter, of course. But,

in this case, the beginning of what we have come to know as the "cold war" justifiably can be said to trace to this illegal and immoral occupation of a free land by its greedy neighbors.

Never before had the true nature of the Soviet hierarchy's plans for the future been more starkly demonstrated. There have been few occasions since that time which more effectively illustrated the gap between what the Soviet claimed as its aspirations and the practices of the Russian Government.

As free men in a free society, we can do no less than to look to a future when the men and women and children of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia may one day proudly proclaim their own independence once more.

Meanwhile, our prayers are with them for, even though they labor beneath the tyrant's yoke and struggle against the burdens others have placed upon them, they retain the dignity of all men who seek liberty.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is the 25th anniversary of the subjugation of the people of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Early in 1940 a reign of terror began in that unfortunate country after invasion and occupation by the Red army. Those suspected of opposition to the Soviet Government were arrested, imprisoned, and shipped off to virtual slavery in distant parts of Asiatic Russia. Hundreds of thousands of innocent victims of Soviet inhumanity were thus deported. Tens of thousands died in exile under conditions of indescribable misery and suffering. It is impossible to determine how many of these helpless people still survive thousands of miles from their homelands.

Mr. Speaker, the brave people of Lithuania are among the oldest known inhabitants of northeastern Europe, the marshes on the northeastern shores of the Baltic Sea having been their homeland for at least 1,000 years. As a distinct national group they trace their written history back to the 11th century. Threats from neighboring tribes to the north forced them to unite under one ruler, thus forming a unified state in the middle of the 13th century. In 1250 the chieftain Mindaugas was baptized and received the crown of King of Lithuania from Pope Innocent IV.

Though unified, the country was still under constant threat from the Teutonic knights and from other groups. During a century of fierce struggle the Lithuanians succeeded in maintaining their independence against powerful adversaries. Early in the 14th century the Grand Duke Gediminas, a daring and resourceful warrior, negotiated agreements and understandings with Lithuania's foes, thus bringing peace to his people. Under his successors Lithuania became a great power, stretching far to the east and south. In 1386 Prince Jagiello ascended the throne and soon after married Queen Jadwiga of Poland, thus uniting the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with the Kingdom of Poland.

This union and the act of Lublin in 1572 are two important dates in the history of Lithuania. From the late 16th century the fate of the Lithuanian and

Polish peoples became intertwined. During the next 200 years Poland's gains and successes were shared by the Lithuanians, as well as Poland's reverses. Toward the end of the 18th century Poland was partitioned and ceased to be an independent state. Lithuania shared a similar fate. The country was overrun, occupied by the Russians, and became part of czarist Russia's empire. Thus came to an end the glorious days of Lithuanian independence. From then on the Lithuanian people were to know the cruel oppression of the czars and later the Communists.

Until World War I, the Lithuanians were subjects of the czar without losing their status as a distinct nationality. During that period they clung with uncommon determination to their cherished national ideals of independence and freedom. When the czarist regime collapsed in 1917, Lithuania seized this opportunity to assert her independence.

On February 16, 1918, a democratic republic was proclaimed. This event was the most joyous in Lithuania's modern history. The people began rebuilding their war-ravaged homeland and accomplished near miracles during the interwar period. The people became prosperous and national morale was high.

But it was not to last. Late in the 1930's the clouds of another great conflict began to darken the horizon. The worst fears and forebodings of the people of Lithuania came true.

Twenty-five years have slipped past since the dreadful events of 1940. The great catastrophe known as the Second World War has been over for 20 years. Yet misery, misfortune, hardship, and suffering are still the lot of the people of Lithuania in their Moscow-dominated homeland. They still suffer under unrelenting Communist tyranny.

On this anniversary of a quarter century of crushing oppression, mindful of the blessings of liberty we in America have come to take for granted, let us express the earnest hope that the time will come when the good people of Lithuania, and all subjugated peoples throughout the world, will regain the freedom and independence to which they are so richly entitled by their years of hardship and travail.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Government has been guilty of violating, and at times has conveniently ignored in a flagrant manner, all solemn agreements which it had once signed in good faith. Through treacherous and illegal acts it has annexed many countries and enslaved many millions of innocent and helpless peoples. And the Soviet Government's seizure of Lithuania, along with the two other Baltic countries, early in the last war, and their outright annexation to the Soviet Union in mid-1940, constitute an international crime. And the enslavement of some 5 million peaceful and inoffensive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians is a crime against humanity.

While the annexation of these countries was underway, hundreds of thousands of Baltic citizens were arrested and exiled to distant corners of the Soviet empire, dooming them to servitude in

prison labor camps. This process of enslavement and deportation went on until mid-June 1941, when a huge mass deportation took place involving tens of thousands. On the 25th anniversary observance of Lithuania's seizure, and on the 24th anniversary of the mass deportation of Baltic peoples by Soviet authorities, let us all hope that these Baltic peoples once again regain their national freedom.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the illegal occupation of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 25 years ago and of the beginning of the mass deportations by the Soviets of the peoples of the Baltic States, the following year, is a sad occasion. It is a heartbreaking remembrance; but it is tinged with happier feelings. With all of the reawakened memories of terror, of hardship beyond description, of injustice, of outrage, of physical and mental suffering, there is an exultation in the extent of Lithuanian perseverance.

That the spirit of Lithuania is alive today in many countries of the world, that the Lithuanian people have endured with vigor and determination and ethnic unity is indeed a basis for rejoicing.

The marking of this anniversary is, too, a reminder of the history of that endurance. The wonder would be great enough were it for the last quarter of a century only that that spirit had survived the violence and vicissitudes of the uprooted life of a nation.

Yet this is only one of a series of such outrages that the Lithuanian people have suffered in the course of a long history. Buffeted by neighboring tribes and nations from every side, literally wiped off the map, not once but many times, the Lithuanian people can nevertheless boast and rightfully claim a history that goes back to an early century in the Christian era. Their antiquity in the annals of Europe is rivaled only by the Basques. The persistence of their national tradition and of a culture unrivaled in modern history has withstood all attempts of their enemies to enslave them. Their language, their customs, their religion, their characteristics as a nation have weathered every effort of their adversaries to annihilate them.

The Lithuanian nation once extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In the 14th century it reached its maximum in area. In succeeding centuries it was repeatedly attacked by invading Poles, Germans, and Russians. Gradually reduced in size until it was completely overrun by succeeding generations of its enemies, it nevertheless endured in spirit and in personality as a nation. Repeatedly too it reemerged as a political entity. Its establishment after World War I as a "democratic republic" was a rebirth, a bursting from the bonds of tyranny of czarist Russia.

That it was to suffer again, at the hands of Soviet Russia, with the advent of World War II, was indeed a disaster. But the spirit of independence was all the stronger. During the intervening years the doughty little Republic had enhanced the reputation of its people for their strength of character, the quality of their

culture, their recognition of freedom of the individual, and the maintenance of individuality as a distinct and surviving people.

It is for this endurance, this personality, this persistence in freedom, and the determination to remain independent in the face of all adversity that we honor the Lithuanian people today.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, at mid-June of this year the free world commemorates two anniversaries: One is the 25th anniversary of the Soviet seizure of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; the other is the 24th anniversary of the mass deportation of peoples from the Baltic States.

The Soviet invasion of Lithuania and the other Baltic States was an act of brazen aggression undertaken without just cause and carried forth with utter disregard for international law. During the period of Lithuanian independence the Governments of Lithuania and the Soviet Union had established a network of treaties and agreements governing their relations. Explicitly stated in a large number of these treaties was the Soviet declaration recognizing the independence of Lithuania and promising to respect Lithuania's territorial integrity.

For the Soviet Union this relationship under law was created solely as an expedient. During this period, as indeed today, the Soviets have accommodated themselves to the customs and general norms of international law not out of desire but out of necessity. For them acceptance of bourgeois international law was an unpalatable reality, but being a reality, they were determined to live with it only so long as this necessity prevailed. In general, the Soviets looked forward to the day when Communist domination of the world would require a new international law, a Socialist international law.

But, the Soviets did not have to await the workings of history according to their claims or their own conspiratorial activities in order to realize their goals at least in the Baltic region. The opportunity came in August 1939 when Stalin concluded an agreement with Hitler according to the terms of which the Baltic region was to be considered within the Soviet sphere of interest.

The first breach of Soviet promises came in the fall of 1939 after World War II had broken out. In the first step to realize the ultimate Soviet goal of control over the Baltic region, the Moscow government imposed upon Lithuania and her neighbors the pacts of mutual assistance. These were no genuine mutual agreements; they were pacts that the Baltic States had to accept, and at the great sacrifice of their integrity.

The final and complete breach of Soviet promises came in June of 1940. In a Soviet contrived artificial climate of crisis, the Red army moved across the frontiers of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, occupied those countries, destroyed the legitimate governments, replaced them with their own puppet regimes, and forcibly annexed the three states to the Soviet Union as constituent republics.

The destruction of law had now been complete. The Soviets had shown

themselves for what they are, a state whose ideological and power goals were and continue to be the expansion of communism until at long last communism dominates the world.

One of the most cruel devices the Soviets had used in order to assert their will over the Lithuanian people and their neighbors in Latvia and Estonia was the mass deportation of peoples. This is a device that the Soviets were to apply not only in the Baltic States but throughout other parts of the Soviet Union. Whole nations, as in the case of the Volga Germans and Chechen and Ingush, were uprooted from their historic lands and dispersed through Soviet Central Asia and Siberia. During the period 1940-41 the Soviets had imprisoned and deported to Siberian concentration camps approximately 40,000 Lithuanians. This figure has been documented by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives. This was the Soviet solution to the nationality problem, and what a diabolical solution it was. The suffering that had been wrought upon Lithuanians and others deported is incalculable. Even Khrushchev was appalled by the barbarity of deportation and in a display of extraordinary ridicule said that Stalin would have deported the entire Ukrainian nation if there were not so many Ukrainians.

On this anniversary commemorating the Soviet seizure of Lithuania and the deportation of Lithuanians we pay tribute to a great and courageous people. The hope of all free men is what they and their Baltic neighbors, the Latvians and Estonians, will one day know the joys of liberty that they all had shared during the golden years of their national independence in the interwar period.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago while the world's attention was focused on the Battle of Britain, Soviet troops moved into the Baltic States of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. During 3 agonizing days, June 14, 15, and 16, 1940, over 100,000 people were deported to Soviet concentration camps in Siberia. The occupation of these three small, progressive, and independent nations took place under conditions of extreme cruelty and in complete defiance of international law and order.

In their long history through the centuries, the Baltic States have never experienced such extermination and annihilation of their people as during the Soviet's last 25 years of occupation. During this time, these countries have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Soviets or died in exile in slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts but the Soviet colonists who are diabolically trying to repopulate and "Russify" the Baltic lands.

At the present time, the Soviet Union in its ruthless fashion carries on the pretext that the people of the Baltic States are content as members of the

U.S.S.R. and also maintains the pretext that the Soviet Socialist Republics bearing their names gives their people recognition and autonomy.

The people of the Baltic States have displayed throughout their history the stamina and ingenuity necessary to withstand years of occupation. They courageously maintain their language, cultures, and religious beliefs, and their brothers in the free world strive to keep alive the spirit of freedom for which they stand. They look forward to the day when independence and legitimate governments may be restored.

The Baltic States, like all countries under Communist rule, belong properly to the community of free nations. The ideals of freedom and independence remain alive in the men, women, and children of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

If the United States is to retain its leadership in the struggle against communism, it must demonstrate courage, firmness, and an unequivocal stand for basic human rights. The yearning for freedom of these enslaved people and their continued devotion to the ideal of human liberty constitute a threat to the rule of the Communist oppressors. We must help keep that faith alive. For 25 years our Government has refused to recognize the legality of the Soviet occupation of these countries, but today the gestures toward accommodation with the Soviet rules are discouraging and frightening to the many friends of these Baltic States.

In observance of that day 25 years ago, we today pay tribute to the bravery and dedication of these people through an expression of our warmest affection and with the assurance of our continued efforts to return freedom and democracy to their countries.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PIKE (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO) for June 15 through June 22, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for the remainder of the week on account of illness.

Mr. ICHORD (at the request of Mrs. SULLIVAN) for June 15 through June 22, 1965, on account of official business.

#### 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. REUSS, today, for 30 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HERLONG, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GROVER), for 10 minutes, on June 16.

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. GROVER), for 60 minutes, on June 17.

Mr. GROSS (at the request of Mr. GROVER), for 30 minutes, on June 16.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. GROVER), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. WALKER of New Mexico), for 15 minutes, on June 23, 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. ROOSEVELT to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter following the legislative business of the day.

Mr. DENTON to revise and extend his remarks made today on the conference report on Department of Interior Appropriations and to include miscellaneous tables.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include a letter from the Bureau of the Budget.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER of New Mexico) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in two instances.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1732. An act to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act;

H.R. 2166. An act for the relief of Stalman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co.; and

H.R. 6755. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1732. An act to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1782. An act to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act;

H.R. 2166. An act for the relief of Stalman Brothers-Simon Wrecking Co.; and

H.R. 6755. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1965, 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:

1224. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the Agency's reply to the Comptroller General's report (B-132913) of February 17, 1965, on ineffective and overly costly aspects of military and economic assistance provided to a foreign country; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1225. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting copy of the Report of the Proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., March 18-19, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 205); to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

1226. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of possible additional costs resulting from failure to competitively procure gasoline engines for the military 5-ton truck, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1227. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred in the indirect procurement of selected aircraft subsystems for A-5 type of aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1228. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for guarantee and insurance of loans to Indians and Indian organizations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1229. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility as evidence of the slip laws and the treaties and other international acts series, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1230. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, for the calendar year 1964, pursuant to the requirements of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1231. A letter from the Attorney General and Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes; 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. MILLER: Committee of conference. H.R. 7717. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62 (Rept. No. 514). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 421. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3014, a bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 515). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 242. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8620. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965; without amendment (Rept. No. 517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 8862. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions; without amendment (Rept. No. 518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 6845. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 481. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to expand the types of equipment and the number of electric typewriters furnished Members of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9042. A bill to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 9043. A bill to provide educational assistance to certain veterans of service in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9044. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9045. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which foreign agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9046. A bill to specify the insignia of grade for certain enlisted members of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9047. A bill to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9048. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend its protection to additional employees, to improve its maximum hours standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9049. A bill to extend the provisions of the Dealer Reserve Income Adjustment Act of 1960 to certain financial institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9050. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9051. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to criminal procedures and sentencing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9052. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which foreign agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 9053. A bill to amend title V of the National Housing Act to protect the equity of homeowners in areas adversely affected by the closing of Federal installations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9054. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate dependency as a condition of entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, and to provide that dependent parents of living insured individuals (as well as surviving parents of deceased insured individuals) shall be eligible for parent's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9055. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9056. A bill to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 9057. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide an exemption for county fairs and other agricultural or horticultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9058. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 9059. A bill to amend section 301 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to make the Norris-La Guardia Act inapplicable to certain injunctive proceedings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9060. A bill to amend section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide for the holding of representation elections upon petition of employers where labor organizations seek recognition on the basis of employees' authorizations or similar evidence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9061. A bill to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9062. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9063. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for an increase in the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9064. A bill to establish a National Commission on Oceanography; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9065. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9066. A bill to provide a uniform period of daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9067. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9068. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to require the Council of Economic Advisers to advise the President regarding the effect of the importation of petroleum and petroleum products on employment in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9069. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for certain contracts between the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and schools of medicine in order to improve the quality of medical care available to veterans in facili-

ties of the Veterans' Administration; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9070. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 20-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid for education or training above the 12th-grade level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 9072. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide an exemption for county fairs and other agricultural or horticultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 9073. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to permit an employee subject to such act to be insured on the basis of the highest rate of compensation received by him in the course of his employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 9074. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9075. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 9076. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9077. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 9078. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIBERT:

H.R. 9079. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9080. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 9081. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9082. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 9083. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 9084. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 9085. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay

for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9086. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9087. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9088. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9089. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 9090. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9091. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 9092. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 9093. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 9094. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9095. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 9096. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9097. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 9098. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9099. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9100. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 9101. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 9102. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 9103. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay

for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 9104. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 9105. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9106. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 9107. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9108. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 511. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 514. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 515. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.J. Res. 517. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.J. Res. 518. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 519. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 520. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 521. Joint resolution to ask the President to petition the United Nations to seek self-determination for Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.J. Res. 522. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.J. Res. 523. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the

United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 524. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H. Con. Res. 437. Concurrent resolution that the United States reaffirm its determination to see the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia living in freedom once again; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 439. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 440. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the worldwide conservation of wildlife and the convening of an international conference on the conservation of wildlife under sponsorship of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 422. Resolution providing for printing of the dedication ceremonies of the Committee on Government Operations hearing room in the Rayburn House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H. Res. 423. Resolution regarding Rev. Peter Powers as a Revolutionary War patriot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

315. By Mr. MONAGAN: Resolution memorializing Congress concerning the donation of Federal surplus property to State civil defense agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

316. By Mr. PRICE: Petition adopted by House of Representatives in the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois supporting the implementation of the national forest program for the Shawnee Hills of southern Illinois, including the planning and development of the George Rogers Clark Recreation Way, the Kincaid, Lusk Creek, Eagle Creek and Little Saline Lakes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

317. By Mr. TUPPER: Joint resolution of the Maine Legislature urging upgrading of economy of Washington County, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9109. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goli Kiari (also known as Helen Chiari); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tam Sui Lan and her two children, Wong Bo Yee and Wong Bo Kee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9111. A bill for the relief of Eleni Sarandis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9112. A bill for the relief of Benedetto and Concetta Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9113. A bill for the relief of Justina Veronika Imre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9114. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Muriel Reta Davies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9115. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Pate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9116. A bill for the relief of Flory Benlolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9117. A bill for the relief of James F. Gittens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9118. A bill for the relief of Miss Margaret Gale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9119. A bill for the relief of Maria Adozinda de Barros Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9120. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Odete M. T. Lisboa Lima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9121. A bill for the relief of Gloria Monica Mendes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9122. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Charles Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9123. A bill for the relief of Felix Abikzir, his wife Yvette Abikzir, and their minor children, Clement Abikzir and Jeanette Abikzir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9124. A bill for the relief of Jung Soon Lee, her daughter, Mrs. Kyong Hai Yun Wahn, and her son-in-law, Jong Kwon Wahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9125. A bill for the relief of Lt. David Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9126. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Srinil Srinivasan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Honorable Mayor Richard G. Crenshaw

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. HANNA. It is my pleasure and honor today, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and the people of our Nation the testimonial dinner which will be held July 6 in honor of Richard G. Crenshaw, the former mayor of Buena Park, Calif.

Dick Crenshaw is and has been a leader during his entire life. He served two hitches in the U.S. Navy, including 4 years in a naval intelligence unit which operated behind enemy lines in China and Burma during World War II. He was honorably discharged at the conclusion of World War II with the rank of lieutenant commander.

At home, which has been southern California for the Crenshaw family for more than half a century, Dick Crenshaw has served many civic causes in innumerable capacities. Among these, he has been particularly active in YMCA and Boy's Club work, as a 32d degree Mason, and as a Shriner. Dick Crenshaw is a past master of the DeMolay's and holds honorary life membership in the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, an honor which was bestowed upon him for his valuable work with the youth of our great State.

In his adopted community of Buena Park, Calif., Dick Crenshaw has been most active in civic affairs. Since 1956, when he and Mrs. Crenshaw moved their family to Orange County, Dick has given unselfishly of his time and many talents to the city, and has contributed greatly to its rapid and orderly development. Dick served as president of the community coordinating council, as a member of the Buena Park Planning Commission, and was elected to the Buena Park City Council. Dick Crenshaw's hard work and leadership on the city council culminated in his election as

mayor of Buena Park by his colleagues on the city council.

Surely no man, Mr. Speaker, is more deserving of the outpouring of gratitude by the people of his community, and State, and Nation than Dick Crenshaw. It will be my distinct honor to be the main speaker at the testimonial dinner planned for Mayor Crenshaw. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to express what the service of Dick Crenshaw has meant to the people of Buena Park, Orange County, the State of California, and his beloved country. It will not be an easy task, Mr. Speaker, for the Honorable Mayor Richard G. Crenshaw has done a great deal for each of us.

### The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to add my wholehearted support to House Concurrent Resolution 429 introduced by Congressmen FASCELL, FRASER, FRELINGHUYSEN, and BOLTON to further strengthen the United Nations on its 20th anniversary. I feel that this resolution is doubly appropriate at this time as the year 1965 has been designated by the United Nations General Assembly as International Cooperation Year.

I strongly support the President's charge to those participating in the International Cooperation Year program to "search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every conceivable approach and avenue of cooperation that could lead to peace." In my estimation, the United Nations has enjoyed 20 most successful years in its attempt to bring peace to our troubled world and to eradicate poverty, disease, and ignorance throughout this globe.

However, I feel that now is the time for us to evaluate and recommit our-

selves to this vital world organization to make it more viable and responsive to our fast-moving and ever-changing world. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the worthwhile objectives of House Concurrent Resolution 429 would greatly strengthen the United Nations, and therefore I strongly support this resolution on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations.

### Lack of Farmworkers Leaves Skilled Workers Unemployed

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, for those who suggest that only the farmer is being penalized by the refusal of the Department of Labor to permit importation of temporary, supplemental farm labor, I insert the following telegram. I hope Members with large, vocal union membership will read it.

Union members on the scene who know the situation intimately urge me to help obtain adequate, competent, reliable farm labor so that the union members employed in industries allied with agriculture can go back to work.

KING CITY, CALIF.

BURT L. TALCOTT,  
Congressman,  
Washington, D.C.

We have accepted all recruits available under the Department of Labor's State and interstate program. They leave as fast as they come. Some are too young. Some are too old. Some are skid-row types. As we have stated before, we were the first to go with the program last year and used no braceros in our carrot fields. The results were disastrous—this year we were forced to destroy 400 acres in Imperial Valley. Now we are facing the same thing in the Salinas Valley. Some recruited workers remain on the job but the wage cost is more than the selling price of the carrots, and the market is good. Please, please we beg you to do something about it. I do not want to destroy foodstuff that hungry people need. We